
Site Address: 25 Sandy Beach Estate, Hayling Island, PO11 9RG
Proposal: Demolition of existing two bedroom two storey detached house and detached garage, replacement with new three bedroom three storey detached house with integral single garage and associated external works.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/22/01210 Expiry Date: 16/02/2023
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Field
Agent: Mr Douglas Case Officer: Tina Pickup
Jeffrey Douglas Chartered Architect
Ward: Hayling East

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to an existing two storey flat roofed detached dwelling located within the private Sandy Beach Estate, at the eastern end of Hayling Island. The site is located on the eastern side of the Estate and backs onto the Sandy Point Nature Reserve which is designated AONB, SSSI and SPA. The defined urban boundary (Policy AL2 and CS17) runs along the rear eastern boundary of the site. The site also falls within Flood Zone 3.
- 1.2 Number 25 is currently in a poor state of repair and is mainly white rendered with a slightly lower white clad section to its front (west) elevation. The existing property is set up to the northern boundary and marginally behind the front facade of number 24, with a side drive to the south providing some space and separation to number 29 to the south. The frame of a dilapidated detached garage is located in the south eastern corner of the site and the property has a timber ground floor sun room with small rear garden overlooking the adjacent nature reserve. From the roof of the sun room is an old external stair leading to the roof terrace. The frontage of the site is entirely hard surfaced, providing parking for a couple of vehicles, behind a front boundary wall.
- 1.3 The Estate has been constructed around a communal green area and comprises properties of a similar age and flat roofed style, however many have been altered and extended and there is now little uniformity to the style or materials used. Number 24 to the immediate north is similar in design and layout, but is set slightly forward and includes a small recessed second floor addition, set back at the rear of the site, which includes large windows. It also has a first floor rear balcony with screening panel against the shared southern boundary.
- 1.4 There are several other examples of second floor additions within the estate, including number 24 to the north as noted above; and significantly number 20 to the north which is a three storey replacement dwelling having gradually stepped back elevations (permitted under ref APP/14/00373); and number 27 to the west (approved under APP/16/00164). Permission has also been granted for second floor additions which have not yet been implemented, at number 23 to the north under ref APP/19/00991, and at number 7 in the north-west corner under APP/22/00125.

2 Planning History

None on site - see above for other nearby sites

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Demolition of existing two bedroom two storey detached house and detached garage, replacement with new three bedroom three storey detached house with integral single garage and associated external works.
- 3.2 The proposed replacement dwelling would be contemporary in style, constructed of a mix of render and horizontal cladding in Blue Grey wood grain finish, with similar grey windows and doors. Frameless glass would be used for balconies with semi opaque cedar coloured 'hit & miss' timber slats forming privacy screens to the first floor terrace.
- 3.3 The proposed replacement dwelling would in part, at ground floor level, fill the entire width of the plot and include an integral garage. The dwelling would be sited further forward, to align with number 24 at the front, but would extend about 3.8m beyond number 24 to the rear (at ground floor level). Amended plans were received during the course of determining this application making some changes to the size of the upper floor and removing oversailing balconies. The resultant proposal would only extend at first floor about 0.5m deeper than number 24, and the proposed second floor above would be stepped in from each side by 0.5m, stepped back from the front elevation by 2m, and stepped back in part up to 1.3m from the rear elevation. The overall height would be 8.5m high.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016
Joint SPD - Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS12	(Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB))
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

n/a

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control

None received

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Objection: overdevelopment of the site and third storey considered to be harmful to the immediate setting of the AONB, notwithstanding a similar upward extension at No. 20 Sandy Beach Estate and others consented elsewhere in the estate.

As originally constructed, these dwellings would have had a simple, pleasing uniformity of appearance as a set piece development, but most have now been heavily altered, with some also building structures on the roof/sun deck, which has disturbed the previous simple uniform skyline.

The site directly abuts the Sandy Point Nature reserve to the east which is part of the AONB, also having SSSI designation. There are no trees in the immediate vicinity of the common boundary with the SSSI to visually mitigate any impact.

The AONB land is at a slightly higher level, so the modest ground floor infill extension beneath the existing balcony would be partly visible over the timber panelled boundary fence. However, it is the upward extension that is of most concern, which even exceeds the height of the modest sun lounge on the adjoining property to the north.

