## SHLAA Proforma

## Site location

| Site name | Richmond Road | Site reference | LW024 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site address and post code | Richmond Road, Lee-on-the-Solent, PO13 9NT | Ward | Lee West |
| Last updated | October 2019 |  |  |

## Site details

| Site description | Garages and parking to west of Kings Road |
| :--- | :--- |
| Topography | Flat with asphalt hardstanding |
| Existing land use | Garages and parking |
| Surrounding land use <br> and storey heights | Residential (two storeys) and HMS Daedalus immediately to the west. |
| Site size | 0.14 ha |
| Development status | None |
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## Key

| Unconstrained |
| :--- |
| Site may be acceptable, subject to further study, <br> infrastructure or mitigation works, or policy requirements |
| Site is not suitable for allocation |

## Suitability

| Issue |  | Comments | Actions |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Local plan designations | 年 |  |  |
| Is the site within the Urban Area Boundary? | Yes | Site may still be <br> appropriate for <br> development. |  |
| Is the site allocated for development? | No |  |  |
| Is the site in the Strategic Gap? | No |  |  |
| Is the site Protected Open Space? | No |  |  |
| Is the site a Protected Employment Site? | No |  |  |
| Dees the site have a community, culture or <br> leisure use? | No |  |  |
| Is the site within a Defined Shopping Area? | No |  |  |


| Issue |  | Comments | Actions |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Is the site currently tourist accommodation? | No |  |  |
| Flooding | No |  |  |
| Is the site in Flood Zone 2 or 3? |  |  |  |
| Is the site predicted to be in Flood Zone 2 or 3 <br> in 2115? | No |  |  |
| Ecology | No |  |  |
| Does the site contain any irreplaceable <br> habitats (such as ancient woodland or ancient <br> and veteran trees)? |  |  |  |
| Does the site have any TPO trees? | No |  |  |
| Does the site contain any protected species <br> (bats, badgers, Great crested newts)? | No | Site within 230m of Solent <br> and Southampton Water <br> Brent Goose Site (Low <br> Use). An ecology survey <br> may be required. <br> Development will not be <br> permitted unless no <br> adverse impact upon the <br> habitat can be <br> demonstrated. |  |
| Does the site contain, or is within 400m of, a <br> SAC or possible SAC, SPA or potential SPA, <br> Ramsar site or proposed Ramsar site, a Brent <br> Goose site or proposed Brent Goose site, or a <br> biodiversity-offset site? | Yes |  |  |


| Issue |  | Comments | Actions |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Does the site contain, or is in proximity of, a <br> SSSI or candidate SSSI? | Yes | Site within 200m of Lee- <br> on-the-Solent to Itchen <br> Estuary SSSI. An ecology <br> survey may be required. <br> Development will not be <br> permitted unless no <br> adverse impact upon the <br> habitat can be <br> demonstrated. |  |  |
| Does the site contain, or is in proximity of, a <br> SINC, candidate SINC or a Local Green <br> Space? | Yes | Site within 400m of Lee- <br> on-the-Solent Beach <br> cSINC. Proposals should <br> protect the habitat. |  |  |
| Access | Yes |  |  |  |
| Can satisfactory vehicular access be <br> achieved? | Yes |  |  |  |
| Can safe pedestrian and cycle access be <br> achieved? |  |  |  |  |
| Can adequate emergency service and refuse <br> truck access be provided? | Yes |  |  |  |
| Heritage | Yes | Site within Daedalus No.16 <br> Conservation Area. A <br> Heritage Statement will be <br> required. Proposals will |  |  |
| Is the site within or is adjacent to a <br> Conservation Area? |  |  |  |  |


| Issue |  | Comments | Actions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | need to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. |  |
| Does the site contain, or is adjacent to, any Designated Heritage Assets (listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments or registered parks and gardens)? | No |  |  |
| Does the site contain, or is adjacent to, any locally listed buildings? | Yes | Adjacent to Former Married Quarters: Old Local List. Proposals should preserve or enhance the heritage assets. |  |
| Is the site likely to be of archaeological interest? | No |  |  |
| Contamination |  |  |  |
| Is it likely the site could be contaminated? | Yes | Site is in 20m buffer area. A Contaminated Land Assessment and potential mitigation will be required. |  |
| Amenity |  |  |  |
| Is development likely to have an adverse impact upon neighbouring amenity? | Yes | Potential impact on neighbouring properties and their parking requirements. Proposal will need to minimise amenity |  |


| Issue |  | Comments | Actions |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | impacts. |  |
| Are neighbouring uses likely to have an <br> adverse impact upon the amenity of future <br> occupiers (industrial uses, major roads)? | Yes | Potential disturbance from <br> aerodrome at Daedalus. <br> Appropriate mitigation will <br> be required. |  |
| Services | Yes | Site in safeguarded area <br> for aerodrome at <br> Daedalus. Restrictions on <br> development may apply. <br> Under Policy LP15 <br> statutory bodies will be <br> consulted. |  |
| Is the site likely to be serviced by utilities? | Is the site within a Safeguarded Area (other <br> than Southampton Airport Safeguarding Zone, <br> which covers the whole borough)? | Yes |  |

## Availability

| Issue | Availability | Comments | Actions |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Does the site have multiple owners? | Unknown | The land ownership is <br> highly complex. The <br> majority of car parking <br> spaces are owned by <br> individual properties in the <br> surrounding area. This <br> results in upwards of 24 <br> different land ownerships <br> on the site. |  |
| Is the site owned by a developer or is the <br> owner willing to sell? | No |  |  |
| Is it necessary to acquire land off-site to <br> develop this site? | No | Unknown | Unknown |
| Does the site have any legal issues <br> (covenants, ransom strips)? | Yes | Parking and garages <br> appears to be in use. <br> Following a site visit it was <br> observed that the site <br> continues to be well used <br> for local parking <br> requirements. Confirmation <br> will be needed if they can <br> be ended or relocated. |  |
| Are there any on-site constraints (pylons, <br> rights of way, easements)? |  |  |  |
| Are there any existing tenancies or operations <br> on site? |  |  |  |

## Achievable

| Issue | Achievability | Comments | Actions |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Is there a realistic prospect that the site would <br> come forward for development within the plan <br> period? | No | It is considered highly <br> unlikely that the site would <br> be developable within the <br> plan period. |  |
| Are there any known abnormal development <br> costs (contamination, heritage conservation, <br> demolition etc)? | Yes | Demolition of existing <br> garages. Funding or <br> planning gain may be <br> needed to make the site <br> viable. |  |
| Does the site require significant new <br> infrastructure investment in order to be <br> suitable for development? | No |  |  |

## Conclusion

## Suitable

| Issue | Figure | Assumptions |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Developable area | 0.14 ha | Based on whole site. |
| Local area density | High | 50 dph |
| Development density | 40 dph | Density of developable area. |
| Capacity for dwellings | 6 | Based on initial visual assessment. |


| Concluding comments | While the site has the potential to accommodate a row of terraced dwellings to suit the existing <br> character of the area it is considered most appropriate to retain the site to accommodate the parking <br> requirements of the existing area. Following a site visit it was confirmed that the site continues to be <br> well used for parking. There is also a complex land ownership arrangement with all of the individual <br> parking spaces owned by adjacent dwellings. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Concluding actions | No further action. |

