Site Address:	Land south of Lower Road and west of Old Manor Farm, Havant		
Proposal:	Approval of reserved matters comprising layout, landscape, scale and appearance, pursuant to outline planning permission APP/21/01071 for the development of 43 dwellings along with public open space and associated infrastructure works.		
Application Type:	Approval of Details/Reserved Matters		
Application No:	APP/24/00612	Expiry Date:	06/11/2024
Applicant:	Bargate Homes Ltd and VIVID Housing Ltd		
Agent:	Mr Moody Pegasus Group	Case Officer:	Kayleigh Taylor
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Reason for Committee Consideration: Departure from the Local Plan

Density: 27dph

HPS Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

Executive summary

The site benefits from an outline permission (APP/21/01071 granted at appeal) which establishes the principle for 43 dwellings on the site and the proposed access from Lower Road. This application seeks the approval of the reserved matters of that permission, which are the appearance; landscaping; layout; and scale.

The developable area of the site is derived by the site constraints, namely owing to external noise sources (the A27 and the railway line) and National Rail and utility easements. The proposal seeks a perimeter block design. The proposal would have an acceptable layout, scale, appearance and would be appropriately landscaped and would be in keeping with the character of the area. Whilst the layout of the development would be more urbanised than phase one, the scale and appearance of the dwellings would be acceptable in relation to the character of the area and setting of an adjacent Conservation Area. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of Character Area 5 of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. This level of harm is reduced by some degree to 'low' on the spectrum, due to the proposed scheme comprising a cohesive, high-quality development, which is respectful of its context adjacent to the Conservation Area and semi-rural setting. The public benefits set out in the Planning Inspector's report are still valid and would continue to outweigh the harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and its significance.

The proposal would provide an appropriate housing mix, including affordable housing provision. It would also provide an acceptable standard of accommodation and amenity space. The internal access roads and paths would be acceptable on highway safety grounds and would allow permeability through the site. On balance there is adequate parking provision and there are satisfactory waste arrangements. The proposed layout, appearance and landscaping conserves and enhances on site biodiversity. Officers are also satisfied that

the proposal would not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the designated European sites, subject to receiving a no objection response from Natural England following the completion of a Habitats Regulations Assessment and Appropriate Assessment in respect of the proposals.

The applicant has submitted a site specific Flood Risk Assessment, which considers all sources of flooding and concludes that the development is not at risk from tidal, fluvial or groundwater flooding. Within the FRA they also set out a drainage strategy for dealing with foul and surface water on the site. This has been reviewed by the relevant consultees and is considered acceptable.

In conclusion, there are no adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. Furthermore, the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies of the development plan. As such, the officer recommendation is that the reserved matters application be granted.

1 Site Description

1.1 The application site comprises the western part of a parcel of land located south of Lower Road in Bedhampton. It is bounded by a development of 50 dwellings to the east (granted under planning permission APP/19/00427); the railway line to the south; the A27 and the junction of the A3(M) to the west; and immediately to the north of the site (to the south side of Lower Road) is a small industrial complex including a large shed and external storage areas.

1.2 The site lies to the west of the Havant/Bedhampton residential area and to the north of Langstone Harbour and comprises approximately 4.02ha of agricultural land. It is located circa 1km west of Bedhampton railway station, Bidbury Mead Recreation Ground and Bidbury school. Bedhampton is predominantly a low rise residential area, of varying styles and materials.

1.3 Whilst the application site falls outside of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, the boundary of the Conservation Area includes the Old Manor Farm site, which is located immediately to the north-east of the site. Compared to the density of Bedhampton as a whole the density of the Conservation Area is relatively low and features a number of character buildings. The materials found in the Conservation Area are predominantly brick with tiled roofs, some with parapet detailing as with The Old Rectory and Bidbury House. Most buildings do not exceed 2.5 storeys and generally feature a pitched roof structure.

1.4 Along Lower Road, further to the north of the site are a number of dwellings which vary greatly in their vernacular style. Dwellings range from small period terraced cottages to large detached two storey houses, with a number of single storey and chalet style bungalows.

1.5 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 in the current day - however it is highlighted as an area as ‘sensitive to change circa 300mm increase’ in the latest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), which will be used as evidence for the forthcoming Local Plan.

1.6 There is an area covered by a Tree Preservation Order in respect to a group of mature conifer trees beyond the northern site boundary adjacent to Lower Road.

2 Planning History

2.1 **Outline permission (phase 2 Lower Road) – to which this reserved matters relates:**

APP/21/01071 - Outline planning application for up to 43 dwellings, associated landscaping, open space and allotments with access from Lower Road – allowed at appeal on 16/05/2023 following non determination.

This outline application was presented at planning committee on 23rd February 2023, where members resolved that had an appeal not been lodged, the Council would have been minded to refuse outline planning permission for Application APP/21/01071 for the following reasons:

1. *The surface water drainage strategy relies on deep-bore soakaways as final discharge points, that will be saturated by high groundwater levels for significant periods. Deep-bore soakaways are considered to be an option of last resort by the Lead Local Flood Authority and given the high water table, it is not considered appropriate in this location. More consideration of alternatives needs to be provided. In light of these concerns, it is considered that the proposals conflict with Policies CS15 and CS19 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Decision Making Principle 4 of the Housing Delivery Position Statement, and Paragraph 167 of the National Planning Policy Framework as without a suitable drainage scheme, flood risk will be increased. In addition, the submitted Flood Risk Assessment is not considered to be compliant with Paragraphs 049, 055 – 059 of the associated Flood Risk and Coastal Change guidance nor S7, S8 or S9 of the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems;*

2. *Binding arrangements are not in place to secure the following aspects of the development, as a result of which it is not considered that the development could be undertaken in a satisfactory manner:*
   i. Affordable Housing;
   ii. Open Space, Allotments and associated infrastructure;
   iii. Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy;
   iv. Highway/Travel Plan requirements;
   v. Public Access;
   vi. Site Management;
   vii. Drainage;
   viii. Community Worker provision; and
   ix. Associated monitoring fees.

   The carrying out of the development in the absence of such provision would result in an unsatisfactory and unsustainable form of development having due regard to Policies CS1, CS9, CS11, CS15, CS16, CS19, CS20, CS21, DM8, DM10, DM11 and DM12 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011; Policy DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014; the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended); and the National Planning Policy Framework.

During the course of the appeal and following further discussions between the LPA, LLFA and the appellant, the Council confirmed to the Planning Inspector that it no longer wished to pursue a case regarding the adequacy of drainage and the subsequent risk of flooding. Given the expert evidence submitted with the appeal, the Planning Inspector concluded that there would be no conflict with Policies CS15 and CS19 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy.

The appellants also submitted with their planning appeal a planning obligation in the form of a unilateral undertaking as a means of addressing the Council's concerns regarding the provision of affordable housing, public open space, sustainable transport measures and a contribution towards a community officer.

Therefore prior to the hearing the matters in dispute between the Council and appellants had been resolved. Notwithstanding this, the Planning Inspector addressed the following other matters in their decision before concluding to allow the appeal;

- Whether the proposal would be in a suitable location, with particular reference to the spatial strategy in the development plan
- The effect of the proposed development on the setting and significance of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area

Relevant extracts of the Inspectors report are included in the report below and a copy of the Appeal Decision is attached at Appendix E to this report.

This outline permission allows for access to be taken from Lower Road, through the Phase 1 development. The outline permission is subject to a number of conditions, which includes;

1. *Application for approval of reserved matters must be made not later than the expiration of two years beginning with the date of this permission and the development must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates: (a) The expiration of two years from the date of this permission; or (b) The expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters, or in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.*
2. *The approval of the Local Planning Authority shall be obtained in respect of the following reserved matters before the development first takes place - the appearance; landscaping; layout; and scale.*

19. *Any subsequent reserved matters applications shall include details of the measures to protect pedestrians from swales adjoining footpaths.*
20. *No building shall exceed two storeys in height across the entire site.*

2.2 Phase 1 Lower Road (to the immediate east which includes the approved access for Phase 2) was subject to the following applications:

APP/20/01031: Development of 50 new dwellings together with access, landscaping and open space (Revised scheme). Refused 14 January 2021 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would adversely affect the open character and appearance of the setting to this part of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area by reason of the scale of the development and the loss of agricultural land which provides a setting to the Conservation Area. These adverse effects are not outweighed by the benefits of the scheme. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Binding arrangements are not in place to secure the following aspects of the development, as a result of which it is not considered that the development could be undertaken in a satisfactory manner:
1. Affordable Housing
2. S106 monitoring fee

3. Open Space, orchard, children's allotments and associated infrastructure should be provided by the developer and arrangements for maintenance incorporated in the Management Plan. Including measures to ensure that the open space is managed in a Nutrient Neutral manner
4. Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy contribution currently £33,975.70
5. SUDS bond
6. A contribution towards Health of £8,000
7. Mitigation Payment to the SWBGS of £329,036.40 for loss of secondary support habitat
8. Permissive paths
9. A contribution towards a Community worker of £12,500
10. Delivery of site access works via a S278 agreement, prior to commencement of development.
11. Financial contribution of £23,489 to be paid towards the route to school improvements identified in drawing number ITB12174-GA-007 Rev A prior to occupation of any dwelling.
The carrying out of the development in the absence of such provision would result in an unsatisfactory and unsustainable form of development having due regard to Policies CS1, CS7, CS8, CS9, CS11, CS13, CS15, CS16, CS19, CS20, CS21, DM13 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011; Policies DM20, DM23 and DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014; the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended); and the National Planning Policy Framework.

APP/19/00427: Development of 50 new dwellings together with access, landscaping and open space. Refused 26 March 2020 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would adversely affect the open character and appearance of the setting to this part of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area by reason of the scale of the development and the loss of agricultural land which provides a setting to the Conservation Area. These adverse effects are not outweighed by the benefits of the scheme. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Binding arrangements are not in place to secure the following aspects of the development, as a result of which it is not considered that the development could be undertaken in a satisfactory manner:
1. Affordable Housing
2. S106 monitoring fee
3. Open Space, orchard, children's allotments and associated infrastructure should be provided by the developer and arrangements for maintenance incorporated in the Management Plan. Including measures to ensure that the open space is managed in a Nutrient Neutral manner
4. Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy contribution currently £33,975.70
5. SUDS bond
6. A contribution towards Health of £8,000
8. Mitigation Payment to the SWBGS of £329,036.40 for loss of secondary support habitat
7. Permissive paths
8. A contribution towards a Community worker of £12,500
9. Delivery of site access works via a S278 agreement, prior to commencement of development.
10. Financial contribution of £23,489 to be paid towards the route to school

improvements identified in drawing number ITB12174-GA-007 Rev A prior to occupation of any dwelling.
The carrying out of the development in the absence of such provision would result in an unsatisfactory and unsustainable form of development having due regard to Policies CS1, CS7, CS8, CS9, CS11, CS13, CS15, CS16, CS19, CS20, CS21, DM13 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011; Policies DM20, DM23 and DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014; the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended); and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Application APP/19/00427 was, however, the subject of an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate. Following a Public Inquiry held on 2nd – 5th February 2021, the appeal was allowed and the development was granted planning permission, with the Inspector's 'Final Planning Balance' concluding:

"130. I have found the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. However, whilst I recognise the importance of the plan-led system, it is necessary to consider whether there are material considerations of sufficient weight or importance to indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

131. I acknowledge the strength of local opposition to the proposal and have given significant consideration to the many concerns raised.

132. I also acknowledge that the principle of developing the site with the quantum of development proposed is currently supported by the emerging plan. Nevertheless, given the potential for modifications to Policy H20, I afford that policy's support for the development only limited weight.

133. There is, however, substantial policy support for the proposal within the Framework given the economic, social and environmental benefits of the proposal as variously set out above. The presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out at paragraph 11d)ii) of the Framework, provides very substantial weight in favour of the proposal.

134. As such, overall, I find that the conflict with the development plan as a whole is outweighed by other material considerations.

This full permission has now been implemented and the dwellings are now occupied.

There is currently a pending non-material amendment to the footpaths within the phase 1 site to resolve a minor discrepancy and to ensure that the footpaths approved as part of phase 1 provide a continuous connection between the phase 2 footpaths and Lower Road (reference: APP/24/00887).

3 Proposal

Approval of reserved matters comprising layout, landscape, scale and appearance, pursuant to outline planning permission APP/21/01071 for the development of 43 dwellings along with public open space and associated infrastructure works.

The proposal seeks the following housing mix;

		Affordable		
	Private	**Rent**	**Shared**	**Total**

			Ownership	
2 bedroom	6	7	2	15
3 bedroom	16	2	2	20
4 bedroom	8	0	0	8
Total	**30**	**9**	**4**	**43**

During the course of the application amended plans have been submitted in response to consultee comments.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016
Havant Borough Council Housing SPD July 2011
Housing Delivery Position Statement March 2022
National Design Guide 2021

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS1	(Health and Wellbeing)
CS8	(Community Safety)
CS9	(Housing)
CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS13	(Green Infrastructure)
CS14	(Efficient Use of Resources)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS19	(Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
DM6	(Coordination of Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)
DM10	Pollution)
DM11	(Planning for More Sustainable Travel)
DM12	(Mitigating the impacts of Travel)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM15	(Safeguarding Transport Infrastructure)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)
DM18 (Protecting New Development from Pollution)
DM20 (Historic Assets)
DM23 (Site for Brent Geese and Waders)
DM24 (Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Setting of Old Bedhampton Conservation Area

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control, Havant Borough Council
No comments

Chichester Harbour Conservancy
No comments received.

Communities Team, Havant Borough Council
Comments relating to CEMP (not submitted with this application but required by condition 6 on the outline permission (APP/21/01071).