Similar extensions are acknowledged as being consented at numbers 7, 23, 27 & 20, And whilst it is clear the economic life and integrity of many of these houses is seriously compromised, prompting the redevelopment option, this officer still considers these to have been retrograde decisions.

This sad trend seems to have started with No. 24, where despite permission having been refused 2-9-1982 under reference 30563 for a flat roof observatory/conservatory, this seems to have been allowed at Appeal.

Adverse harm is concluded to the AONB, in terms of the purposes of its designation, which is to conserve and enhance natural beauty.

County Ecologist

The application is not accompanied by any ecological information: the submitted Ecological Statement (Jeffrey Douglas Chartered Architect, November 2022) does not comprise a robust ecological assessment produced by a qualified professional ecologist. I am unsure of the contents of any pre-application advice provided, although if it was consistent with usual pre-application advice it would have recommended that a professional assessment of any built structures should be carried out, with a particular focus on roosting bats. It is essential, as with any other technical discipline, that assessments are undertaken by suitably qualified persons. Bats roost within small gaps and crevices (as small as 1cm width) on the exterior of buildings, including modern structures, and their presence is highly unlikely to be noticed by occupants. Features such as cladding (including timber and uPVC), felt roof lips and any other small crevices present provide opportunities for individual bats to roost.

In this instance, and in recognition of the generally unsuitable appearance of the building (from my review of submitted photographs) I would be willing to review good quality recent photographs of the building. These photographs should show all elevations of the building and include details of cladding materials.

Should images demonstrate that suitable features for roosting bats are present, or be inconclusive due to poor quality, then I would recommend that the applicant commissions a preliminary ecological assessment of the site: this should include an assessment of the potential for the site to support protected species such as bats, to be provided by a qualified ecologist. The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (www.cieem.net) holds a database of suitably

qualified ecologists.

A preliminary ecological assessment will determine whether there is any evidence of protected species or whether the site offers habitat suitable for supporting protected species, and whether the proposed works are likely to result in impacts to those habitats or species. Unless the qualified ecologist is able to conclude that there is no reasonable likelihood of protected species being present (due to negligible potential) or that if present they are not to be impacted by the works, it is likely that further ecological survey work (Phase 2 survey) will be required prior to determination of the application. The results of any further surveys should be used to provide an assessment of the likely ecological impacts of the proposed works and to inform any mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures.

NPPF, Circular 06/2005 and Natural England Standing Advice on Protected Species, require that planning decisions are based on full, up-to-date ecological information and it is essential that all necessary survey, assessment and mitigation information is available to the LPA prior to determination, particularly in the case of protected species, which are a material planning consideration. This will enable the LPA to determine the application on the basis of full knowledge about the ecological impacts of the proposal and to ensure that any impacts can and will be mitigated, and are acceptable.

Crime Prevention

None received

Southern Water

formal application required to connect to the public foul sewer;
supporting documents refer to SuDs and under certain circumstances will be adopted, otherwise the applicant will need to ensure long term maintenance of the SuDs facilities for effectiveness in perpetuity. Where SuDs to be implemented, drainage details must be submitted to LPA of: responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SuDs; timetable; management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development;
If any sewer found to be crossing the site, must first be investigated.

Engineering/Drainage

None received

Environment Agency

None received

Hampshire Highways

would advise that as the proposal relates to the demolition and rebuilding of a single dwelling with the access to a private road, HCC's Highway Standing Advice should be referred to in the first instance.

with regard to the application, the Highway Authority would advise that the proposed redevelopment would not result in a significant increase in vehicle movements and therefore would be unlikely to have a detriment impact on the operation and safety of the wider local highway network.

Natural England - initial response

FURTHER INFORMATION REQUIRED TO DETERMINE IMPACT ON DESIGNATED SITES

As submitted, the application could have a likely effect on:

- Solent and Dorset Coast Special Protection Area (SPA)
- Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Solent and Southampton Waters SPA and Ramsar
- Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA, Ramsar and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

Your authority will need to undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to determine whether the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the sites named above, proceeding to the appropriate assessment stage where significant effects can be ruled out. The following information is required to inform the HRA:

- Consideration of this project's effects on total nitrogen and/or total phosphorus nutrient loading within the Solent catchment.
- Consideration of potential for impacts to be caused through noise and visual disturbance to Solent SPAs and functional land.
- Consideration of potential impacts from construction, including a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP).
- Any other likely significant effects that could arise from the development should also be assessed.

