

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1. The proposed development by reason of its bulk, height and site coverage would be an incongruous feature to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area, and would not provide satisfactory waiting and turning facilities for servicing vehicles within the site, and as a result would be prejudicial to the safety and amenities of users of the highway network in the surrounding District Centre.

As such the proposed development would be contrary to Policies CS16, CS20 and DM7 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

2. In the absence of binding arrangements for the provision of on site affordable housing or alternatively an acceptable contribution in lieu of on site provision the proposal fails to make adequate provision for affordable housing in the interests of creating mixed communities and responding to housing need. As such the proposed development is contrary to Policy CS9 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the adopted Havant Borough Council Housing SPD July 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

3. The proposal, without completion of the appropriate binding arrangements to secure a contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Project, is contrary to the Council's Policy on contributions towards measures of mitigation adopted by the Local Planning Authority. These seek to ensure that the provision is made from new development towards mitigating against increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. The development is therefore contrary to policies CS11 and CS21 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and Policy DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

A subsequent appeal was dismissed on 5/5/16 for the following reasons:

*It is concluded that the cramped layout of the development at the western end of the sheltered housing and the associated lack of space for landscaping, the poor outlook for residents, and the unsuitable access arrangements would all result in a poor design that would harm the character and appearance of the area and the amenity of residents and their visitors, contrary to CS Policy DM7.*

Regarding parking provision and impact on the highway, the Inspector outlined that: *The shortfall in car parking provision against likely demand, the lack of disabled spaces, the lack of parking or turning areas for larger service vehicles and the inadequate provision for refuse servicing are further consequences of the restricted space available around the building because of its large footprint. Neither do the submitted drawings identify any location for short or long term secure cycle storage as required by the Parking SPD. The Appellant's Transport Statement draws particular attention to the levels of cycle usage in this notably flat urban area.*

*In conclusion on this issue, whilst the evidence indicates that the Parking SPD requirement of 1 parking space per flat is unnecessary, it also suggests that a ratio as low as 0.32 would be inadequate. As a lack of parking could have adverse consequences for the vitality of the district centre (and also for congestion on local roads should it encourage illegal on-street parking that may be difficult to enforce against), I consider that a higher parking ratio of at least 0.40 would be necessary to reduce the risk of such impacts at this location. The lack of provision for disabled parking or cycle storage contravenes other provisions of the Parking SPD.*

*In conclusion for the above reasons this would be a poor design resulting in environmental harm and some potential for economic harm to the district centre. The harm would outweigh the social and economic benefits of the housing and retail development such that this would not be a sustainable development in terms of either the development plan or the National Planning Policy Framework.*

*The benefits of the development do not outweigh the design defects of the submitted scheme and its resultant conflict with the development plan. In any case most of the benefits should be capable of achievement in a scheme with a better design and layout albeit that this may require a reduction in the number or size of the units of accommodation.*

### **3 Proposal**

The proposal is for the demolition of retail unit and associated outbuildings and construction of a 3 storey building consisting of 1No retail unit with 4No one bedroom flats fronting Elm Grove and a 3 storey, sheltered housing, building consisting of 19No one bedroom and 20No two bedroom assisted living accommodation with associated car parking and external works to the rear. The sheltered apartments are to be for people of 55 years or over, and provide specialist accommodation in self-contained flats, in a community setting. This element is an all affordable housing development comprising: 19 x 1 bed & 2 x 2 bed apartments for affordable rent - 54%, and 18 x 2 bed apartments for shared ownership. In terms of scale the proposed sheltered housing element varies between one and three stories in height. The retail unit, with apartments above will also be three storeys with a pitched roof. The access to serve this and the flats to the rear is proposed between this replacement frontage unit and 106 Elm Grove to the south. The car park between 106 and 108 Elm Grove is now included in the application site and is proposed for retention with 104 and 106 Elm Grove.