Community Infrastructure, Planning Policy & Urban Design
Comments received 28/08/24
CIL - The dwellings are CIL Liable, in accordance with our CIL Charging Schedule: http://www.havant.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/HBC%20CIL%20Charging%20Schedule%20Full%20Document%20Feb%202013.pdf
The amounts in the Charging Schedule are indexed according to the year in which permission is issued, if a permission is issued in 2024 the amount of indexation would be 70.09%.
A schedule of accommodation has been provided, however a revised document is needed showing the GIA in sqm, by tenure. This has already been requested.
A CIL form 10 will be required prior to commencement if mandatory affordable housing relief is being claimed. A further CIL form 2 may also be necessary.
The amount of Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy has been advised under separate email. The total sum due including monitoring is £37,586.85. This sum increases by the RPI on 1/4/25.

S106 - There is a unilateral undertaking dated 9 May 2023 pertaining to the outline application.

Conservation Officer
The application site comprises the western part of a parcel of land located south of Lower Road, in Bedhampton. It is bounded at the south by the railway line and the A27 and the junction of the A3 to the west and Lower Road to the north. Immediately to the north of the site and on the south side of Lower Road, is a small industrial complex including a large shed and external storage areas.
The Manor Farm complex is located to the northeast of the application site. This is included within part of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, known as Character Area 5. The other character areas of the conservation area are located north and east of Lower Road. The Old Bedhampton Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset. The significance of Character Area 5 comprises historic cottages and former agricultural buildings, now converted to dwellings, set slightly apart from the historic village core and thus rooted in the historical agricultural landscape.
To the immediate east of the application site a new residential development of 50no. dwellings, known as Lower Road Phase 1, has been implemented. For the development site subject to this application, outline permission for 43no. dwellings, along with public open space and associate infrastructure works, has been approved via a planning appeal.

Legislation

When assessing the proposal, the following legislation and policy context is taken in

consideration.

Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Conservation Area, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

National Planning Policy Framework (revised November 2023)
Chapter 16 of the NPPF relates to the Historic Environment comprising paragraphs 195 – 214. *(Officer comment now paragraphs 202-221 in NPPF 2024)* The following paragraphs are most relevant to the consideration of potential impacts on the heritage asset(s):
Para 205 *(now 212)* states that:
'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'.
Para 206 *(now 213)*states that:
'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:
(a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
(b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional'
Para 207 *(now 214)* states that:
'where a development will result in substantial harm to, or total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, permission should be refused, unless this harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits, or a number of criteria are met. Where less than substantial harm is identified paragraph 208 requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development
Para 208 *(now 215)* states that:
'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'.
Para 209 *(now 216)* states that:
'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011 and Allocations Plan 2014)
Policy CS11 – Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of the Havant Borough
Policy CS11 (4) states that planning permission will be granted for development which:
'Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest'.

Policy CS16 – High Quality Design
Policy CP16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states that:
'Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:
a) Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site'.
b) Integrates with existing local landscape features, promotes wildlife and biodiversity and/or applies characteristics of the local area into the design of a scheme wherever possible to create variety and interest;
c) Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors;
d) Is well connected to and integrates with the immediate local area and the wider area by linking to existing pedestrian and cycle routes and encouraging people to use public transport where possible; and
e) The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.

Policy DM20 (Allocations Plan) - Historic Assets
Policy DM20 states that;
'Planning permission will be granted for development proposals that conserves and enhances the historic assets of Havant. It also states that application which affect, or have the potential to affect, heritage assets are expected to provide a Heritage Statement that:
1. Describe the significance of the asset and its setting, using appropriate expertise and where necessary original survey, at a level of detail proportionate to its significance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal.

2. Sets out the impact of the development on the heritage assets and mitigation that is proportionate to the impact and the significance of the heritage asset, including where possible positive opportunities to conserve and enjoy heritage assets.

Assessment

A Heritage Statement (HS), by SLR Consulting Ltd - 24th July 2024, has been submitted with the reserved matters application.

The HS assesses in detail, the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the adjacent conservation area and reflects on the impact of the now completed Phase 1 of the development – St Thomas' Mead. It acknowledges that this has altered the character of part of the setting to now be suburban however, it does not detract from the historic core of Character Area 1 and the resultant harm on the setting of Character Area 5, is mitigated by the high-quality buildings, generous landscaping and green space, separation and set back from Lower Road.

Appeal Decision for outline permission:

With regards to the application site, the Planning Inspector, when considering the site for outline approval for 43no. dwellings, found that:
'The appeal scheme would result in some low moderate harm to the setting and significance of the CA. As a result, the proposal would be at odds with Policies CS11 and CS16 of the CS and Policy DM20 of the LP, which seek to secure development that protects conservation areas'.

However, they also advised that:
'There would also be scope to soften the presence of the development when viewed from Lower Road through continuous structural landscaping along the northern boundary and by setting the housing back from the road. There would also be opportunities to design the appeal scheme to respond positively to the key characteristics of CA1 and CA5, such as the period architecture/materials/detailing, use of boundary walling/hedging and the loose and verdant settlement pattern. The development can also be restricted to two storeys in height to prevent the scheme appearing overly prominent in the setting of the CA. Accordingly, the overall and cumulative level of harm to the setting of the CA would be below that found by the previous Inspector. It would be low moderate'.

Proposed reserved matters scheme:

The reserved matters scheme has been designed to reflect on the response set out by the Planning Inspector. With regards to the proposed layout, this is more urbanised than Phase 1 which was highlighted as an issue at pre-application stage. However, justification for the perimeter block design is to limit the residential dwellings from noise arising from the industrial units to the northwest and the inclusion of a generous portion of open space and landscape buffering.

Full details of housing types have been submitted with the application. A number of housing types/designs have been proposed, which draw from a shared palette of traditional style materials and architectural features including chimneys, bricked up windows to break up blank elevations, buttresses, herringbone brickwork panels and timber cladding.

This design approach is very similar to the Phase 1 development, where it is evident that this works well and has resulted in high quality, interesting new housing, with high quality boundary treatments, which draws from the local context of an edge of settlement, semi-rural setting.

Narrow Marsh Lane:
An objection has been raised against the failure to address the impacts of the proposals on heritage and landscape settings, in particular, a historic route southeast of the Phase 1 and 2 sites, known as Narrow Marsh Lane. This feature is outside the red line for Phase 2 and does not form part of this application, which is likely the reason for its non-inclusion within the heritage statement for the application. Nonetheless, it is an important local historic feature, and it is therefore advised that the applicants should reinstate this path, following the completion of construction works, as an amenity for the local residents.

Summary:
The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of Character Area 5 of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area.
However, this level of harm is reduced by some degree to 'low' on the spectrum, due to the proposed scheme comprising a cohesive, high-quality development, which is respectful of its context within the conservation area and semi-rural setting.
As per advice in the NPPF, the level of harm to the designated heritage asset, must be weighed up against the public benefits of the scheme.

Councillor Liz Fairhurst - Bedhampton
No comments received.

Councillor Michael Lind
No comments received.

Councillor Phillipa Gray
I am taking a neutral stance on this application because APP/21/01071 (Outline planning application for up to 43 dwellings, with access from Lower Road and associated landscaping, open space and allotments, and all other matters reserved. Land south of, Lower Road, and west of Old Manor Farm, Havant has already been approved and therefore development will go ahead on this site.
Given the level of local concern about this development and the associated volumes of traffic, I believe that the application must be considered very carefully, and every opportunity taken to compensate for the detrimental impact on the surrounding area.
As suggested in an objection the proposals should take into account the heritage and landscape of the area. Narrow Marsh Lane, an historic link to Langstone Harbour, runs through the developments in Old Bedhampton, although it is not acknowledged in this application.
The developer should re-instate it so it can be enjoyed by residents.
I support the comments by SE Hants Ramblers in favour of a pedestrian route from the north west corner of the development to the footway at the west end of Lower Road near where it joins Bedhampton Hill which will open up interesting walking routes in the area.

Officer comment*: Outline permission has been granted for the access and erection of up to 43 dwellings on the site, as such the impact on the local highway network has already been considered acceptable. Likewise the access has already been approved and therefore it is outside the scope of this application to consider further pedestrian access, furthermore as set out later in this report such a link would not be feasible. The Council's Conservation Officer has commented on third party comments about Narrow Marsh Lane, nonetheless, this is outside the application site and therefore its reinstatement is not a consideration under this application.*

Countryside Access Team, HCC, Countryside Access Team, Countryside Service
There are specific legislative requirements for the Highways Authority, Planning Authority, Developers and Landowners with respect to the PROW network. Where no changes are proposed to Public Rights of Way, the Planning Authority shall be aware of the following, and we request that the applicant is made aware of the following requirements through informatives where appropriate.

Informatives:
1. Where Public Rights of Way are close to application sites or are used for access to the development site, they must be shown on the submitted plans with details of how they will be accommodated within the proposals. Government guidance requires that applications should not be validated unless such information has been submitted.
2. Nothing connected with the development, or its future use, shall have an adverse effect on the Public Rights of Way, which must always remain available for safe public use at all times.
3. No vehicles (including builder's and contractor's), machinery, equipment, materials, spoil, scaffolding, or anything else associated with the works, use, or occupation of the development, shall be left on or near to a Public Right of Way as to cause obstruction, hindrance, or a hazard to the legitimate users. The public retain the right to use the PROW at all times.
4. The grant of planning permission does not entitle developers to obstruct a public right of way. The diversion or stopping up of footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways is a separate process, which must be carried out before the paths are affected by the development. It cannot be assumed that because planning permission has been

granted that an Order under section 257 of the TCPA (1990) will invariably be made or confirmed.
Development, in so far as it affects a PROW, must not be started and the PROW should be kept open for public use, unless or until the necessary order has come into effect.
5. All vehicles that would be legitimately accessing the site via a Public Right of Way should give way to public users, which could include horse-riders and cyclists, at all times. In cases with legitimate vehicular access a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) should be submitted to, and approved by, Hampshire Countryside Service as Highways Authority prior to any approval by the Planning Authority, and prior to commencement, to ensure the protection of public safety.
6. There must be no surface alterations to a Public Right of Way without the consent of Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority. Planning permission under the Town and County Planning Act (1990) does not provide this and separate consent is required. To carry out any such works without this permission would constitute an offence under Section 131 of the Highways Act (1980).
7. No works to the surface of the Public Right of Way shall be carried out without prior approval of the HCS Area Countryside Access Manager. Any damage caused to the surface of the Public Right of Way by construction traffic will be required to be restored to the satisfaction of the Area Countryside Access Manager on the completion of the build.

County Planning, Economy, Transport & Environment Department
No comments received.

Developer Services, Southern Water
No comments received.

Ecologist
The submitted Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy (Aluco, July 2024) includes details of previous ecological surveys plus the results of updating assessments in 2023 and 2024: I am content that sufficient survey information has been used to inform the mitigation strategy.

Detailed avoidance and mitigation measures have been described for the various ecological receptors: these are acceptable, and it is the responsibility of the applicant and their appointed agents to ensure that all avoidance and mitigation measures are implemented.

The developed site will contain large areas of open space, including areas of biodiversity-led grassland and wetland features. Detailed management prescriptions have been provided for these various parcels of habitat. The management prescriptions are acceptable, and again it is the responsibility of the applicant and their appointed agents to ensure that all avoidance and mitigation measures are implemented

This development is not captured by mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). A BNG assessment has been provided, showing that the various habitat creation and enhancement measures would result in an estimated 30% increase in habitat units and a c.688% increase in hedgerow units.

Overall, I am content with the information provided. All ecological avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures must be implemented as described.

Engineering Services, Havant Council
No comments received.

Environment Agency, Romsey Depot
No comments received.

Environmental Health Manager, Community Group
I refer to the above consultation request for the approval of reserved matters under the Town & Country Planning Acts passed to this Service for comment.
An additional noise assessment has been provided with this application which indicates that the measurements provided are from a noise survey conducted in September 2021.

It is noted that a response provided previously to a colleagues query under the outline application was that the number of proposed dwellings requiring a closed windows approach to meet the recommended internal noise levels, it was advised that approximately one third of dwellings will be reliant on closed windows.
It was also not clear at the time as to how many would require acoustic trickle vents and / or mechanical ventilation.

In the latest noise assessment, it is stated that in order to achieve the standards recommended under BS8233:2014 for internal noise, it will be necessary for residents to occupy their dwellings with windows closed. Albeit that the windows will be openable and residents will have the choice of having them open or not.

It is further suggested that to comply with the requirements of BS8233:2014, that mechanical ventilation and heat recovery (with summer bypass) is strongly recommended for all dwellings.

It is also suggested that passive ventilation using acoustically rated through wall or trickle vents could achieve acceptable internal noise levels, but that it would be unlikely to be adequate for those units requiring consideration of overheating.
However at this time I have not had sight of any recommendations in relation to the mechanical ventilation, or which units may be able to use passive ventilation only.
If the Local Planning Authority is minded to approve this application I would ask that the following conditions be included in any consent granted:

Condition 1:
The applicant will need to confirm that the acoustic mitigation measures to be employed with regard to the building envelope, including fenestration and ventilation, for all residential units, will meet BS8223:2014 standards as recommended for indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings, especially in relation to living rooms and bedrooms i.e during the day (07:00 to 23:00) 35 dB L Aeq,16 hour and at night (23:00 to 07:00) 30 dB L Aeq,8 hour for bedrooms. In this regard it should also be stipulated which units will use passive ventilation and which will use mechanical ventilation.
Reason: To ensure the residential amenity of the properties is not impacted upon by any external noise levels, especially traffic noise.