Natural England - on revised details and HRA AA

DESIGNATED HABITATS SITES – NO OBJECTION SUBJECT TO SECURING APPROPRIATE MITIGATION

This advice should be taken as Natural England's formal representation on appropriate assessment given under regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). You are entitled to have regard to this representation. With regard to European Sites, Natural England does not object to the granting of this permission subject to the advice given below.

Your appropriate assessment, dated 8th February 2023, concludes that your authority is able to ascertain that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the sites in question. Having considered the assessment, and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal, Natural England advises that we concur with the assessment conclusions.

This advice is provided on the basis that all mitigation measures will be secured as planning conditions or obligations by your authority to ensure their strict and timely implementation for the full duration of the development.

Norse South East

None received

Waste Services Manager

None 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: 4

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 8 letters of SUPPORT have been received

Comment	Officer Comment
The letters of support generally note the existing dwelling is in disrepair and an eyesore and its redevelopment would meet all the points of the 'Sandy Beach Estate' character in terms of maintaining off road parking, suitable privacy considerations etc. and would result in an improvement that should not be delayed. The objection from Chichester Harbour Conservancy is noted but the conformity has long since been lost with several properties on the nature reserve boundary being higher, such that current view from the coastal path is unattractively diverse and fragmented in style. It must also be noted that some of the original 2 storey dwellings had an unusual, clumsily designed covered cuddy to gain stair access to the sun deck above the flat roof level, and parapet walls to create an enclosure, which raises the overall visual roofline in an oddly irregular way. The proposed design of number 25 is in keeping with the square style of the original buildings, yet brings to it a modern contemporary look that - with attention to materials used and conformity of flat roofing - can provide a much more aesthetically pleasing backdrop to the nature reserve if viewed from the coastal path than is currently the case. As other properties in the row are inevitably developed, uniformity of the skyline can be somewhat restored.	Noted - see section 7

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
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area and AONB
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- (iv) Parking
- (v) Flood risk
- (vi) Impact on Habitat Sites and Ecology
- (vii) CIL

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria. As a 1 for 1 replacement dwelling, there would be no net gain in residential units on the site.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area and AONB

7.3 Given the mixed character of the Sandy Beach Estate with other examples of second floor additions to previously flat roofed dwellings, the principle of the proposed addition is considered appropriate. The design retains the flat roofed theme of the estate with contemporary design solution that is generally appropriate to the context of the site. There are also some other examples of more contemporary materials and grey cladding within the estate, and as such the use of such materials would not be inappropriate to the visual appearance of the area.

7.4 As originally submitted the detailed design was however considered to result in an overly boxy and prominent design with the upper floor not sufficiently recessed with an oversailing balcony adding to the silhouette of the proposal. Amended plans were therefore sought and forthcoming, setting the second floor back by 2m from the front (west) elevation and stepping in from the sides slightly and removing the upper oversailing balcony. It is considered that the proposed upper floor development, as amended, has a sufficiently stepped profile to be visually recessive and subservient. It would result in a similar profiled development to that already built at number 20 and approved at number 23.

7.5 Whilst the proposal would partially fill the entire width of the plot, this would be at ground floor only and at the rear, in a set back location. Therefore in street scene terms some space and separation to the side boundaries would be retained and achieved.

7.6 It is acknowledged that Chichester Harbour Conservancy have objected to the proposal as being harmful to the setting of the AONB, with the impact on the skyline their key concern. Long distance views from the beach further to the east are across the nature reserve to the edge of development which comprises a fairly strong linear line running north-south made up of the rear of the properties in Sandy Beach Estate, 242 Southwood Road, and Treloar Road further to the north. The scale and skyline of these properties varies from two storey developments with pitched roofs, to the flat roofed two storey properties in Sandy Beach estate, some with part 3 storey projections, and bungalows with pitched roofs. Arguably the scale, mass and bulk of the block of flats at Cedarwood at the southern edge of the Sandy Beach Estate has the most dominant silhouette and visual impact on these long distance views from the AONB. But the skyline and edge of development is varied and not uniform.