The sheltered apartment block comprises a courtyard U shaped approach. The main frontage elevation to the west is mainly 3 storey in height, with varying pitched roofs, but steps down to single storey elements towards the southern boundary. The whole scheme is largely defined with a succession of hipped roofs. When viewed from the south the building is predominantly 3 storey, though with single and two storey elements, closest to the southern boundary on each wing of the proposal. These elements are set away from the southern boundary, by approximately 2.5metres and 4.5 metres respectively, the communal garden is between these elements of the building the boundary. The northern elevation is largely designed as 3 storey, and is separated into a number of distinct elements by extending pitched roofs, and then dropping down to elements of two and single storey elements which provides some variance in the plan depth. The east elevation has the shortest frontage and is predominantly 3 storey although it steps down to 2 storey at its southern end.

The approach to the design is contemporary in nature, with the scale of the proposed buildings designed to reflect the nature of the development and enhance the surrounding buildings in the locality. The façade articulation are proposed with varied materials. Materials are proposed as a mixture of pale red and stock bricks, standing seam cladding with vertical metal cladding to roof and corners of the sheltered housing block, and grey concrete tiles with slate effect tile for the front retail building.

A shared central access is proposed between the retail/apartment building and 106 Elm Grove, which will have a 3 metre wide footpath to the north of the internal access road, which will secure a safe access to the flats at the rear of the site, and be able to facilitate mobility scooters. The flats are provided with 16 car parking spaces, which are set in three distinct blocks in front of the western elevation, landscaping is proposed at points within these car parking areas to soften the impact of the hardstanding, and to address the previous appeal decision on this matter. Eight accessible mobility scooter charging points are provided on site.

For the proposed retail and residential units at the front of the site, a car parking area is proposed to the rear of this unit, which will provide 4 parking bays are provided for the proposed retail unit, with a further 4 servicing the flats above. Five cycle spaces are allocated to the Front Building, with a further two provided for visitors directly opposite the main entrance to the Main Building.

As such the main changes between this application and the previous application APP/15/00950, which was refused, and subsequently dismissed at appeal are:

- Reduction in number of units in the sheltered housing block by proposing 5 fewer units;
- Reduction in height and scale of the sheltered housing block, in addition this element has moved further back into the site, allowing re-configured parking
- Additional car parking, which would provide 0.46 spaces per unit, compared to the previous application which provided 0.32 spaces per unit
- Revised shared access, including a footpath
- Additional landscaping within the car parking to soften the impact of the development.

The application is supported by a number of documents:

Archaeological Desk Based Assessment

Transport Statement

Landscaping Strategy

Ecology Report

Contamination Desk Study

Flood Risk Assessment with drainage strategy

Design and Access Statement including Affordable Housing statement

#### **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 Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

|      |                                                                         |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CS16 | (High Quality Design)                                                   |
| CS17 | (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)  |
| CS20 | (Transport and Access Strategy)                                         |
| CS21 | (Developer Requirements)                                                |
| CS4  | ( )                                                                     |
| CS9  | (Housing)                                                               |
| DM11 | (Planning for More Sustainable Travel)                                  |
| DM13 | (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)                      |
| DM2  | (Protection of Existing Community Facilities and Shops)                 |
| DM7  | (Elderly and Specialist Housing Provision)                              |
| DM8  | (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features) |

##### Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

|      |                                                                                           |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| HY1  | (Hayling Island Housing Allocations)                                                      |
| AL1  | (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)                                        |
| DM24 | (Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development) |
| AL3  | (Town, District and Local Centres)                                                        |
| AL2  | (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)                          |

## Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

### Pre-submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036

The Pre-submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 was approved by the Council on 30 January 2019 and was subsequently published under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 for public consultation between 4 February 2019 to 18 March 2019. After this period, the next stage in the plan preparation will be the submission of the Local Plan for independent examination and thereafter adoption. Until this time, the Pre-Submission Local Plan is a material consideration in the assessment of this planning application in accordance with paragraph 48 of the NPPF, which confirms that weight may be given to policies in emerging plans following publication unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. Based on the current stage of preparation, along with the fact that the policies are compliant with the NPPF, the policies within the Pre-Submission Local Plan referenced below are currently afforded some weight, dependent on the level of objection received to each individual policy during the consultation process.