Condition 2:
Where future residents will need to keep windows closed to mitigate noise from road traffic sources (especially overnight) the applicant will need to provide an Overheating assessment in accordance with CIBSE TM59 (2017) and Approved Document 'O' which supports Part O of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010, to demonstrate that indoor temperatures will be acceptable in the absence of open windows. Any scheme/s or measures to mitigate overheating should be included with the Acoustic

Design Statement or in the approved plans for the development.
Reason: To ensure that the internal residential amenities are not impacted on by overheating, especially during periods where windows cannot be opened for any reasonable length of time due to external traffic noise levels in particular.

Condition 3:
Post validation testing of noise levels in and around specified dwellings, will be a requirement prior to occupation, if approval were to be granted for the construction of residential accommodation on this site . Post validation testing will need to be undertaken by a competent person to determine compliance with the BS8223:2014 standards.
Such testing should be achieved using at least 3 sample dwellings, nearest to the measurement positions Locations 1, 2 & 3.
A report shall be produced which details the post validation testing that has taken place This must be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This report is to confirm the expected noise levels within the proposed dwellings have been achieved, especially at bedroom and living room first floor level, and are in line with those levels laid out in BS8233:2014, and recommended for indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings, especially in relation to living rooms and bedrooms i.e during the day (07:00 to 23:00) 35 dB L Aeq,16 hour and at night (23:00 to 07:00) 30 dB L Aeq,8 hour for bedrooms. In addition to a windows closed scenario, levels should also be provided with windows in an open position.
Similarly for traditional external areas that are used for personal amenity space, such as gardens and patios, it is desirable that the external noise level does not exceed 50 dB LAeq, 16 hour with an upper guideline value of 55 dB LAeq, 16 hour in noisier environments. External amenity area levels are also required to be tested upon completion, to confirm the levels detailed here, and as a result of any proposed mitigation measures, have been met.
Reason: To ensure the residential amenity of the property will not be impacted upon by any external noise levels

Condition 4:
No floodlighting, street lighting or other form of external lighting scheme, including at or on dwelling units, shall be installed unless it has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include, Location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination. Any lighting scheme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall not thereafter be altered without prior consent other than for routine maintenance, which does not change its details.
Reason: To protect the occupants outside of and within the development from light disturbance / nuisance.

Condition 5: Piling
If piling is to form any part of the foundations proposed for these dwellings, then the least intrusive noise and vibration method of piling shall be employed. This should be accompanied by a justification as to the reasons why a particular piling method has been chosen, and additionally the proposed mitigation methods to be employed, to ensure minimal impact on nearest residential receptors, during piling operations.
Reason: To ensure the amenities of nearby residential properties are not impacted upon by any external noise or vibration levels during any piling operations, and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework

Below, I advise of the items I wish to see covered under a submitted Construction Environmental Management Plan:
The following should be in addition to any other items required for this plan, and should

be in operation for all phases of the development i.e. excavation, clearance and construction:
a. no works or ancillary operations associated with the above phases at the development, which are audible at the site boundary, shall take place on any Sunday or Bank / Public Holiday, nor on any other day except between the following times: Monday to Friday: 8.00 – 18.00 and Saturday: 8:00 – 13.00;
b. Deliveries and removal of materials, plant, equipment, machinery, waste, spoil and so forth, from the site must only take place within the permitted hours detailed in a. above.
c. No bonfires to take place on this site, during any phase of the operation;
d. A suitable and sufficient water supply for dust suppression purposes, shall be available on or to the site, prior to any ground works taking place
e. Control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants. It should advise as to what measures are to be put in place for the control of any dust that might emanate from the development site. Furthermore the methods of dust control should be in accordance with the guidance as laid out in the BRE Report 456 - Control of Dust from Construction and Demolition activities, and also the IAQM Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction 2014.
It should also be noted that besides the keeping of haul roads damp during dry weather conditions, any areas where tracked excavators, dozers and the like are working, are also to be kept damp at all times.;
e. Procedures for emergency deviation of the agreed working hours.
f. Details of measures to be employed to control the emission of noise during the above phases to be provided. BS5228:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 1: Noise, and Part 2: Vibration (BSI, 2014v) provide guidance on the requirements and indicative noise and vibration levels and criteria;
g. All site construction vehicles to be fitted with white noise or broadband reversing alarms;
h. Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes to ensure no impact on neighbouring residential properties.
i. Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison, and contact telephone numbers and e-mail

Officer Comment*: A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is secured on the outline permission, as such, to avoid duplication of conditions the CEMP condition is not included in the officer recommendation.*

Environmental Services
HBC on behalf of Norse South East:

1. Access Requirements:
Access/Service Roads need to be capable of taking a 26 tonne Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV) and allow vehicle to reverse close to bin store or containment area. Width of RCV 2.8m, maximum length 11.3m.
Drop kerbs also need to be provided to allow easy transfer of bins from store area to vehicle.
No bins to be pulled or waste carried more than 25 metres.

2. Bin Stores:
Almost all bulk bins utilised by the Authority are approximately 1.26 metres wide, therefore doors to stores need to be of 1.8 metres width to enable all types of container to be easily removed and returned.
A standard depth of 1.0 metre also applies to the majority of bulk bins,

and bin stores therefore need to accommodate the required of containers measuring 1.26m x 1,0m.

NB: In 2026 food waste collections will be introduced, so consideration should be given to capacity for additional containers.

3. Bin requirements
Note: Factors such as family size and age of occupants can influence the number of bins required and it is therefore advisable that the waste Management team be asked to confirm each calculation if possible.

4. Bin sizes for Information:
a) 140 litre (plastic) - 1065mm tall x 485mm wide x 550mm deep
b) 240 litre (plastic) - 1075mm tall x 580mm wide x 725mm deep
c) 660 litre (metal) - 1310mm tall x 1260mm wide x 730mm deep
d) 940 litre (metal) - 1500mm tall x 1020mm wide x 975mm deep
e) 1100 litre (metal) - 1370mm tall x 1260mm wide x 990mm deep

Hampshire Constabulary, Tasking & Co-Ordination Directorate
No comments received.

Hampshire County Council Education Department, Strategic Planning Unit
No comments received.

Hampshire County Council, County Minerals, Planning and Development
No comments received.

Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service, Business Fire Safety
Unfortunately, due to circumstances outside of HIWFRS control we are currently unable to engage in non-statutory consultation work. We will therefore not be able to issue a formal consultation response on this occasion.

Hampshire Wildlife Trust, Beechcroft House
No comments received.

Harbour Office, Langstone Harbour Board, Langstone Harbour Board
No comments received.

HCC - Children's Services Department, Services for Young Children (SfYC)
No comments received.

HCC Arboricultural Consultancy, HCC Highways Depot
As this is reserve matters, and the belt of screening trees is retained and new tree planting will increase the canopy cover in the longer term, I have no objections to this proposal. Tree protection measures must be in line with BS5837 and enforced throughout development.

Highways Development Planning, Strategic Transport, Economy, Transport and Environment Department

Comments received 30/09/2024
Background
The applicant submitted a Reserved Matters Note (RMN) to the Highway Authority for

review in April 2024. Following comments provided on the RMN by the Highway Authority, to support this reserved matters planning application the applicant has submitted a number of supporting plans which the Highway Authority have reviewed and have the following comments to make.

Internal Road Network

The proposed internal layout for the site is shown within drawing SL.10. The drawing is limited in nature however the Highway Authority have undertaken a review and comments on the internal layout are provided below. The Highway Authority reserve the right to make additional comments once further information has been provided.

Vehicle splays within drawing 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-003 Rev P4 are based on 20mph (25m) but pedestrian crossing splays within same area of the site are only for 15mph (17m). These splays should be consistent to reflect the design chosen speed for the site and the applicant should provide revised drawing to reflect this.

Forward visibility at entrance to site is noted on drawing however no visibility splays have been shown. Forward visibility splays should be provided on updated plans for assessment.

The current proposals do not meet adoptable standards, and it is not expected that this would be put forward for adoption. However, if this to be adopted the proposed layout would need to comply with the requirements of TG1 and TG2. Changes that would be required would be:

- Provision of 2.0m footways throughout
- Suitable provision to cross pedestrians from plots to footways and avoid dropping pedestrians directly into carriageway
- All areas facilitating visibility splays to be offered for adoption
- Lighting design to adoptable standards in accordance with TG13
- Drainage requirements in accordance with TG6-4/TG8-1/TG8-2

Vehicle Tracking

The applicant has undertaken vehicle tracking for a fire appliance vehicle, which is not accord with the size of fire appliance vehicle set out in HCC's TG2. The applicant should revise the size of fire appliance vehicle and submit updated vehicle tracking drawings.

No vehicle tracking has been provided for a refuse vehicle around the bend approaching the site access

The applicant should update the submitted vehicle tracking to include the bend approaching the site access for assessment.

Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA1)

The applicant has submitted a Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA1) for the internal layout of the application site. The safety audit raised two problems (items 8.1 and 8.2) which highlighted visibility splay encroaching over a private area and pedestrian footpath which exits into a layby which could be blocked by parking vehicles. The safety audit provides recommendations to amend the design to remove the conflicts/problems.

The designer's response to problem 8.1 states that covenants and/or planting scheme will be designed to ensure visibility splays are not compromised. The designer's response to problem 8.2 states that parking spaces have been adjusted to ensure that the path passes between parking spaces to improve pedestrian visibility.

The submitted RSA1 has assessed the internal road network of the site, and the highway Authority are satisfied with the designer's responses to the problem highlighted by the safety auditor.

Car Parking

Car parking spaces serving each residential property have been provided at 2.4m x

5.0m which is in accordance with HBC's adopted parking standards. In their capacity as local parking authority, HBC will determine whether the quantum of parking is considered sufficient.
Parallel visitor parking bays are provided at a width of 2.0m x 6.0m. TG1 out the parking requirements for parallel spaces within the highway which would be required to be 2.5m x 6m to prevent overhanging of the vehicles and to reflect the increase in vehicle sizes.
HBC Parking Standards do not set dimensions for parallel parking; however, the 2.5m width is in accordance with more recent parking standards across the County.
All visitor bays are provided with an area of hardstanding to the rear of the parking space which is considered acceptable.

Cycle Parking
Cycle parking for the application site is provided for each plot within a garden shed or to the rear within the proposed garden as presented in drawing PSL.01. This is noted and the provision is considered acceptable.

Recommendations
Having regard to the above, there is insufficient information for the Highway Authority to provide comments on this planning application. Further comments will be provided upon receipt of the above requested information.

Comments received 10/12/2024
In regard to application APP/24/00612, following on from the previous HCC Highway consultation response dated 30 September 2024, it is noted that the applicants have submitted additional and revised information in order to cover the highway points and issues that had been previously raised.

As outlined in the previous HCC Highway consultation response, it is understood that the roads and footways relating to this application are not being offered for adoption by the developer. As such, HCC would not object in principle to the proposals. However, the updated information has been reviewed and the following comments are made:

Internal Road Network / Visibility Splays
Concerns were previously raised in regard to the utilisation of incorrect pedestrian visibility splays and the lack of evidenced vehicle visibility splays at the access junction into this phase of the site.
The applicant has subsequently produced an 'Engineering Review and Vis Splay' Drawing (6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-003 Rev P6) which now demonstrates achievable pedestrian visibility splays at the required 20mph design speed.
Additionally, forward visibility splays have also been provided for the access junction into the site on the same drawing, which also show appropriate visibility splays can be achieved. It is noted however that the splay covers an area of 'public realm' which is listed as being for shrubs' groundcover. Given that the area is not simple grass, there is a slight concern that the shrubs could grow to a height that could obstruct visibility, and as such a condition concerning visibility is requested as outlined below.

Vehicle Tracking
Concerns were previously raised in regard to the utilisation of an incorrectly sized Fire Tender for the vehicle tracking drawings, as well as the lack of Refuse Vehicle Tracking at the site access junction.
In response to this, the applicants have submitted revised vehicle tracking drawings:

A. Fire Tender Tracking Drawing 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-501 Rev P6; and
B. Refuse Tracking Drawing 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-500 Rev P6.
These drawings have been assessed, and demonstrate an acceptable level of movement is achievable.
The fire tender can gain appropriate access around the site, getting within a reasonable distance to all dwellings.
The refuse vehicle can also achieve access around the site (as outlined in the previous consultation response), and whilst the tracking demonstrates a requirement to utilise a proportion of non-designated lane when manoeuvring through the site access junction, this is deemed acceptable in this specific case due to the infrequency of movements; the relatively low speeds and vehicle flows anticipated at this point; and the availability of passing width within a short distance of the junction within the visibility splay area.
Finally, whilst not a point of objectionable concern, the applicants have also clarified the width of parallel parking bays within the site. Previously HCC Highway's commented that they were 2.0m wide and it would be recommended that these were widened to 2.5m. The applicants have confirmed that whilst the demarcation of the spaces is 2.0m, the physical area is actually 3.0m which will ensure vehicles do not overhang into the carriageway space. This additional width is welcomed.

Recommendation
Given the production of the additional information and confirmation of issues as outlined above, HCC as Local Highway Authority would have no objection to the application as proposed, subject to the condition listed below being applied. Additionally, forward visibility splays have also been provided for the access junction into the site on the same drawing, which also show appropriate visibility splays can be achieved. It is noted however that the splay covers an area of 'public realm' which is listed as being for shrubs' groundcover. Given that the area is not simple grass, there is a slight concern that the shrubs could grow to a height that could obstruct visibility, and as such a condition concerning visibility is requested as outlined below.