7.7 It is considered that the proposed height at 8.5m would not be dis-similar to the height of the pitched roofs of other two storey developments and in particular the Cedarwood development and would therefore blend with that overall skyline - it would not project above or visually jar with the general scale of surrounding development. This is

demonstrated in the submitted photomontage. It is acknowledged that it would be higher than number 29 directly to the south (which may well be redeveloped itself in the future) but the separation to the south boundary helps to mitigate this individual relationship. The upper floor is slightly stepped off both sides to soften its appearance and help it appear more visually recessive than the first floor below. Overall, the LPA are of the opinion that given the context of the site, the proposed development would not be harmful to the wider skyline views, nor the natural beauty or setting of the AONB when viewed from the east.

- 7.8 Overall the amended design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the estate in which it is sited, and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policies CS12 and CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy) and adopted Design Guide SPD. It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality or setting of the AONB.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.9 Number 24 to the north has a small second floor, largely glazed addition located within the south eastern corner of the roof space, separated from the application site by the width of a drive. It also has a rear first floor balcony with opaque glazed screen facing the application site. To its front number 24 also has side windows at first floor level serving main habitable rooms. Number 29 to the south is in a poor state of repair but also currently has a side first floor terrace above an attached garage, which is located close to the shared boundary. Number 29 also has first floor side windows and a roof terrace.
- 7.10 In terms of impact on number 24, the proposed replacement dwelling would, at first and second floor, roughly align with number 24 and the proposed north elevation is entirely blank, with no windows. The modest second floor rear balcony would be recessed and as such no side views would be possible to harm neighbouring amenity. The front second floor balcony would be glass and should be conditioned that its side screens are opaque glass to protect any direct views down into number 24's side windows. There would be some loss of outlook and light available to number 24's second floor room, but this has windows to all 4 sides with an open aspect, such that the partial loss of light and outlook due south would not compromise the overall sense of openness and views from within. The primary 180 degree view to the east would be unaffected.
- 7.11 In terms of impact on number 29, the replacement dwelling would be higher and have a greater mass and bulk. The main two storey development would have a separation of between 1.5m and 2m from the shared side boundary, and up to 4m from number 29's garage, and 6.5m first floor to first floor separation. This separation would help mitigate any overbearing effect. The site lies directly north of number 29 and hence any additional overshadowing and loss of daylight would be marginal.
- 7.12 The proposed south elevation includes 2 high level windows - the first floor one serving the main habitable space which is proposed to be obscure glazed to protect any direct overlooking to number 29. A first floor rear terrace is also proposed, over part of the ground floor rear addition, which would extend up to both side boundaries. It is proposed to be screened to the sides with hit and miss style timber slats having a height of 1.8m. Within the estate it is commonplace for first floor balconies to extend up to one side boundary with side screens for privacy. Whilst this proposal would result in the first floor terrace extending to both side boundaries, with effective side screens this should not materially affect either neighbour. Due to the available views,

the first floor terraces have become the equivalent of ground floor gardens in terms of amenity space. Overall, given the context of the site, the scale of the first floor balcony is considered acceptable, provided the side screens are provided and retained - which can be conditioned.

- 7.13 Overall, with the provision of appropriate side screens, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.14 The existing dwelling has 2 bedrooms and following redevelopment the proposed dwelling would have 3 bedrooms, although it is noted the ground floor room annotated 'garden lounge' has an en-suite bathroom and would likely function as an additional bedroom. Assuming the finished development has 4 bedrooms, then 3 on site parking spaces would be required to meet the adopted Parking SPD. The plans indicate 2 forecourt spaces and an integral garage. The garage only measures 5.5m in length ie 0.5m below the minimum of 6m as set out in the guidance for an internal garage, but it is noted that the forecourt area has sufficient width to park 3 cars. So overall, it is considered that the site does have sufficient space to park at least 3 cars and both the Parking SPD and policy DM13 can be considered complied with.

(v) Flood risk

- 7.15 The site lies within flood zone 3 and a Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted. This indicates that the new build would allow for significant opportunities to improve flood resilience at the site. The finished floor level of the habitable rooms are to be increased from 2.07AOD to 2.3m AOD (note garage is lower at 1.95 AOD) which is 0.5m above external ground levels. In addition measures such as solid floor construction; raised sockets, switches etc; non-return valves fitted to drainage system; and removable flood boards fitted to ground floor external door openings etc would all be incorporated. The EA's flood warning service would also be used.
- 7.16 These measures would result in an improvement to the flood risk of the existing dwelling, and it is noted that in the event of a flood event, occupiers would have access to upper floors and emergency escape routes via the various balconies. Overall there is no objection to flood risk issues arising from the development.