The relevant planning policies of the emerging Local Plan are:

- DR1 - Delivery of Sustainable Development
- DR2 - Regeneration
- IN1 - Effective Provision of Infrastructure
- IN2 - Improving Transport Infrastructure
- IN3 - Transport and Parking in new development
- IN5 - Future management and management plans
- E1 - High Quality Design
- E2 - Health and wellbeing
- E3 - Landscape and settlement boundaries
- E9 - Provision of public open space in new development
- E12 - Low Carbon Design
- E14 - The Local Ecological Network
- E15 - Protected Species
- E16 - Solent Special Protection Areas
- E17 - Solent wader and Brent Goose feeding and roosting sites
- E18 - Trees, hedgerows and woodland
- E19 - Managing flood risk in new development
- E20 - Drainage infrastructure in new development
- E22 - Amenity and pollution
- H1- High Quality Homes
- H2 - Affordable Housing
- H3 - Housing Density
- H4 - Housing mix
- H5 - Retirement and specialist housing
- H32 - Pullingers, Elm Grove
- C5 - Mengham District Centre

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

## **5     Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

### **Arboriculturalist**

No Objection

### **Building Control**

No response

### **Communities Manager**

No response

### **Community Infrastructure, Planning Policy & Urban Design**

Comments reflect the need for an appropriate legal agreement to be in place, to secure relevant matters. CIL and SRMS are also applicable for this application.

### **Councillor Leah Turner - Hayling East**

No comments received

### **Councillor M Wilson - Hayling West Ward**

No comments received

### **Councillor R Raines - Hayling East**

No comments received

### **County Archaeologist, Strategic Environmental Delivery Group, HCC**

No objection

### **County Ecologist**

No Objection - subject to condition the additional information confirms that the site has not materially changed since the previous assessment and that the recommended ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are still valid.

### **Crime Prevention -Major Apps**

No response

### **Developer Services, Southern Water**

No Objection subject to condition

### **Early Years**

No response received

### **Economic Development**

No response received

### **Education Department**

No Objection The development provides 20 “eligible” dwellings on which I would calculate the pupil yield. An eligible dwelling is a dwelling with 2+ bedrooms. From these 20 dwellings I would expect 6 primary age pupils and 5 secondary age pupils, i.e. about one pupil per year group. A yield of pupils at this level can be accommodated in the existing accommodation in the schools on Hayling Island. Consequently I will not be seeking a contribution towards additional educational facilities.

## **Environmental Health Manager, Community Group**

No Objection subject to conditions

## **Hampshire Highways**

No objection subject to conditions

Further to the

Highway Authority's response dated 2nd June, a Transport Note has been submitted by the applicant to address the comments previously raised. The Highway Authority has reviewed the Transport Note and has the following comments to make.

### Personal Injury Accident Data

The applicant has now provided an analysis of the pedestrian accidents which occurred across the study area.

The Highway Authority does not accept the use of Crashmap accident data; however, an internal review of accidents in the area has been undertaken to cross reference against the data provided in the Transport Note which concludes that there are no existing accident trends in the area which could be exacerbated by the proposed development.

### Site Access

At the request of the Highway Authority, the site access has been amended to retain and upgrade the existing vehicle crossover, which is in keeping with accesses along Elm Grove. This arrangement is reflected in drawing number 143.0007.001 Rev A. The tracking provided in drawing numbers 143.0007.002 Rev A and 143.0007.003 Rev A indicate that there is sufficient space for a refuse vehicle to enter the site and two family cars to pass concurrently.

It is noted that the applicant has discussed the proposed amendment to the existing double yellow lines in the layby to the south of the site with Havant Borough Council's Traffic Management (TM) Team who originally requested an amendment to the TRO. Following discussions between the Highway Authority and TM, the extent of the lining work required has been clarified and a formal amendment to the TRO is therefore not required. Extending the double yellowing lining will ensure that the southbound visibility splay is not obstructed by a car parked illegally next to the parking bay.

The Highway Authority will therefore require a condition which secures the implementation of the lining works by the developer prior to occupation of the development.