Conditions

CONSTRUCTION METHOD STATEMENT REQUIRED
No development shall start on site until a construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority, which shall include:
(a) A programme of and phasing of demolition (if any) and construction work;
(b) The provision of long term facilities for contractor parking;
(c) The arrangements for deliveries associated with all construction works;
(d) Methods and phasing of construction works;
(e) Access and egress for plant and machinery;
(f) Protection of pedestrian routes during construction;
(g) Location of temporary site buildings, compounds, construction material, and plant storage areas;
(h) Details of the methodology for ensuring dirt is not transferred onto the highway from the site (i.e. wheel washers), and onwards mitigation should this fail, such as the employment of mechanical road sweepers, and the subsequent refresh of street lining (as and when required) should this be damaged during the process.
Demolition and construction work shall only take place in accordance with the approved method statement.
Reason - In order that the Planning Authority can properly consider the effect

of the works on the amenity of the locality.

VISIBILITY SPLAYS
The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until visibility splays shown on drawing 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-003 Rev P6 have been provided. Nothing over 0.6m in height above the level of the adjacent carriageway shall be placed or permitted to stay within the visibility splay.
Reason – In the interests of highway safety.
Officer comment: *A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is secured on the outline permission, as such, to avoid duplication of requirements the Construction Method Statement condition is not included in the officer recommendation.*

Historic England, South East
Historic England provides advice when our engagement can add most value. In this case we are not offering advice. This should not be interpreted as comment on the merits of the application.
We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers. You may also find it helpful to refer to our published advice at https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/find

Housing Needs Manager, Havant Borough Council
Current planning policy requirements Core Strategy policy CS9. 2, the Havant Borough Housing SPD (July 2011), mean that developments of 15 units or more would be required to provide 30-40% affordable housing on site.

However, following the withdrawal of the previous Havant Borough Local Plan from Examination earlier this year, the council has produced a Housing Delivery Position Statement March 2022 for the purpose of setting out how planning applications for housing not in accordance with the Development Plan will be considered in the context of the Council's current five-year housing land supply and Housing Delivery Test measurement.

This statement confirms that developments of 10 dwellings or more will be expected to provide a minimum of 30% affordable housing outside of Havant, Waterlooville, and Leigh Park town centres: and 20% affordable housing on sites within Havant, Waterlooville, and Leigh Park town centres.

This development would be expected to deliver a minimum of 13 units and the applicants have confirmed their intention to meet this requirement with a 69%/31% tenure split in favour of the rented units.

The applicant's proposal for the affordable provision is:

Dwelling type	Tenure	Bedrooms	Persons	Area sqm	Number
House	Affordable Rent	2	4	81	7
House	Affordable Rent	3	5	95	2
House	Shared Ownership	2	4	81	2
House	Shared Ownership	3	5	95	2
TOTAL					13

Housing Mix
The demand for affordable housing remains consistently high within Havant borough as applicants continue to struggle with high rents in the Private Rented Sector, and

high house prices making home ownership more difficult to achieve.

As at 10/09/2024 there are 1581 active applications registered on Hampshire Home Choice (HHC), with a further 137 applications currently being processed. All applicants are seeking rented accommodation of all sizes in our area:

Bedroom need	Grand Total
1	656
2	531
3	328
4	62
5	3
6	1
Grand Total	1581

Between April 2023 to March 2024, for Band 3 applicants (which reflects a reasonable priority for moving), the time between registration and nomination was an average of between 2 years 6 months, and 5 years, depending on the property size required. Although there are fewer applicants for 3- and 4-bedroom homes, their wait is longer. In fact, the average waiting time for a larger 4+ bedroom home is still not able to be calculated due to the severe lack of this size of property.

All the proposed affordable house types appear to meet the minimum internal area required to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards.

I would expect to see some of the new homes constructed to M4(2) and M4(3) standards to enable use by residents with disabilities/mobility needs.

Once developed, and subsequently transferred to the Registered Provider, any affordable homes for rent will be required to be advertised through Hampshire Home Choice, and the weekly rental will be capped at Local Housing Allowance rates at first, and every subsequent letting.

The site's location provides easy access to the town centre and is well placed to enable any new residents to have use of local services, including retail, transport, education, and medical facilities.

In principle Housing would support this application**.**

Officer comment: *All affordable housing would meet M4(2) standards. No M4(3) dwellings are proposed, however this is not a requirement of planning policy.*

HBIC

Within 50m Notable and Protected Species- Bats in flight: Common Pipistrelle (Lower Road)
Within 500m SSSI Langstone Harbour
Within 500m SPA, RAMSAR Chichester and Langstone Harbours
Within 500m SAC Solent Maritime

Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council

From a landscape perspective we have the following comments in relation to this application:

- To encourage sustainable transportation and active travel, we would want to see a shared footpath which connects to the existing network to the north west of the site on

Bedhampton Hill.
- We have concerns with the lack of off road pedestrian footpath provision around the site, which could discourage sustainable transportation which is contrary to HBC policy. Only units S2.1 and 4.2 can manoeuvre though the site without having to walk on the road. Given the scale of the site and the number of vehicles moving around all properties should have good off road pedestrian connectivity.
- Phase 1 and 2 will provide a total of 93 dwellings and Field in Trust guidelines recommend a development of this scale the provision of a local area of play (LAP), locally equipped ear of play (LEAP) and a contribution towards a MUGA.
- Where soft landscaping is used to break up massing of car parking we require trees to be planted to height and screening.
- SUDs form a part of the sites overall open space and should be designed to allow safe access and egress as such no slopes should be more than a 1 in 3 gradient, where appropriate.

Officer comment: *Access was agreed at outline stage and therefore a further access point cannot be secured at this stage. The other comments are addressed in section 7 of this report.*

Langstone Harbour Board
No comments received.

Local Lead Flood Authority HCC, Hampshire County Council
Comments received 12/09/2024:
The County Council has reviewed the following documents relating to the above application:
• Flood Risk Assessment & Development Drainage Strategy ref: SS/21/0433/6430
The drainage strategy has been amended from that previously reviewed and a discharge point has been identified to a watercourse to the south west of the site. This is considered acceptable in principle.
Plans and calculations have been provided with the discharge rate controlled at the outfall of the attenuation basin in line with greenfield runoff rates.
However, flows are directed using swales into a small basin prior to uncontrolled weir discharge overland into the watercourse. We have some concerns regarding this final feature. There is no defined routing between the pond and the watercourse and while it is accepted that flows would naturally utilise this route, the presence of the adjacent railway needs consideration with confirmation of any required offsets in relation to standing water. The railway is also lower than the pond so additional features may be appropriate to ensure flows are directed towards the ditch.
In relation to the reserved matters application, we would have no objection provided the above points can be addressed in an appropriate discharge of conditions application. If condition 12 is sought for discharge as part of this submission, the additional queries need to be addressed before this is done.

Comments received 13/12/2024:
The County Council has reviewed the following documents relating to the above application:
• Flood Risk Assessment & Development Drainage Strategy rev E
• Drainage Strategy Technical Note rev E
• Levels Layout ref: 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-002 P5
• Drainage Layout ref: 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-001 P14
The above information has addressed the comments identified previously and as such, we have no objection to the application.

Natural England, Natural England Consultation Service

Comments received 06/09/2024:
I can confirm, Natural England has previously been consulted on an Appropriate Assessment for the outline application (APP/21/01071) in accordance with Paragraph 63 (3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Natural England has no further comments to make on this application, as long as the relevant avoidance and mitigation measures specified in the Appropriate Assessment are secured in perpetuity. Our previous response dated 16 February 2023 is attached here once again.

Officer comment: *Further consultation response on the Appropriate Assessment awaited.*

Network Rail, Planning Team
Due to the close proximity of the proposed development to Network Rail's land and the operational railway, Network Rail requests the applicant / developer engages Network Rail's Asset Protection and Optimisation (
ASPRO) team prior to works commencing. This will allow our ASPRO team to review the details of the proposal to ensure that the works can be completed without any risk to the operational railway. The applicant / developer may be required to enter into an Asset Protection Agreement to get the required resource and expertise on-board to enable approval of detailed works. To start the process with our Asset Protection team, the applicant / developer should use the Asset Protection Customer Experience (ACE) system found on Network Rail's Asset Protection website (https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/looking-after-the-railway/asset-protection_and-optimisation/). Where applicable, the applicant must also follow the attached Asset Protection informatives. The informatives are issued to all development within close proximity to the railway (compliance with the informatives does not remove the need to engage with our ASPRO team).

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion does not: • encroach onto Network Rail land • affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company's railway and its infrastructure • undermine its support zone • damage the company's infrastructure • place additional load on cuttings • adversely affect any railway land or structure • over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land • cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future Network Rail strongly recommends the developer complies with the following comments and requirements to maintain the safe operation of the railway and protect Network Rail's infrastructure.

Future maintenance
The applicant must ensure that any construction and subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of/or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land and air-space. Therefore, any buildings are required to be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail's boundary. This requirement will allow for the construction and future maintenance of a building without the need to access the operational railway environment. Any less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works as well as adversely impact upon Network Rail's maintenance teams' ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments. Access to Network Rail's land may not always be granted and if granted may be subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. As mentioned above, any works within Network Rail's land would need approval from the Network Rail Asset Protection

Engineer. This request should be submitted at least 20 weeks before any works are due to commence on site and the applicant is liable for all associated costs (e.g. a l l possession, site safety, asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third-party access to its land.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail's property, must at all times be carried out in a "fail safe" manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail's property or into Network Rail's culvert or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail's property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail's property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail's existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed within 20 metres of Network Rail's boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail's property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants' expense. Scaffolding Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant's contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail's existing fencing / wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point during or post construction should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation within Network Rail's land boundary must not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers' vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential

for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer's approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway should be made aware to the future occupiers of the site. It must also be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which holds relevant national guidance information.

The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night-time train running and heavy freight trains. The appropriate building materials should be used to reduce any potential noise disturbance from the railway.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.
Landscaping
Any trees/shrubs to be planted adjacent to the railway boundary these shrubs should be positioned at a minimum distance greater than their predicted mature height from the boundary. Certain broad leaf deciduous species should not be planted adjacent to the railway boundary as the species will contribute to leaf fall which will have a detrimental effect on the safety and operation of the railway. Network Rail wish to be involved in the approval of any landscaping scheme adjacent to the railway. Any hedge planted adjacent to Network Rail's boundary fencing for screening purposes should be so placed that when fully grown it does not damage the fencing or provide a means of scaling it. No hedge should prevent Network Rail from maintaining its boundary fencing. If required, Network Rail's Asset Protection team are able to provide more details on which trees/shrubs are permitted within close proximity to the railway.

Existing Rights
Whilst not a planning matter, we would like to remind the applicant of the need to identify and comply with all existing rights on the land. Network Rail request all existing rights, covenants and easements are retained unless agreed otherwise with Network Rail.

Property Rights
Notwithstanding the above, if any property rights are required from Network Rail in order to deliver the development, Network Rail's Property team will need to be contacted.

Officer comment: *The applicant has provided the required easements. An informative would be added to the decision notice to remind them of the ASPRO engagement requirements.*

Norse South East, Operations Director
No comments received.

Planning Policy, PPUD
The applicant has submitted a site specific Flood Risk Assessment, which considers all sources of flooding and concludes that the development is not at risk from tidal, fluvial or groundwater flooding. Within the FRA they also set out a drainage strategy for

dealing with foul and surface water on the site.

Portsmouth Water Company
Comments received 09/09/24
Portsmouth Water have reviewed the application for APP/24/00612 and have no concerns regarding impacts to groundwater quality, as the location is outside our Source Protection Zone boundaries. We have no further comments to make.

Comments received 19/08/24
Please find attached the plan(s) showing the approximate position of water mains at the requested location.
Service connections are not shown but it should be assumed that all premises are supplied from the water distribution network. Other connections
not related to properties, such as field supplies, may also exist so we would suggest a visual/CAT scan/Ground Radar survey is undertaken prior to any
hand or mechanical excavation.
Safe digging practices in accordance with HSE publication HSG47 “Avoiding Danger from Underground Services” must be used to verify and establish
the actual position of the mains, pipes, services and other apparatus on site before any mechanical plant is used. This documentation is available at
http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/priced/hsg47.pdf
Copies of guidance notes: Working near distribution apparatus and Guidance for working near or over a Trunk Water Main are enclosed. Please read
carefully as the conditions will apply to any work you undertake in the vicinity of Portsmouth Water assets.
It is important to ensure that a copy of the above guidance is provided to those undertaking any work which may affect our apparatus.
Please note Portsmouth water has no responsibility for any underground drainage or sewerage infrastructure. Enquiries regarding these assets should
be directed to the relevant authority/company.

Ramblers Association, South East Hants Group
We welcome the paths and open space that is proposed within the new development and the encouragement they will give to walking activities. However, we are concerned that the only pedestrian access to and from the development site is to the north east through the 'phase one' development. This north east access is fine for walkers wanting to go north east towards Bilbury Mead but not for people wanting to use the paths leading from the west end of Lower Road up to Portsdown Hill or down to the coast at Chalkdock Lake, or to Farlington Marshes. People wanting to go in these directions would have to walk through the new estate before doubling back along Lower Road. An unnecessary extra 1/3 of a mile. This will not encourage walking.

We therefore suggest a pedestrian link be made from the proposed open space at the north west corner of the development to the footway at the west end of Lower Road near where it joins Bedhampton Hill. Such a link would provide many circular walks and would greatly encourage walking as an activity.

Officer comment: *As set out before, the access was agreed at the outline stage and therefore the provision of further accesses is outside the scope of this reserved matters application.*

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, 1st Floor Pavilion View
No comments received.

South Eastern Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group, CommCen Building
No comments received.

Southern Electric plc, Network Investment Team
No comments received.