(vi) Impact on Habitat Sites and Ecology

- 7.17 The site is located adjacent a nature reserve designated a SPA, SAC, RAMSAR and SSSI, and part of the beach is a brent geese support site (site H81). Following Natural England's guidance a Construction Environment Management Method Statement has been submitted addressing how noise and disturbance from the construction process would be mitigated. This includes, amongst other methods, minimising noise, visual and vibration disturbance by having no percussive piling or heavy machinery having a noise level on excess of 69dba during the bird over wintering period of October to March inclusive, which would likely preclude demolition during the winter. A Habitats Regulations Assessment was then undertaken, which noted that as a replacement dwelling there would be no additional significant effect arising from either recreational pressures or water quality, and that the impacts from noise and visual disturbance from construction would be adequately mitigated with compliance with the submitted CEMP, Drawing Number 22203/206 Rev A, and a condition limiting noisy construction

over 69dbAmax taking place during the over wintering period. i.e. October to March inclusive.

7.18 Natural England were consulted on the HRA AA and raise no objection.

7.19 In terms of ecology, following photographic assessment by the County Ecologist it is considered that the site is unlikely to provide suitable habitat for bat roosts, but an Informative is suggested to alert the applicant to the legal protection of bats should any be found.

(vii) CIL

7.20 As a replacement dwelling the development is CIL liable for the net additional floorspace, which in this instance amounts to 99.5sqm, which generates a liability of £14,880.58. In this case self-build exemption has been claimed for the development, and the Draft Liability Notice has been sent to the agent.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The scale, siting and design of the replacement dwelling would have limited and acceptable impact on the character of the area, AONB, neighbours and adjacent habitat sites, and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/22/01210 subject to the following conditions

1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Design and Access Statement by Jeffrey Douglas Chartered Architect dated December 2022

Photomontage view from Nature Reserve

Ecological Statement by Jeffrey Douglas Chartered Architect dated November 2022

Schedule of External Materials & Finishes Revision A dated February 2023

Flood Risk Assessment by Jeffrey Douglas Chartered Architect dated December 2022

Proposed Block & Location Plan - Drawing Number 22203/201 Rev A

Proposed Ground Floor & Site Plan - Drawing Number 22203/202 Rev A

Proposed First & Second Floor and Roof - Drawing Number 22203/203 Rev A

Proposed West & South Elevations - Drawing Number 22203/204 Rev A

Proposed North & East Elevations & Section - Drawing Number 22203/205 Rev A

Construction Environment Management (CEMP) Method Statement with

Addendum dated February 2023
CEMP Stage Plans - Drawing Number 22203/206 Rev A
Existing Block and Location Plans Drawing Number 22203/101
Habitats Regulations and Appropriate Assessment, completed 24/03/2023

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as specified on the Schedule of External Materials and Finishes document Rev A dated February 2023 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS12 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 The hereby approved privacy screens for the sides of the second floor front balcony shall be provided on site prior to first occupation of the hereby approved extension and retained as such thereafter. The frosted glass shall provide a degree of obscuration no less obscure than that which is provided by Pilkington's Texture Glass Obscuration Level 4 (or equivalent).
The hereby approved 'hit and miss style' slatted side privacy screens to the first floor terrace shall be provided on site prior to first occupation at a minimum height of 1.7m and shall be retained at that minimum height with opaque or non-see through solid material in perpetuity.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted the first floor window in the south elevation shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6 No percussive piling or works with heavy machinery (i.e. plant resulting in a noise level in excess of 69dbAmax - measured at the sensitive receptor - the nearest point of the SPA or any supporting habitat) shall be undertaken on site within the bird over wintering period, from 1st October to 31st March inclusive. All details of the hereby approved Construction Environmental Management Method Statement with Addendum dated February 2023, and associated Drawing Number 22203/206 Rev A, shall be strictly adhered to at all times.
Reason: To protect the habitats of the adjacent SPA designated site H81 and the SSSI, RAMSAR and SAC, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011.