### Parking and Servicing Arrangements

The applicant has confirmed that the parking bays located to the north of the vets will be retained for use by visitors accessing the shop.

The Highway Authority's previous response requested further details regarding the onsite servicing arrangements. It is understood that the end users for the site are currently unknown and the exact servicing arrangements cannot be identified. To confirm that there is sufficient space for vehicles to manoeuvre in the site, tracking has been provided in drawing numbers 143.0007.002 Rev A and 143.0007.003 Rev A to demonstrate that a super large refuse vehicle and delivery van can enter the site, manoeuvre and egress in a forward in gear.

With the end users for the site unknown at this stage, the Highway Authority is willing to accept a condition which secures the provision of a Servicing Management Plan prior to occupation which details the exact servicing requirements for the site.

As set out previously, a parking ratio of 0.41 spaces per unit (equating to 16 parking bays) has been proposed for the assisted living element of the development to address the Inspector's comments made on application reference 15/00950.

A total of 8 parking spaces are proposed for the retail element of the site, falling 2 short of HBC's published parking standards. Given the proposed shortfall, and with regard to the Inspector's decision associated with planning reference 15/00950, HBC in their capacity as the local parking authority should determine whether the parking shortfall is considered suitable for the development.

#### Trip Generation

A comparative TRICS assessment has been undertaken for assisted living units to confirm whether the trip rates proposed under the previous Transport Statement, utilising retirement flats, is robust.

The trip rates associated with the assessment undertaken for assisted living units is less than the previous TRICS data provided for retirement flats, although it is noted that there is a reduced number of sample sites. The Highway Authority does not agree that the trips associated with the previous retail unit should be net against the proposed use given the time that has passed since the unit was occupied. That being said, the total two way trip rates of 8 in the AM peak hour and 11 in the PM peak hour proposed in the original Transport Statement are now considered robust and therefore acceptable.

#### Recommendation

The applicant has satisfactorily overcome the comments raised in the Highway Authority's previous response. The Highway Authority therefore recommend no objection to the proposed development, subject to relevant conditions.

#### **Housing Manager (Development)**

Support - The proposals comprise of residential development that will include 43 dwelling units; 39 units in the main apartment block and 4 over the retail unit. These 43 units would include 23 no 1 bed 2-person units, and 20 no 2 bed 3-person units.

Emerging policy H1 /High Quality Homes, at para 6.3 confirms that the Council will require all residential development to meet the nationally described space standard (or any subsequent Government standard). At this stage this emerging policy carries only limited weight, however I am very pleased that the applicants intend to provide new homes that meet this standard. They advise that the 1-bedroom flats will be 51sqm, and the 2 bed homes will be 62.5sqm.

The demand for affordable housing remains high within Havant borough; as at 31st March 2020 there are 1588 households registered on Hampshire Home Choice (HHC) seeking accommodation in our area and of these 749 are waiting for a one-bedroom home, 512 for a two bed.

Waiting times on Hampshire Home Choice represent a significant number of years. Between April 2019 to March 2020 For Band 3 applicants the time between registration and nomination was an average of between 3 to 4 years depending on the property size.

Once developed, and subsequently transferred to the Registered provider, the Affordable Rent homes will be required to be advertised through Hampshire Home Choice. I would appreciate an up to date estimation of the weekly rents.

I would expect the Shared Ownership homes to be marketed through Help to Buy 3, our local Help to Buy Agent, and will be available to those applicants registered as being eligible for this type of low cost home ownership product.

The location of the development is near to local services, bus transport, retail, and medical facilities. The proposals should help to create a mixed and well-integrated community in a very desirable area, particularly for older residents.

#### **Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council**

No objection to amended plans- subject to conditions securing both hard and soft landscaping details to ensure that this will overcome the reasons that the Inspector gave for dismissing the previous appeal.

#### **Local Lead Flood Authority HCC**

No Objection subject to conditions following further information being submitted:

The County Council has reviewed the following documents relating to the above application:

- MicroDrainage Network Calculations; dated: July 2020.
- MicroDrainage Attenuation Calculations; dated: June 2020.
- General Arrangement Showing Drainage; Job No: 30666; Drawing No: EX.01; Rev: P3; dated: May 2020.
- SITE SPECIFIC FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT WITH DRAINAGE STRATEGY LEVEL 2; dated: December 2019.