Southern Gas Network
Comments received 20/08/2024:
There are high pressure pipelines in the vicinity of your proposed work area. SGN formally object to this planning application until such time as a detail consultation has taken place.
For your safety, it is essential that no work or crossing of this high pressure pipeline is carried out until a detailed consultation has taken place.
This response is for initial/scoping out work only. This response does not give permission to undertake any work.
When consultation has taken place, your planning has been approved and works on site are due to start, another request for information and updated maps must be made via our on-line system as a 'planned works' enquiry.
Please find an extract from our mains records for your search area, any SGN assets are described in the map legend. On some occasions maps may be sent that do not contain any gas pipes, this is due to the location of your proposed work area and although there are no pipelines in the immediate vicinity, consultation is still required to ensure that your development has no other impact on our pipelines. SGN Personnel must confirm the actual location of all pipelines prior to commencement of any work. Please note there may also be additional gas pipes (low pressure, medium pressure, etc.) shown on the mains record.
This mains record only shows the pipes owned by SGN in our role as a Licensed Gas Transporter (GT). Please note that privately owned gas pipes or pipes owned by other GTs may be present in this area and information regarding those pipes needs to be requested from the owners. If we know of any other pipes in the area we will note them on the plans as a shaded area and/or a series of x's.
The information shown on this plan is given without obligation or warranty and the accuracy cannot be guaranteed.
Service pipes, valves, siphons, stub connections etc. are not shown but their presence should be anticipated. Your attention is drawn to the information and disclaimer on these plans.

It must be stressed that both direct and consequential damage to gas plant can be dangerous for your employees and the general public and repairs to any such damage will incur a charge to you or the organisation carrying out work on your behalf.

Comments received 17/01/2025:
SGN have agreed to remove the objection with the following conditions imposed:

1. Relating to the proposed swale, depth of cover over the pipeline (from ground level to crown of pipeline) must be maintained at, at least 1m

2. Relating to the proposed swale, an impermeable layer (or equally suitable solution to be approved by SGN) must be installed to prevent excessive water ingress to the soils surrounding the pipeline and pipeline easement

3. Nothing can be done which is likely to cause damage or injury to the gas main

4. Not, without consent make any material alteration or deposit any of

anything on the easement (20 feet either side of the pipeline) so as to interfere with or obstruct access to the gas main.

5. Not to erect or install any building or structure or permanent apparatus in through, upon, or over the easement strip (20 feet either side of the pipeline). Under this clause, agreement has been made to remove a flagpole structure shown on indicative plans being within the easement

6. All works in the vicinity of the high pressure gas pipeline must comply with those conditions set out in a document published by Southern Gas and which is titled "SGN/WI/SW/2 - Work Instruction for Safe Working in the Vicinity of Pipelines & Associated Installations with maximum operating pressure >7barg". A copy of this document is enclosed with this letter

7. Any documentation or drawings that include the gas pipeline must appropriately label them as Major Accident Hazard Pipelines (a classification within The Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996)

8. Any vehicle crossing points will require an SPIA Assessment, if pipeline stresses are found to be too high then protective measures (e.g. concrete protection slab) must be designed and installed under permission from SGN

9. SGN reserves the right to introduce further conditions if the aforementioned assessments indicate a danger to the pipeline

Officer comment: *The high pressure pipe line is located in the south-western corner of the site, outside the developable area. These SGN requirements will be included as informatives to the decision notice.*

Leisure Officer, Communities Team

The Active Wellbeing team comments are broadly similar to that of the pre application response in that we are pleased to see the allocated play space within the layout plan and further detail on the design to determine the level of impact it will have on local children and young people is required.

The design of the play space for children and young people should consider the Havant Borough Council Open Space strategy:
https://www.havant.gov.uk/media/8331/download?inline=
The strategy outlines that it follows Fields In Trust (FIT) guidelines as below.
https://www.fieldsintrust.org/Upload/file/guidance/Guidance-for-Outdoor-Sport-and-Play-England.pdf

Phase 1 and 2 combined of the development will provide a total of 93 dwellings. Field in Trust guidelines recommend for a development of this scale that there is a need for provision of a local area of play (LAP), locally equipped ear of play (LEAP) and a contribution towards a MUGA. Thes LEAP and LAP spaces could be creatively combined in one area on site by allocating appropriate space and the variety of equipment required to meet the needs of all ages.

A detailed design needs to be presented for the play space(s), including the equipment mix to be provided to encourage all ages and abilities to enjoy the areas safely, together. It should detail how each area is inclusive and accessible for all regardless of age or ability.

The proposal to create a natural play space to encourage children to interact with

nature is positive. There would however need to be more substantive play provision than the logs, balance beams and mounds suggested as these alone provide limited play value for children. We would welcome further detail on how other play experiences such as: swinging, spinning, climbing, bouncing, and sensory provision are to be provided.

It would also be helpful to see further details on the robustness of materials to be used, their life expectancy, types of safety surfacing and whether fencing and gates are proposed.

Detail should also be provided on the ancillary items to be provided such as number and location of bins, seating areas and bike storage.

Officer comment: *Outline planning permission has already been granted, this is a separate permission to phase 1 and furthermore a contribution to a MUGA cannot be secured through a reserved matters application. Nonetheless an onsite play space is proposed. Further details of the play space will be secured by planning condition.*

Traffic Management, East Hampshire District Council
No comments received.

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 285

Number of site notices: 2

Statutory advertisement: 23/08/2024

Number of representations received: 11 (including a letter received from Havant Climate Alliance and Havant Friends of the Earth) on the following grounds;

Highway safety and capacity
- Traffic generation impacts on small roundabout at the top of Brookside Road.
- Does not provide another junction on main roundabout from Lower Road and no right turn facility out of Tulip Gardens
- Clarification sought on construction access
- Sharp S bend by Elms Nursing Home, no footpath
- Is there an alternative route via Lodge Road
- No pavement along Lower Road, Brookside Road, Bidbury Lane
- Lower Road is a busy cycle route
- Parking on verges of Lower Road restricts visibility
- Access through the estate would be were children play
- Access should be from the road before Cotton Way
- Lower Road should be single lane and traffic lights should be provided to manage traffic flow
- Phase 1 HGVs queued up Brookside Road for long periods, diesel engines idling causing pollution and houses to shake.

Officer comment: *Outline planning permission has been granted, the access to the site and the impacts on the local highway network were considered acceptable.*

Parking provision

- Alteration to allocated parking spaces of existing residents – moved by 90 degrees and 22m away from property. EV charging point would need to be moved. Would prefer if left as is.

Heritage

- Failure to address impact of proposal on the heritage and landscape settings and in particular Narrow Marsh Lane. Narrow Marsh Lane should be reinstated. Narrow Marsh Lane significant as ancient heritage route to/from Langstone Harbour deep water channel.
- Failure to ensure reinstatement of Narrow Marsh Lane would result in substantial harm to the setting of the Conservation Area.

Officer comment: *The Council's Conservation Officer has addressed this in their comments, Narrow Marsh Lane is outside the application site area as such its reinstatement is outside the scope of this application.*

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

i. Principle of development and planning history
ii. Impact on visual amenity and character of the area
iii. Impact on the setting of the Conservation Area
iv. Housing mix and affordable housing provision
v. Standard of accommodation and private amenity space
vi. Impact upon residential amenity
vii. Connectivity, impact on highway safety, car parking provision and waste arrangements
viii. Sustainability
ix. Ecology
x. Impact on nature conservation sites and nutrient neutrality
xi. Flood risk and drainage
xii. Community Infrastructure Levy and S106

(i) Principle of development and planning history

7.2 The application site is located outside the urban area boundary where development is restricted. The Council's Five-Year Housing Land Supply, updated at March 2023, indicates the Borough's housing land supply position as 1.81 years with a 20% buffer applied. This shortfall engages Paragraph 11d) of the NPPF with its presumption in favour of granting permission unless there are any adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

7.3 The site benefits from an outline permission (APP/21/01071 granted at appeal) which establishes the principle for 43 dwellings on the site and the proposed access from Lower Road. This application seeks the approval of the reserved matters of that permission, which are the appearance; landscaping; layout; and scale.

7.4 The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (DMPO) defines the reserved matters as follows:

Appearance - means the aspects of a building or place within the development which determines the visual impression the building or place makes, including the external built form of the development, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting and texture;

Landscaping - in relation to a site or any part of a site for which outline planning permission has been granted, means the treatment of land (other than buildings) for the purpose of enhancing or protecting the amenities of the site and the area in which it is situated;

Layout - means the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces within the development are provided, situated and orientated in relation to each other and to buildings and spaces outside the development;

Scale - except in the term "identified scale", means the height, width and length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings, and

Access - means the accessibility to and within the application site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network.

7.5 For avoidance of doubt, planning permission has already been granted for the erection of up to 43 dwellings on the site and the access. Therefore, it is only appearance, landscaping, layout and scale that can be considered at this stage.

(ii) Impact on visual amenity and character of the area

Layout

7.6 In terms of the density of development it is acknowledged that the outline permission (APP/21/01071 granted at appeal) has established the principle for 43 dwellings on the site and the developable area is derived by the site constraints, thus resulting in a density of approximately 27dph. This density is therefore considered acceptable, albeit slightly higher than phase 1, which has a density of 24dph. The proposed urban grain is appropriate for this location and this density allows for appropriate gaps between the built form to provide relief.

7.7 The proposal seeks a perimeter block layout, this is reflective of the indicative plans submitted with the outline planning application (appendix D). The applicant has explained that this layout is in response to the offsite noise sources (the railway to the south and A27 bypass to the west) as the perimeter block design allows for private amenity areas to be shielded by the dwellings to minimise noise levels (noise considerations are discussed further in the standard of accommodation section of this report). This allows for generous areas of open space on the western and southern boundaries, which would include the SuDs drainage basins, allotments and a play area. The perimeter block design also allows for legibility and active frontages with natural surveillance of the open spaces, whilst providing security to the private garden spaces. The Council's Design Guide encourages the use of perimeter block development for this reason.

7.8 The applicant has explained that the location of the play space has been chosen for its proximity to phase 1. Officers support this location in terms of its accessibility from phase 1, however it is also noted that this is close to the proposed attenuation basin and railway line. The latest revision of the NPPF states in paragraph 102 '*The safety of*

children and other vulnerable users in proximity to open water, railways and other potential hazards should be considered in planning and assessing proposals for development;' It is therefore considered reasonable to require the applicant to submit further information on the measures to safeguard children using the play area from these hazards. It is noted that the applicant proposes 1.2m high post and rail fencing around the play area and attenuation basin, however given the gaps in such a fence, officers are not satisfied that this alone would satisfy the requirements of paragraph 102 of the NPPF.

7.9 The applicant has engaged in pre-application discussions with officers and has made minor amendments to the layout prior to the submission of this reserved matters application. For instance, plot 1 has been orientated to face the access road to provide an active frontage at the entrance of the phase 2 development, this provides both natural surveillance of the access road and parking spaces opposite and visual interest in the street scene. Likewise plots 8 and 9 have been oriented to provide good natural surveillance of the proposed play space.

Scale

7.10 The proposal seeks predominantly two storey development with two chalet bungalows on the western side of the site. The scale of the proposed dwellings would be acceptable and would be in keeping with the character of the wider area and would accord with the requirements of condition 20 on the outline permission. There would also be a range of house types with a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties and single and double garages, this would provide acceptable massing and form and provide visual interest.

7.11 The foul water pumping station shown on the southern side of the site would be below ground, as such would have a minimal impact on visual amenity.

Appearance

7.12 The proposed dwellings would feature a range of roof designs with several properties featuring chimneys. This would provide an attractive roofscape. There would also be high quality architectural detailing which would reflect the phase 1 development, such as tile hanging, open porches, string courses, herringbone brick detailing, dentils at the eaves, buttresses and window mullions and transforms. The proposed materials pallet includes two types of brick, black weatherboarding and hanging tiles on the elevations and two types of roof types. These materials would have an acceptable appearance and would reflect the semirural character of the area and would allow for cohesion with phase 1. Submission of material samples is required by condition 10 on the outline permission prior to the commencement of development, this would ensure that the materials are of a high quality.

7.13 The applicant has paid regard to the importance of corner turner properties and has ensured that there are windows on both the front and side elevations addressing the proposed access roads. This would provide both natural surveillance and visual interest. These corner turner properties would also feature a good level of detailing, which provides visual interest and helps to give the proposed development a unique, positive and coherent identity.

7.14 No external lighting has been proposed at this time, therefore these would be no material light spill from the development. It is considered reasonable to impose a

planning condition restricting external street lighting or lighting within the open areas unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to ensure that any lighting is sensitive to the semi-rural character of the area and that there would be no conflict with the consultation response received from National Rail.

Landscaping

7.15 The open spaces to the west and south allow for landscape buffers, which would soften the views of the site and provide communal amenity spaces. The existing soft landscaping on the site boundaries would be retained. Further to this there would be additional tree planting, hedgerows and shrubs within the open space. This planting would comprise native species including; field maple, alder, hazel, blackthorn, oak, hawthorn, holly, honeysuckle. There would also be large expanses of wildflower planting across the public open space including damp tolerant species within the proposed attenuation basins. Allotments and a community orchard are proposed on the western part of the site.

7.16 The appeal decision in paragraph 21 states *'There would also be scope to soften the presence of the development when viewed from Lower Road through continuous structural landscaping along the northern boundary and by setting the housing back from the road.'* The applicant has responded to this comment by proposing pleached trees on the northern boundary comprising evergreen species such as holly. This would provide a strong continuous and high level screening of the site from Lower Road.

7.17 There would be street trees throughout the development which would help to soften the development and contribute to positive place making. There would also be flowering evergreen shrubs at the frontages of dwellings.

7.18 In terms of hard landscaping, boundary treatments would comprise 1.8m high closeboard fencing between the properties. Where the fencing would be visible from public vantage points this would have a black staining, which would complement the black weatherboarding detail on dwellings. There would be 1.8m high brick walls where there would be a continuous plot boundary between private gardens and the proposed internal roads or public open space with the brickwork matching the host dwelling. The proposed brick walls would maintain a high quality appearance for the lifetime of the development and would be softened by climber planting.

