From: Amy Sign
Sent: 26 July 2023 15:30
To: Wells, Lesley
Subject: FW: APP/22/01072 - 81C London Road, W'ville

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the council - only open links and attachments that you're expecting.

Hi Lesley,

Many thanks for getting back to me – trust all is well?

I have broken down all of issues highlighted within the application below:

1. ***Highways/Cycle Issues***

- *Visibility*
  - Within the lefthand side visibility splay it is hedging that is proposed and requested by the Landscape Consultee to provide a bit more privacy to the windows for the ground floor flats. It is acknowledged that the landscaping on the corner in particular will require maintenance to ensure it does not exceed past the 600mm height restriction. The righthand side visibility splay is slightly restricted by the existing substation to the right of the site. While this is understood to impact the visibility and is taller than 600mm – it was accepted within the extant site scheme (REF: APP/16/00963) which ultimately then poses the question, with the scheme not becoming any narrower and less congested with cars – why it would be deemed worse by planning?

- *Refuse/Servicing*
  - Are you able to confirm if my comments from my original email on the 26th May were passed onto Highways? As I do believe the distances required were included and showed compliance with the Manual For Streets.
  - Instead of introducing kerbs – I have attached the revised plan which shows bollards to the rear of each bay to ensure that the 900mm is retained to allow for access, would this be accepted?
  - In regard to the hatching within the 1.92m x 2.4m zone – I have included this with annotation on the revised attached plan.
  - Finally, the Eurobin has been omitted from the retail courtyard and replaced with 2 further wheelie bins which will allow for manoeuvring within the 900mm spacing.

- *Parking*
  - With the thought for parking permits to be secured through an S106 as previous discussed, the focus is on the provision of cycle storage. When referencing the Havant Parking SPD, it is identified that 1Bed units require 1 Cycle Space and 2Bed Units require 2 Spaces along with an additional 20% for visitors. We have worked out, and confirmed within the D&A, that with 7 x 1Bed units and 6 x 2Bed units – 19 spaces must be provided and then an additional 4 spaces are to be shown for visitors. These 23 spaces are within the internal bike store. In regard to the cycle storage for the retail; when referencing the SPD again and going for the likely hood of the units being A1 (Retail) the requirement is 1 space per 300m2 or 1 space per 6 staff. There hasn't been an allocation for the small shop (25m2), however the larger shop has a provision of 5 spaces within the rear courtyard which we believe to be satisfactory.

- *Site Access Mitigation*
    - Apologies for any confusion the removal of this had caused, it has now been readded onto the revised plans along with the statement that warning signage is to be provided within the amended Design and Access attached.

2. *Contributions to Date*

- My client acknowledges these contributions and I have confirmed his Solicitors details below for them to be passed on to the relevant bodies within the Council in order for the draft S106 agreements to be prepared. In regard to the CIL, I have attached the revised forms to this email.
- Andrew Rafferty, Bramsdon and Childs @ 141 Elm Grove, Southsea, Portsmouth PO5 1HR
- Email: jr@bramsdonandchilds.com

3. *Nitrates*

- I have attached the revised checklist to the email.

4. *Viability Assessment*

- Are you able to advise how my client can go about making this payment? Would an invoice need to be raised by yourselves, or does he make a payment to a certain account?

5. *Elevation Issue*

- The front elevation has been amended to reflect the roof building, thank you for pointing this out!

6. *Change to Description*

- I can confirm we are happy with the revised description.

7. *Environmental Health's Comments*

- Apologies that this hadn't been addressed further, we had assumed that the response from the 26th January was based upon conditions which were to be set against the development. However when looking to address the concerns we are able to elaborate further on the proposals. For instance while the construction of the proposed scheme is yet to be confirmed given that final engineer input has not been established – I would confirm that the current assumptions is for the building to be a masonry external structure and core, with timber internal walls and separating floors. Therefore, the current Wall Type proposed from Approved Document E is Wall Type 3 (Masonry) with Floor Type 3 and Ceiling Treatment A along with Robust Detail E-WT-1 for the party walls outside of the core. This would also be combatted for the concerns around the plant to install British Gypsum GypWall ShaftWall between the Plant and Residential Units. However – any changes to this could be addressed should the Sound conditions be set against the decision.
- Finally, we accept the condition for the requirement of a CMP.

8. *Drainage*

- The FRA/DS was sent in an email to yourself on the 26th May at around 1pm – if this has been missed, I have reattached to this email for clarity.

If it's easier, perhaps we could schedule a phone call once you have been able to digest all of the above?

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Kind Regards,

Amy Sign

☎ 01489 660194
@ amy@k-a-d.co.uk
🌐 www.k-a-d.co.uk
📍 First Floor Unit 7, The Quarterdeck,
Port Solent,
PO6 4TP

KNIGHT
ARCHITECTURAL
DESIGN