Following our formal response to this planning application dated 10th February 2020, we received additional information on the 15th June & on the 09th of July 2020 including the requested detailed drainage drawings together with detailed hydraulic calculations.

The additional information has addressed our concerns regarding Surface Water Management and Local Flood Risk.

#### **Natural England Government Team**

Natural England notes that your authority, as competent authority, has undertaken an appropriate assessment of the proposal in accordance with Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended). Natural England is a statutory consultee on the appropriate assessment stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process, and a competent authority should have regard to Natural England's advice.

Your appropriate assessment 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 any adverse effects, it is the advice of Natural England that we concur with the conclusion of the HRA, provided all mitigation measures are adequately secured with any permission.

#### **Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy – no objection subject to mitigation**

Since this application will result in a net increase in residential accommodation, impacts to the coastal Special Protection Area(s) and Ramsar site(s) may result from increased recreational pressure. Havant Borough Council has measures in place to manage these potential impacts through the agreed strategic solution which we consider to be ecologically sound.

Subject to the appropriate financial contribution being secured, Natural England is satisfied that the proposal will mitigate against the potential recreational impacts of the development on the site(s). It is Natural England's view that the Solent Mitigation Recreation Strategy Contribution adequately mitigates the effects of the development on potential recreational impacts on the designated sites.

#### **Nutrient Neutrality – no objection subject to mitigation**

Natural England is aware that your authority has adopted an interim strategy using Grampian conditions to address nutrient impacts from developments currently in the planning system and we have been working with the Council to develop this approach. It is noted that the mitigation would be secured through a Grampian condition, requiring the mitigation package to be agreed, provided to the Council and implemented prior to the occupation of the development.

Your appropriate assessment 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. With regard to deterioration of the water environment, it is noted that the approach to address the positive nitrogen budget for this development is to offset against the interim strategy, with measures to ensure this approach can be adequately secured and accounted for. For completeness, Natural England advise your authority to detail the nitrogen budget requiring mitigation within the HRA.

It is Natural England's view that in this case, provided the Council as competent authority, is satisfied that the approach will ensure the proposal is nutrient neutral and the necessary measures can be fully secured; Natural England raises no further concerns.

Please consult Natural England on the discharge of the Grampian condition.

#### **Planning Policy**

No response

#### **Public Spaces**

No response

#### **SE Hants Clinical Commissioning Group**

As a Clinical Commissioning Group we have a specific interest in new residential developments and how the increased population would directly affect local healthcare provision. We are especially interested in the types of residential properties being built to help us plan for the future.

The resulting growth in the locality population will inevitably seek registration with a local GP surgery and place additional pressure on existing NHS services; NHS services in primary, community and secondary care settings.

The increased demand would be accommodated by the existing GP surgeries open to new registration requests from people living in the area of the proposed development; however additional workforce and building capacity within the premises will be required.

The CCG considers that the application should be required to make an appropriate financial contribution to the provision of capital and revenue investment that the NHS will make in this regard.

Please see below the NHS investment projection that the CCG will consider should the application be granted by the Council;

The proposed contributions formula for developments under 2000 dwellings is: 43 No. of dwellings x 2.4 divided by average list size (1800) x 16 (size of a consultation room (m2) x £375 (cost of rent and other additional expenses with regard to premises) x 20 (number of years expected on a lease)

This means that South Eastern Hampshire CCG will be looking for a contribution of £6880 of planning gain for health.

South Eastern Hampshire CCG identifies multiple practices (Waterside Medical Practice and The Elms Practice) could be impacted by this development in our CCG area as all the following practice boundaries cover this area. However, it is likely that Waterside Medical Practice will be the preferred practice for new patient registrations due to their close proximity to the development. Therefore we request that funding be made available from developer contributions to enable those practices impacted, to make suitable building adaptations to facilitate this growth.