7.19 The submitted plans show that on the eastern site boundary there would be a post and rail fence with a mesh. This would form part of the boundary treatment of the private garden areas for plots 1-9 and is to allow for the retention of the existing hedgerow planting along the boundary of phase 1.

7.20 As previously mentioned a 1.2m high timber post and rail fencing is proposed around the attenuation basin, play space and allotments, this would have a rustic appearance and would appear acceptable, however, given the safety concerns outlined in the earlier subsection further details on safety measures would be secured by planning condition.

7.21 1.2m high metal estate railing painted black is proposed at the frontage of dwellings in

the centre of the site and around the parking area for plot 25. Whilst this is a fairly urban form of boundary treatment, given that this would mainly be confined to the centre of the site and would be seen within the context of soft landscaping, officers are satisfied that this would appear acceptable on balance.

7.22 Details of the hard surfacing of the internal roads, pathways and parking spaces have not been provided with this application. The submitted layout plan suggests that the central cul-de-sac would have a block paving finish. This would reflect the appearance of the phase 1 development which comprises both tarmac and block paving. Details of hard surfacing materials would be secured by planning condition.

7.23 On the whole, the proposed hardstanding to provide parking provision is of an appropriate level and there is a good mix of tandem parking as well as bay parking. This prevents large expanses of hard standing. Where rows of parking are proposed, for example plots 2-5 inclusive, this is broken up by tree and shrub planting which would help soften the appearance.

7.24 It is acknowledged that there would some plots such as plot 9 and plot 25 that would have large areas of hard standing. Officers raised this as a concern at pre-application stage, the applicant advised that this would have a different material finish to the main access roads. As mentioned above final details of hard surfacing materials would be secured by planning condition.

7.25 The proposal seeks a 500sqm play area. The Council's Leisure Officer has commented:

'A detailed design needs to be presented for the play space(s), including the equipment mix to be provided to encourage all ages and abilities to enjoy the areas safely, together. It should detail how each area is inclusive and accessible for all regardless of age or ability. The proposal to create a natural play space to encourage children to interact with nature is positive. There would however need to be more substantive play provision than the logs, balance beams and mounds suggested as these alone provide limited play value for children. We would welcome further detail on how other play experiences such as: swinging, spinning, climbing, bouncing, and sensory provision are to be provided. It would also be helpful to see further details on the robustness of materials to be used, their life expectancy, types of safety surfacing and whether fencing and gates are proposed. Detail should also be provided on the ancillary items to be provided such as number and location of bins, seating areas and bike storage.'

Further details of the play space would be secured by planning condition.

7.26 Having regards to the above, in terms of the visual appearance and impact on the character of the area, the proposal would have an acceptable layout, scale, appearance and would be appropriately landscaped. The proposal would therefore accord with policies CS11, CS13 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011.

(iii) <u>Impact on the setting of the Conservation Area</u>

7.27 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Conservation Area, to have special regard to the

desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area. Whilst the site in question does not lie within the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, it is within the Conservation Area's setting.

7.28 Paragraph 208 of the NPPF requires that LPAs '*identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset)',*

7.29 As set out in the Council's Conservation Officer's comments *'The Manor Farm complex is located to the northeast of the application site. This is included within part of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, known as Character Area 5 (within the Conservation Area Appraisal). The other character areas of the conservation area are located north and east of Lower Road. The significance of Character Area 5 comprises historic cottages and former agricultural buildings, now converted to dwellings, set slightly apart from the historic village core and thus rooted in the historical agricultural landscape.'*

7.30 The following is an extract from the Planning Inspector's appeal decision which granted the outline planning permission;

'*16. The Old Bedhampton Conservation Area (CA) is broadly centred on St Thomas Church and encompasses the historic village. The Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) identifies five character areas. Character Area 1 (CA1) is the historic settlement core, which is the loose nucleus of the settlement. The appeal site does not directly adjoin this area and is separated from it by 'Phase 1', which was permitted on appeal. On the other hand, the appeal site is very close to Character Area 5 (CA5): Old Manor Farm Buildings. This character area encompasses cottages and former agricultural buildings, now converted to dwellings, set slightly apart from the historic village core and thus rooted in the agricultural landscape.*

17. The CAA also outlines some of the key character features of the CA and these generally relate to its rural origins. For example, the narrow lanes, relative tranquillity, historic architecture, a mill complex and farm buildings. The CA is therefore a repository of bygone rural lives and settlement patterns, and this provides evidential and illustrative historic value and significance. The ability to appreciate the rural setting of the CA is important to how its evidential and historic value and significance is experienced and understood.

18. Historic mapping in the CAA demonstrates that the original rural and low-density settlement of Bedhampton has expanded considerably in the last century or so due largely to the construction of New Bedhampton. Prior to the approval of Phase 1, much of this new housing development had been to the north of Lower Road and therefore some semblance of Old Bedhampton's rural setting had endured to the south despite the presence of the A27.

19. The appeal site is an undeveloped parcel of land which currently contributes to the setting of CA1 by providing evidence of the historic core's rural hinterland. Lower Road may also have been a main route into the historic village. The undeveloped appearance of the appeal site also contributes to the setting of Character Area 5, and the former agricultural buildings therein, by providing a vestige of the link between these buildings and the land they were farmed in connection with.

20. The adjoining Phase 1 development of up to fifty homes was found by the previous

Inspector to result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the CA. This is because it erodes the rural setting and affects the understanding of the historic role of the adjacent farmstead at CA5. The appeal scheme would compound this impact by effectively extinguishing the semblance of the CA's rural hinterland when experienced from Lower Road. That said, the appeal site is now a pocket of land tucked to the southwest of the CA which is already bounded by transport infrastructure and housing. The appeal scheme would be seen in this context, as well as that of the adjoining Phase 1 development, which provides a suburban buffer between the CA and the appeal site and wraps around CA5 on two sides.

21. There would also be scope to soften the presence of the development when viewed from Lower Road through continuous structural landscaping along the northern boundary and by setting the housing back from the road. There would also be opportunities to design the appeal scheme to respond positively to the key characteristics of CA1 and CA5, such as the period architecture/materials/detailing, use of boundary walling/hedging and the loose and verdant settlement pattern. The development can also be restricted to two storeys in height to prevent the scheme appearing overly prominent in the setting of the CA. Accordingly, the overall and cumulative level of harm to the setting of the CA would be below that found by the previous Inspector. It would be low moderate.

22. In conclusion, the appeal scheme would result in some low moderate harm to the setting and significance of the CA. As a result, the proposal would be at odds with Policies CS11 and CS16 of the CS and Policy DM20 of the LP, which seek to secure development that protects conservation areas.'

7.31 Later in the inspectors report (paragraphs 60-66 inclusive), the harm to heritage assets is weighed up against the public benefits namely; housing provision having regards to the short fall in housing land supply, the provision of affordable housing, accessibility to sustainable transport modes, greater housing choice, a short-term boost to the construction industry, a long-term boost to the provision and retention of local services and facilities through additional 'spend' and use, community vitality, biodiversity enhancements, highway improvements, new green infrastructure and open space. The inspector concluded as follows;

'66. The proposal would result in low moderate but permanent harm to the setting and significance of a CA. This matter carries weight of a high order. Against this, the public benefits of the proposal are cumulatively of notable weight. Overall, the benefits are of sufficient force to outweigh the weight I afford to the less than substantial harm that would occur. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Paragraph 200 of the Framework as harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset would have clear and convincing justification.'

7.32 It is therefore accepted that the proposal would result in some low moderate harm to the setting and significance of the CA, which is outweighed by the public benefits. At reserved matters stage it is for members to consider whether the proposed appearance, landscaping, layout and scale would minimise this harm in so far as practical having regards to the outline planning permission.

7.33 The Council's Conservation Officer has commented:
'The reserved matters scheme has been designed to reflect on the response set out by the Planning Inspector. With regards to the proposed layout, this is more urbanised than Phase 1 which was highlighted as an issued at pre-application stage. However, justification for the perimeter block design is to limit the residential dwellings from noise

arising from the industrial units to the northwest and the inclusion of a generous portion of open space and landscape buffering.

Full details of housing types have been submitted with the application. A number of housing types/designs have been proposed, which draw from a shared palette of traditional style materials and architectural features including chimneys, bricked up windows to break up blank elevations, buttresses, herringbone brickwork panels and timber cladding.

This design approach is very similar to the Phase 1 development, where it is evident that this works well and has resulted in high quality, interesting new housing, with high quality boundary treatments, which draws from the local context of an edge of settlement, semi-rural setting.'

7.34 Having regards to the Conservation Officer's comments whilst the layout of the development would be more urbanised than phase one, the scale and appearance of the dwellings would be acceptable in relation to the character of the area and setting of the Conservation Area. The Council's Conservation Officer concludes that: *'the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of Character Area 5 of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. However, this level of harm is reduced by some degree to 'low' on the spectrum, due to the proposed scheme comprising a cohesive, high-quality development, which is respectful of its context within the conservation area and semi-rural setting.'*

7.35 The public benefits set out in the Planning Inspector's report and summarised in paragraph 7.13 are still valid and would continue to outweigh the harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and its significance, in line with paragraph 215 of the NPPF. The proposal would accord with policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011 and policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014.

(iv) <u>Housing mix and affordable housing provision</u>

7.36 In terms of the overall mix, 35% of dwellings would be 2 bed and therefore would be in accordance with the Council's Housing Delivery Position Statement which requires provision of *'a range of dwelling types and sizes to meet local housing need, including 35% of the overall housing mix as two bedroom homes unless locally identified need evidence indicates an alternative approach should be taken'.*

7.37 The S106 pursuant to the outline permission (APP/21/01071) requires 30% of dwellings to be affordable with a mix consisting of 70% affordable rented dwellings and 30% shared ownership dwellings or such other mix of type, tenure and numbers as may be agreed in writing the Council at its absolute discretion. The proposal seeks 13 affordable units (30.2% of the development) of which 69% would be affordable rent and 31% would be shared ownership.

7.38 The Council's Housing Officer accepts the affordable housing mix proposed which therefore accords with the requirements of the S106 and is satisfied with the pepper potting of affordable housing across the site, which comprises 3 clusters, which the applicant states will aid the effective management by the Registered Provider (Vivid). The scale and layout of the affordable housing is therefore acceptable. Furthermore, all affordable dwellings would be tenure blind and therefore have an acceptable appearance.

7.39 All affordable houses would be designed to be M4(2) compliant (accessible and adaptable dwellings as set out in building regulations), which accords with the requirements of the Council's Housing Delivery Position Statement. It is noted that the Council's Housing Officer has requested that there be M4(3) compliant properties (wheelchair user dwellings as defined in building regulations). However there is no planning policy requirement for this, as the Council's Housing Delivery Position Statement only requires this on developments of 50 dwellings or more.

7.40 The proposal would therefore have an acceptable housing mix including affordable housing provision and would be in accordance with the S106 pursuant to the outline permission, the Council's Housing Delivery Position Statement and policy C9 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011.

(v) Standard of accommodation and private amenity space

7.41 All properties would meet the Nationally Described Space Standards as required by Decision Making Principle 5 of the Council's Housing Delivery Position Statement. Furthermore, all properties would benefit from private garden areas and therefore would have adequate amenity space.

7.42 The Council's Design Guide SPD requires back-to-back distances between dwellings to measure a minimum of 20m and back-to-side distances of 10m where there is a blank gable. The proposal would accord with this requirement and all gardens would have adequate depth and minimise overlooking of private garden areas.

7.43 All habitable rooms would be served by windows and would have outlook. Although not entirely linear, the perimeter block design allows for broadly similar building lines, this would ensure that all habitable windows would receive adequate light and the relationship between dwellings is such that there would not be any overbearing impacts on adjoining plots.

7.44 Where appropriate windows on side elevations would be obscurely glazed. In order to safeguard the privacy of the future occupiers of adjoining plots it is considered to impose a condition on plots 2, 7, 10, 21, 26, 32 and 38 to ensure that the windows are installed with an adequate level of opaqueness and restrict additional windows being installed without the approval of the Local Planning Authority.

7.45 The appeal decision for APP/21/01071 states in paragraph 31 *'around a third of properties may need to keep windows closed to achieve appropriate internal noise environments. This would be problematic as it would affect living conditions';* and in paragraph 32 it states *'It may be that the number of properties designed on a closed windows approach can be reduced'.*

7.46 This reserved matters application is supported by a Noise Impact Assessment prepared by 24 Acoustics. This has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer whom has stated 'In *the latest noise assessment, it is stated that in order to achieve the standards recommended under BS8233:2014 for internal noise, it will be necessary for residents to occupy their dwellings with windows closed. Albeit that the windows will be openable and residents will have the choice of having them open or not. It is further suggested that to comply with the requirements of BS8233:2014, that mechanical ventilation and heat recovery (with summer bypass) is strongly recommended for all dwellings. It is also suggested that passive ventilation using acoustically rated through wall or trickle vents could achieve acceptable internal*

noise levels, but that it would be unlikely to be adequate for those units requiring consideration of overheating.'

Whilst it is disappointing that the report submitted with this application indicates that all properties will likely need windows closed to mitigate the external noise sources, given the background of an extant outline permission for the construction of up to 43 dwellings on the site, officers are content that the use of the perimeter block layout proposed is an appropriate response to the site constraints in terms of mitigating noise (Paragraph 7.7 above refers). Conditions are recommended to secure further details of acoustic and overheating mitigation.

7.47 Therefore, on balance the proposal is considered to have an appropriate scale, appearance and layout in terms of providing an acceptable standard of accommodation and amenity space. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011 and Policy DM18 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 in this regard.

(vi) Impact upon residential amenity

7.48 Owing to the separation distances between the proposed dwellings and the existing dwellings along Lower Road, Officers are satisfied that there would be no material harm to the amenities of these neighbouring occupiers.

7.49 The gardens of plots 1-9 on the eastern side of the site would adjoin the boundary with the Phase 1 development. There would be a back-to-back distance of 22m-24m, which exceeds the requirements set out in the Borough Design Guide SPD and as such, Officers are satisfied that the relationship is acceptable and that there would not be material harm by way of overbearing development, loss of light or loss of privacy.

7.50 Officers note the third party comments submitted in relation to the alteration to allocated parking spaces of existing residents. The access was approved at outline stage, as such, the relocation of allocated spaces has already been approved in principle in order to accommodate the proposed access. The relocated parking provision is reasonably sited. The reconfiguration of the electric charging space would be a private matter between the developer and existing occupier.

7.51 Having regards to the above officers are satisfied that the layout and scale of the development would not result in an adverse impact upon neighbouring amenity. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011 in this regard.

(vii) Connectivity, impact on highway safety, parking provision and waste arrangements

7.52 The proposed layout shows good connectivity throughout the site. The footpaths linking the cul-de-sacs together via the open space would allow for pedestrian permeability across the site. This would measure 2m in width. It is acknowledged that the Council's Landscape Officer has raised concerns with the lack of off road pedestrian footpath provision around the site and that pedestrians would have to walk in the road. In response the applicant has referred officers to The Manual for Streets (MfS 7.2.14) which notes shared surfaces are likely to work well: *In short lengths, or where they form cul-de-sacs. Where the volume of motor traffic is below 100 vehicles per hour (vph) (peak) and where parking is controlled or it takes place in designated areas*.

Furthermore, phase 1 utilises shared surfaces. Therefore, Officers are satisfied with this arrangement.

7.53 Officers also note that several consultees have requested a pedestrian and cycleway in the north-western corner of the site to link the site to Bedhampton Hill, this is outside the scope of this application as access was agreed at the outline stage. Furthermore, the applicant has advised that this would require development on land outside of the applicant's control and there is extensive existing vegetation and significant level differences. As such, it would not be a safe route and would not accord with Secured by Design principles.

7.54 Concurrent with this application is a Non-material Amendment application for the footpaths of Phase 1 (ref: APP/24/00887). This involves minor rerouting of the approved footpaths in Phase 1 to ensure that they link up with the Phase 2 footpaths and provide a continuous connection between the Phase 2 footpaths and Lower Road.

7.55 Whilst the access was agreed at outline stage the County Highway Authority have commented on the appropriateness of the internal roads as part of this reserved matters application. During the course of the application additional information and amendments have been made to the proposal in response to the County Highway Authority's comments. The County Highway Authority is now satisfied with the proposal, there would be adequate visibility splays and adequate accessibility for refuse vehicles and fire tender. Visibility splays would be secured by planning condition.

7.56 In terms of parking provision, the proposal seeks 56 on plot car parking spaces, 18 allocated car parking spaces and 27 garage spaces. In total this equates to 101 spaces. This would accord with the Council's Parking SPD which requires 86 private parking spaces for a development of this size. Officers are satisfied the spaces and garages would meet the space standards set out in the Council's Parking SPD. Each dwelling would have its own electrical vehicle charging point.

7.57 The proposal seeks 9 visitor parking spaces (although the applicant has suggested that the proposal can accommodate a further 11 visitor cars on street as shown on the submitted Parking Strategy Plan). The Council's Parking Standards SPD requires an additional 20% of parking as visitor spaces. 20% of the total allocated parking requirements would be 17.2 spaces and therefore there would be a shortfall of 8 spaces. However, officers do acknowledge that the wording of the SPD is ambiguous and if taken to mean 20% of the dwellings the required visitor parking spaces would equate to 8.6 spaces, which the development would accord with. Given the ambiguity of the SPD and given that the applicant has demonstrated that additional onstreet car parking can be accommodated, it is considered on balance the proposed parking provision is acceptable. Visitor parking is distributed evenly across the proposed development.

7.58 Secure cycle parking would be provided on plot either in the proposed garages or sheds in accordance with the Council's Parking SPD.

7.59 There would be adequate space for the storage of bins within the curtilages of the proposed dwellings. The application is also supported by waste freight tracking plans which show the development can be served by refuse vehicles even with on street parking. There is a turning head proposed adjacent to the parking spaces for plots 40 and 41, the parking provision would be clearly demarked from the finish of the turning head to deter using the turning head for parking. Although the tracking plans do not show the refuse vehicle accessing the ends of cul-de-sacs, officers are satisfied that

all dwellings could be reasonably serviced to prevent excessive dragging distances of bins.

7.60 Having regards to the above officers are satisfied that the layout and scale of the development would ensure adequate accessibility, parking provision, waste arrangements and would not result in an adverse impact upon highway safety. The proposals would broadly accord with policies DM11, DM12 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011.

(viii) Sustainability

7.61 The Council's Housing Position Statement seeks to '*Achieve a reduction in CO2 emissions of at least 19% of the Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) compared to the Target Emission Rate (TER) of Part L of the Building Regulations'*.

7.62 The submitted Design and Access Statement states that *'Bargate Homes is committed to delivering homes which go beyond the requirements of the Building Regulations and mitigate the effects of climate change. Homes will be designed in accordance with the energy hierarchy to utilise enhanced fabric and energy efficiency measures before making use of low carbon renewable energy. Homes will target a water consumption rate of 110 litres per person per day (l/p/d), in line with the Building Regulations higher water efficiency standard.*

In addition, the development will aim to use a range of sustainable materials and design features and will make use of sustainable timber from FSC (or equivalent) sources and materials specified using the BRE Green Guide to construction. The final design and specification of new buildings will be determined during the detailed design of the development.'

7.63 A condition is recommended to secure a sustainability statement is submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development to ensure compliance with the Housing Position Statement.

(ix) Ecology

7.64 Condition 5 on the outline permission requires the submission and approval of an Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy and timetable including measures to secure at least 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.

7.65 The applicant has submitted an *Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy (Aluco, July 2024).* The Council's Ecologist has commented:
'*I am content that sufficient survey information has been used to inform the mitigation strategy. Detailed avoidance and mitigation measures have been described for the various ecological receptors: these are acceptable, and it is the responsibility of the applicant and their appointed agents to ensure that all avoidance and mitigation measures are implemented. The developed site will contain large areas of open space, including areas of biodiversity-led grassland and wetland features. Detailed management prescriptions have been provided for these various parcels of habitat. The management prescriptions are acceptable, and again it is the responsibility of the applicant and their appointed agents to ensure that all avoidance and mitigation measures are implemented. This development is not captured by mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). A BNG assessment has been provided, showing that the various habitat creation and enhancement measures would result in an estimated 30% increase in habitat units and a c.688% increase in hedgerow units.'*

7.66 The applicant seeks to retain the established hedgerow along the boundary between Phase 1 and Phase 2. The hedgerow is subject to condition 3 of the permission relating to Phase 1 and acts as a foraging route for bats and connectivity to the vegetation along the railway line to the south.

7.67 The proposed layout, appearance and landscaping therefore conserves and enhances biodiversity. It is therefore considered that the proposed development accords with policies CS11, CS13 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011.

(x) Impact on nature conservation sites and nutrient neutrality

7.68 The Council has conducted a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), including Appropriate Assessment (AA), of the proposed development under Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The Council's assessment as competent Authority under those regulations is included in the case file. The screening under Regulation 63(1)(a) found that there was likely to be a significant effect on several European Sites due to both the increase in recreation and the decrease in water quality that would be the result of the proposed development. An updated nitrates calculation has been submitted with this reserved matters application. Officers have drafted a new Appropriate Assessment to consider the impacts of the development on nature conservation sites.

7.69 The Appropriate Assessment outlines that the site was previously identified as a Candidate Site and before that a Secondary Support Area in line with the Solent Waders and Brent Geese (SWBG) within the Brent Goose and Wader Strategy (October 2018) (SWBGS). However, its classification has since been updated to 'no recorded use' which has been accepted by Natural England and the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy Steering Group. This reflects four years of good survey data which has led to the reclassification of the site as 'no recorded use'.

7.70 The authority has concluded that the adverse effects arising from the proposal are wholly consistent with the effects detailed in the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy with regards recreational disturbance. The adverse effects are also consistent with the effects detailed in the Position Statement and Mitigation Plan for Nutrient Neutral Development with regards water quality. The authority's assessment is that the application complies with these strategies and the potential to provide mitigation to remove the significant effects that otherwise would have been likely.

7.71 The outline permission is subject to a S106 agreement, which secures the mitigation package. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposed development will not affect the status and distribution of key bird species and therefore the development will not act against the stated conservation objectives of the European sites.

7.72 The proposed development would be nitrate NEGATIVE (-8.24 KgTN/yr (including + 20% buffer)).The outline permission was subject to a S106 agreement which ensures that the Common Parts, Open Space and SuDs areas of the site are maintained for those purposes. Therefore, officers are satisfied that the site would remain nitrate negative/neutral in perpetuity. The proposed development therefore will not affect the

water quality of the Solent European Sites and therefore the development will not act against the stated conservation objectives of the European sites.

7.73 It can therefore be concluded that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the designated sites. The Appropriate Assessment process requires Natural England to be consulted, the recommendation is therefore subject to No Objection being received from Natural England during the statutory consultation period. The proposal would also accord with policies DM23 and DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014.

(xi) Flood Risk and drainage

7.74 With regards to flood risk since the submission of this application the Council has published an updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). Whilst the modelling shows no part of the site to be at risk of fluvial flooding now or in the future it does indicate the area as sensitive to increase in water levels. Accordingly, the applicant has updated their Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which analyses the ground levels of the site and the available modelling data and sets out that the site lies at least 1.5m above the sensitivity level of any fluvial flood risk. Therefore, it can be concluded that the developable area of the site is not at risk of fluvial flooding. The Council's Policy Team has reviewed this and is satisfied with this conclusion.

7.75 The FRA identifies that the site is not at risk of ground water flooding and is very low risk of surface water flooding. The applicant proposes a SuDs scheme that has been designed to manage the runoff from the exceptionally rare 1 in 100 storm event (1% AEP), plus an additional 40% allowance for predicted future climate change effects. This would involve drainage from house and garage roofs, driveways and parking courts, carriageways and footways will to swales which convey water to reed beds in the southern landscaped area of the site. There would be an attenuation basin in the south of the site which will be dry when not receiving storm water and will attenuate large return period storms via restricted outflow. Infiltration to ground will also occur gradually within the swales and base of the attenuation basin. During the course of the application the FRA and drainage strategy has been updated in response to the Lead Local Flood Authority's (LLFA) comments. These have now been satisfactorily addressed and the LLFA have confirmed that they have no objection.

7.76 It is noted that the Council's Landscape Officer has commented *'SuDs form a part of the sites overall open space and should be designed to allow safe access and egress as such no slopes should be more than a 1 in 3 gradient'.* The applicant has confirmed that the attenuation basin would comply with this requirement.

7.77 In terms of foul water drainage, the submitted FRA states that foul water flows generated from the development will discharge via a pumping station and rising main into the Phase 1 foul system located beyond the north-eastern boundary of the site. Southern Water has not commented on the reserved matters application, however at outline stage Southern Water confirmed in their consultation response that they can facilitate foul sewerage disposal to service the proposed development.

7.78 Having regards to the above the proposal would accord with Policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011.

(xii) Community Infrastructure Levy and S106

7.79 The S106 pursuant to the outline permission (APP/21/01071) requires the provision of affordable housing, management company and management plan to secure the provision and maintenance of the common parts, open space land, permissive paths and SuDs. The S106 secured financial contributions for community project worker contribution, SRMS contribution (to be paid prior to commencement of development) and sustainable transport contribution. The S106 also secured a travel plan and its monitoring.

7.800A draft liability notice has been produced which would require a CIL contribution of £525,492.83.

8 Conclusion

8.1 It is acknowledged that the outline permission (APP/21/01071 granted at appeal) has established the principle for 43 dwellings on the site and it is agreed that the developable area is derived by the site constraints. The proposal would have an acceptable layout, scale, appearance and would be appropriately landscaped and would be in keeping with the character of the area. Whilst the layout of the development would be more urbanised than phase one, the scale and appearance of the dwellings would be acceptable in relation to the character of the area and setting of the Conservation Area. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of Character Area 5 of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. This level of harm is reduced by some degree to 'low' on the spectrum, due to the proposed scheme comprising a cohesive, high-quality development, which is respectful of its context adjacent to the conservation area and semi-rural setting. The public benefits set out in the Planning Inspector's report and summarised in paragraph 7.13 are still valid and would continue to outweigh the harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and its significance.

8.2 The proposal would provide an appropriate housing mix, including affordable housing provision. It would also provide an acceptable standard of accommodation and amenity space. The internal access roads and paths would be acceptable on highway safety grounds and would allow permeability through the site. On balance there is adequate parking provision and there are satisfactory waste arrangements. The proposed layout, appearance and landscaping conserves and enhances on site biodiversity. Officer are also satisfied that the proposal would not result in adverse effect on the integrity of the designated sites, subject to receiving a no objection response from Natural England.

8.3 The applicant has submitted a site specific Flood Risk Assessment, which considers all sources of flooding and concludes that the development is not at risk from tidal, fluvial or groundwater flooding. Within the FRA they also set out a drainage strategy for dealing with foul and surface water on the site. This has been reviewed by the relevant consultees and is considered acceptable.