#### **Southern Gas Network**

No response received

#### **Traffic Management, East Hampshire District Council**

The Traffic team would raise the concern that with a parking allocation for the sheltered accommodation of 0.41 past experience tells us that this would be an insufficient amount of parking space for the development.

With limited parking available in the local area already being oversubscribed with similar developments.

#### **Waste Services Manager**

No response 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: 29

Number of site notices: 2

Statutory advertisement: 31/01/2020

Number of representations received: 9

5 objections recieved from 4 residents, and 4 letter of support received from local residents

| Comment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Officer Comment                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Letters of objection</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                     |
| The proposed development at three stories high is too bulky and completely out of character with the surrounding area. Should the plans be re submitted for a development at two stories high, I would not object.                                                                                                                                                     | Addressed in section 7.1 (ii)                                                                                                                       |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                     |
| The number of units needs to be reduced as there is insufficient parking available on the site for visitors who will always want to visit their parents and friends in these homes. Because the local car parks (Hayling Billy and Co-Op) and now either developed or closed to non-shoppers, the adjoining roads will be unable to accommodate the extra parked cars. | Addressed in section 7.1 (iv)                                                                                                                       |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                     |
| No further residential development should take place on the island until the very real problem of the single road on and off the island has been addressed.                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Addressed in section 7.1 (iv)                                                                                                                       |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                     |
| Concern about loss of privacy on neighbouring properties                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Addressed in section 7.1 (iii)                                                                                                                      |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                     |
| We do not need any further elderly people living facilities on the Island                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | The Housing Officer has indicated that there is a significant need for such types of housing, given the identified waiting list within the borough. |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Letters of support</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                     |
| It is our opinion that the proposed site has been vacant for some 5 years giving the area a run down feel, We welcome this development with open arms as it will re-establish the shop frontage on this stretch of Elm Grove and the housing development will offer much needed affordable accommodation to the local community.                                       | Noted                                                                                                                                               |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| <p>1. This development will provide considerable financial benefits to local businesses and shops.</p> <p>2. The proposed entrance will be no more busy than when Pullingers and Tesco were open.</p> <p>3, The proposed plans are attractive and well laid out and as the main development is set well back from the road compared to the recent McCarthy and Stone development opposite that sits right on the main road we see this as a very appealing proposal.</p> |  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |  |

## **7 Planning Considerations**

- 7.1 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 results of the proposed development.
- 7.2 The planning application was then subject to Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63. This included two packages of avoidance and mitigation packages. The first is a package of measures based on the suggested scale of mitigation in the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy. The second is a package of measures based on the Position Statement on Nutrient Neutral Development. The applicant has entered into a legal agreement to secure the mitigation packages for the SRMS. The applicant has also agreed the Grampian style condition, as outlined in the position statement, in order to mitigate the impact of the developments in terms Nutrient Neutral Development.
- 7.3 The Appropriate Assessment concluded that this is sufficient to remove the significant effect on the SPAs which would otherwise have been likely to occur. The HRA was subject to consultation with Natural England as the appropriate nature conservation body under Regulation 63(3) who have confirmed that they agree with the findings of the assessment. The applicant has indicated a willingness to enter into a legal agreement to secure the mitigation packages.

7.4 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) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highway and parking considerations
- (v) Drainage and flood risk
- (vi) Impact on ecology
- (vii) Developer Contributions/S106

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. The site lies within a secondary frontage of the Gable Head District Centre and policy AL3 of the adopted Local Plan (Allocations) requires 25% to be retained in retail use. In this regard the proposal replaces the existing retail unit with one of a narrower frontage in order to provide a suitable access along its northern side. The retail frontage is therefore only marginally reduced and it is considered the provision of the ground floor retail unit should help satisfy this requirement. It should also be noted that the previous application was not refused on such matters, and the Inspector did not raised this matter in the appeal on the previous application for APP/15/00950.