8.4 In conclusion, there are no adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. Furthermore, the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies of the development plan. As such, the officer recommendation is that the reserved matters application be granted.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00612 subject to;

(A) No objection from Natural England being received within the statutory 21 day consultation period;

(B) Agreement of pre-commencement conditions; and

(C) The following conditions (subject to such changes and/or additions that the Head of Planning considers necessary to impose prior to the issuing of the decision)

1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Location Plan Thrive LP.01 A
Coloured Site Layout * Thrive CSL.01 B
Site Layout Thrive SL.01 B
Affordable Housing Layout Thrive AHL.01 B
Boundary Materials Layout Thrive BML.01 B
Dwelling Materials Layout Thrive DML.01 B
Parking Strategy Layout Thrive PSL.01 B
Refuse Strategy Layout Thrive RSL.01 B
Street Elevations – Sheet 1 Thrive SE.01 C
Street Elevations – Sheet 2 Thrive SE.02 C
Coloured Street Elevations - Sheet 1 * Thrive CSE.01 C
Coloured Street Elevations – Sheet 2 * Thrive CSE.02 C
House Type S2.1 (Block of 2) – Elevations Thrive HT.S2.1(2blk).e C
House Type S2.1 (Block of 2) - Floor Plans Thrive HT.S2.1(2blk).p B
House Type S2.1 (Block of 3) – Elevations Thrive HT.S2.1(3blk).e C
House Type S2.1 (Block of 3) - Floor Plans Thrive HT.S2.1(3blk).p B
House Type S3.2 (Block of 2) – Elevations Thrive HT.S3.2(2blk).e C
House Type S3.2 (Block of 2) - Floor Plans Thrive HT.S3.2(2blk).p B
House Type 2.1 (Block of 2) – Elevations Thrive HT.2.1(2blk).e C
House Type 2.1 (Block of 2) - Floor Plans Thrive HT.2.1(2blk).p C
House Type 3.1-A - Elevations Thrive HT.3.1-A.e C
House Type 3.1-A - Floor Plans Thrive HT.3.1-A.p C
House Type 3.2 (Block of 2) – Elevations Thrive HT.3.2(2blk).e C
House Type 3.2 (Block of 2) - Floor Plans Thrive HT.3.2(2blk).p C
House Type 3.2 - Plans and Elevations Thrive HT.3.2.pe C
House Type 3.6 - Elevations Thrive HT.3.6.e C
House Type 3.6 - Floor Plans Thrive HT.3.6.p C
House Type 4.1 - Elevations Thrive HT.4.1.e C
House Type 4.1 - Floor Plans Thrive HT.4.1.p C
House Type 4.2 - Elevations - Option 1 Thrive HT.4.2.e1 C
House Type 4.2 - Elevations - Option 2 Thrive HT.4.2.e2 C
House Type 4.2 - Floor Plans - Option 1 Thrive HT.4.2.p1 C
House Type 4.2 - Floor Plans - Option 2 Thrive HT.4.2.p2 C
House Type 4.5 - Elevations Thrive HT.4.5.e C
House Type 4.5 - Floor Plans Thrive HT.4.5.p C
House Type 4.6 - Elevations Thrive HT.4.6.e C
House Type 4.6 - Floor Plans Thrive HT.4.6.p C
House Type 4.7 - Elevations Thrive HT.4.7.e C

House Type 4.7 - Floor Plans Thrive HT.4.7.p C
Garage - Single - Floor Plan and Elevations Thrive GAR.01.pe A
Garage - Double - Floor Plan and Elevations Thrive GAR.02.1.pe A
Garage - Twin - Floor Plan and Elevations Thrive GAR.02.2.pe A
Landscape General Arrangement Terra Firma 2255-TFC-00-00-DR-L-1001 P05
Landscape General Arrangement Terra Firma 2255-TFC-00-00-DR-L-1002 P05
Landscape General Arrangement Terra Firma 2255-TFC-00-00-DR-L-1003 P06
Landscape General Arrangement Terra Firma 2255-TFC-00-00-DR-L-1004 P05
Specifications Terra Firma 2255-TFC-00-00-DR-L-1005 P05
Landscape General Arrangement (site wide) Terra Firma 2255-TFC-00-00-DR-L-1006 P04
Drainage Strategy Layout MJA 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-001 P14
Survey Drawings 1-6, plus 'gas main, water main & perforated pipes' drawing (7 drawings in total) Encompass 6NN3A -
Greenfield Plan MJA 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-005 P1
Impermeable Areas MJA 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-006 P2
Levels Layout MJA 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-002 P5
Engineering Review and Vis Splays MJA 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-003 P6
Refuse Tracking Layout MJA 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-500 P6
Fire Appliance Tracking Layout MJA 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-501 P6
SUV Car Tracking Layout MJA 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-502 P5
Pump Station Tracking Layout MJA 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-503 P4
Potential Visitor Parking Tracking Plan MJA 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-504 P2

The following documents have also been considered in the determination of this application:

Application Form Pegasus Group 31.07.2024
CIL Information Form Pegasus Group 14.11.2024
Covering Letter Pegasus Group 31.07.2024
Planning Statement (inc. Affordable Housing Statement) Pegasus Group P23-1017 3 July 2024
Development Quality Standards Checklist Pegasus Group - - July 2024
Statement of Community Involvement Pegasus Group P23-1017 2 July 2024
Design and Access Statement Thrive BARG230421 A 22.07.2024
Accommodation Schedule Thrive BARG230421 H 28.10.2024
CIL Calculations Thrive BARG230421 B 11.11.2024
Heritage Statement SLR 425.065736.00001 3 24.07.2024
Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy MJA SS/21/0433/6430 Rev. G updated 17/01/2025.
Drainage Strategy Technical Note MJA SS/23/0157/6430 13.11.2024
Surface Water Checklist MJA July 2024
Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Traffic Management Consultants (via MJA) A 15.07.2024
Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Strategy (EMES) * Aluco November 2024
Biodiversity Net Gain Metric Aluco - 25.07.2024
Nitrogen Budget Plan Bargate Homes - - 24.07.2024
Nitrogen Budget Calculator V3 submitted 14/01/2025
Havant Occupancy Calculator submitted 14/01/2025
Noise Impact Assessment 24 Acoustics R8907-4 5 26.07.2024
Transport Technical Note (new document) i-Transport SJ/ITB12174-022

15.11.2024
Infiltration Testing Results Geo-Env GE20565/FG01/220111 11.01.2022
Winter Monitoring Results Geo-Env GE20565 2021-2022
Winter Groundwater Monitoring Letter Geo-Env GE20565/WP01/220401 01.04.2022
Borehole Prelim Information Letter Geo-Env GE20814/WP01/220429 29.04.2022
Borehole Ground Investigation Letter Geo-Env GE20814/WP02/220518 18.05.2022
Ground Investigation Results (2 no. documents) Geo-Env GE20565 2022
Winter Monitoring and Swale/Basin Locations Geo-Env GE21231/TM01/221014 14.10.2022
Surface Water Calcs I-DRN 25.07.2024

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

2 No development above slab level shall take place until an Acoustic Design Statement setting out the acoustic mitigation measures to be employed with regard to the building envelope, including fenestration and ventilation, for all residential units, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall set out how the mitigation measures shall meet BS8223:2014 standards as recommended for indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings, especially in relation to living rooms and bedrooms i.e during the day (07:00 to 23:00) 35 dB L Aeq,16 hour and at night (23:00 to 07:00) 30 dB L Aeq,8 hour for bedrooms. The acoustic mitigation report shall also stipulate which units will use passive ventilation and which will use mechanical ventilation. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the residential amenity of the properties is not impacted upon by any external noise levels, especially traffic noise in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Policy DM18 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3 No development above slab level shall take place until an overheating assessment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where future residents will need to keep windows closed to mitigate noise from road traffic sources (especially overnight) the applicant will need to provide an Overheating assessment shall be in accordance with CIBSE TM59 (2017) and Approved Document 'O' which supports Part O of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010, to demonstrate that indoor temperatures will be acceptable in the absence of open windows where windows will need to be closed to mitigate noise (especially overnight). The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure that the internal residential amenities are not impacted on by overheating, especially during periods where windows cannot be opened for any reasonable length of time due to external traffic noise levels in particular in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4 No dwelling shall be occupied until a post completion noise survey has been undertaken and a report submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The post validation testing will need to be undertaken by a competent person to determine compliance with the BS8223:2014 standards. Such testing should be achieved using at least 3 sample dwellings, nearest to

the measurement positions Locations 1, 2 & 3. A report shall be produced which details the post validation testing that has taken place. This report is to confirm the expected noise levels within the proposed dwellings have been achieved, especially at bedroom and living room first floor level, and are in line with those levels laid out in BS8233:2014, and recommended for indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings, especially in relation to living rooms and bedrooms i.e during the day (07:00 to 23:00) 35 dB L Aeq,16 hour and at night (23:00 to 07:00) 30 dB L Aeq,8 hour for bedrooms. In addition to a windows closed scenario, levels should also be provided with windows in an open position. Similarly for traditional external areas that are used for personal amenity space, such as gardens and patios, it is desirable that the external noise level does not exceed 50 dB LAeq, 16 hour with an upper guideline value of 55 dB LAeq, 16 hour in noisier environments. External amenity area levels are also required to be tested upon completion, to confirm the levels detailed here, and as a result of any proposed mitigation measures, have been met.
Reason: To ensure the residential amenity of the property will not be impacted
upon by any external noise levels in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Policy DM18 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5 No floodlighting, street lighting or other form of external lighting scheme, including at or on dwelling units, shall be installed unless it has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include, Location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination. Any lighting scheme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall not thereafter be altered without prior consent other than for routine maintenance, which does not change its details.
Reason: To protect the occupants outside of and within the development from light disturbance / nuisance and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6 There shall be no piling carried out on site unless a detailed methodology has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The methodology should seek the least intrusive noise and vibration method of piling and shall detail proposed mitigation methods to be employed, to ensure minimal impact on the nearest residential receptors.
Reason: To ensure the amenities of nearby residential properties are not impacted upon by any external noise or vibration levels during any piling operations and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7 The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until visibility splays shown on drawing 6430-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-003 Rev P6 have been provided. Nothing over 0.6m in height above the level of the adjacent carriageway shall be placed or permitted to stay within the visibility splay.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policies CS16 and CS20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8 Notwithstanding the hereby approved details, no development shall commence above slab level until a scheme detailing hard landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include plans showing the details and samples of the hard surfacing materials and a programme for the provision of the hard landscaping. Thereafter the scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and once provided, the works shall be retained in perpetuity.
Reason: In the interests of amenity and of the environment of the development and having due regard to policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9 Notwithstanding the hereby approved details, no dwelling shall be occupied until a more detailed soft landscaping scheme for all open parts of the site not proposed to be hard surfaced has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall specify the proposed finished ground levels in relation to the existing levels, the distribution and species of ground cover to be planted, the positions, species and planting sizes of the trees and shrubs to be planted and/or retained, and timing provisions for completion of the implementation of all such landscaping works. The implementation of all such approved landscaping shall be completed in full accordance with such approved timing provisions. Any tree or shrub planted or retained as part of such approved landscaping scheme which dies or is otherwise removed within the first 5 years shall be replaced with another of the same species and size in the same position during the first available planting season.
Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10 No dwelling shall be occupied until a report detailing measures to protect children and other vulnerable users from open water within the site and the railway beyond the site boundary and other potential hazards has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include a programme for provision of mitigation measures. Thereafter the mitigation measures shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity.
Reason: In the interest of public safety and having regards to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and paragraph 102 the National Planning Policy Framework.

11 No development shall commence until a sustainability statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The sustainability statement shall detail how the dwellings shall achieve a reduction in CO2 emissions of at least 19% of the Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) compared to the Target Emission Rate (TER) of Part L of the Building Regulations. Consideration should also be given to the minimising the visual impacts on the setting of the Conservation Area and shall minimise impacts on the amenities of the occupiers of the site and neighbouring properties. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In the interest of sustainability and having regards to the Council's Housing Delivery Position Statement and policies CS11, CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework. This is a pre-commencement condition as it goes to the heart of the permission.

12 All the windows at or above 1st floor level in the side elevations of plots 2, 7, 10, 21, 32, 38 and the rear elevation of 26 shall

i) consist of at least two lights divided horizontally with only the top light capable of being opened, and shall be maintained in that condition at all times;

ii) at all times be and remain glazed entirely with obscure glass, the particular type of which glass shall provide a degree of obscuration no less obscure than that which is provided by Pilkington's Texture Glass Obscuration Level 4.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework

13 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order, 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no additional windows or other openings shall be constructed within the rear (northern) elevation of Plot 26 without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework

14 No dwelling shall be occupied until a detailed design of the play space has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The detailed design shall include the equipment mix to be provided to encourage all ages and abilities to enjoy the areas safely, together. It should detail how each area is inclusive and accessible for all regardless of age or ability. It should include a range of play experiences such as natural play space, swinging, spinning, climbing, bouncing and sensory provision. Details shall be provided on the robustness of materials to be used, their life expectancy, types of safety surfacing and whether fencing and gates are proposed. Detail should also be provided on the ancillary items to be provided such as number and location of bins, seating areas and bike storage.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and to promote health and wellbeing and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

15 Prior to the occupation of any dwelling, the allocated vehicle and cycle parking spaces and any necessary turning spaces necessary for the safe access to that dwelling shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans. These spaces shall thereafter be retained for their designated use.

Reason: To provide adequate on-site car parking and turning space for the development and having due regard to policies DM13 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendices:

(A) Location Plan - LP.01A
(B) Site Layout Plan - CSL.01 REV B
(C) Street Scene Plans - CSE.01 REV C and CSE.02 REV C
(D) Illustrative masterplan submitted with APP/21/01071 - MOSAIC - REV V5
(E) Appeal decision APP/X1735/W/22/3305704 (APP/21/01071 Outline permission)