With respect to the housing proposal the site has specifically been allocated for residential development in the adopted allocations Plan under policy HY1 as site reference HY13. This allocation gave an indicative number of 14 dwellings. This number was not prescriptive and had anticipated a standard dwelling layout. However, the proposed sheltered apartment scheme makes better use of previously developed land in a sustainable location adjacent to the District Centre and it is considered that this form of development is acceptable in principle as the site is within the defined urban area. The proposal will contribute towards meeting the borough's housing requirements in accordance with policy CS9(1). It will also provide accommodation for the ageing population in accordance with policy CS9(6) of the Core Strategy.

Policy CS9(2) of the Core Strategy requires the provision of affordable housing and at 30% this would equate to 12.3 dwellings. The application is supported with an affordable housing statement, which outlined that all of the 39 sheltered housing units would be affordable housing comprising: 19 x 1 bed & 2 x 2 bed apartments for affordable rent - 54%, and 18 x 2 bed apartments for shared ownership. As such the scheme provides 95% of the units as affordable housing, this scheme will therefore make a significant contribution towards the affordable housing stock on Hayling Island, for much needed elderly persons housing, and therefore this is an housing mix is acceptable.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area  
Front building

On the Elm Grove frontage, the replacement retail unit with flats above, will be three stories high is proposed in a contemporary design approach. The immediate and surrounding area on Elm Grove is now a mixture of two and recently three storey development, following the completion of the Sheltered housing scheme, on the former Hayling Billy Public House site. As such the proposed scale of the building would not be significantly out of keeping with the character and appearance with the area. The proposed design and use of materials are key in terms of making contemporary developments, such as this, integrate into the character of the area. The proposed façade articulation with the varied materials and positioning of window openings provides interest and order to the elevations. The proposed materials comprises the use of pale red stock brick, with contrasting bands of cladding to provide visual interest. The window are proposed to be composite PPC metal frames, with concrete roof tile. It is considered that this design ethos would enable the development to has picked up on the vernacular of the local area, with a contemporary twist. As such it is considered that this element of the proposal is acceptable and would not have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Sheltered housing

The previous application was dismissed at appeal, which is outlined in the planning history section of the report. The Inspector in this decision considered that the principle of a three storey building in this location was acceptable. However, the Inspector concluded that *"that the cramped layout of the development at the western end of the sheltered housing and the associated lack of space for landscaping, the poor outlook for residents, and the unsuitable access arrangements would all result in a poor design that would harm the character and appearance of the area and the amenity of residents and their visitors, contrary to CS Policy DM7."*

This application has sought to address the concerns raised by the Inspector, with following main changes for the sheltered housing element:

- Reduction in number of units in the sheltered housing block by proposing 5 fewer units;
- Reduction in height and scale of the sheltered housing block, in addition this element has moved further back into the site, allowing re-configured parking
- Revised shared access, including a pedestrian footpath 3 metres in width which would be able to accommodate mobility scooters
- Additional landscaping within the car parking to soften the impact of the development.

The building lies 47m back from the Elm Grove frontage and will be viewed either through the previous Pullinger and the Vet car park or the new access to the development located to the north of the replacement retail unit and flats above. At this distance from the Elm Grove frontage it is considered that a development of this scale, with the particular approach taken to its detailed design and massing and which features a significant amount of articulation, will result in a building that will not be detrimental to the character of the Elm Grove street scene. In terms of the wider impact upon the character of the area, to the north of the site is a car park and bowling green and the actual British Legion club is at a distance in excess of 55m; to the west are the open areas of the Allotment Gardens with a width of 45m and beyond the Allotments are the car park of both Mengham Junior School and, to the north of that, the Recreation

Ground. These neighbouring uses are not all public areas but are uses that provide community uses that are visited by the public. Their generally open character provide a spacious land use context for the new building beyond the site itself, and whilst the new development will be clearly prominent in this context, the relationships and distances to the adjoining land uses are considered to be such that the proposal to introduce a three storey building would not, in itself, be detrimental to the character of this particular area. To the south of the site are rear gardens of a terrace of two storey dwellings in Palmerston Road and that detailed relationship in terms of residential amenity is considered in the section below. The Inspector on this point, outlined that "*I consider that a 3-storey building could here be in keeping with the surrounding area. From most directions the design of the sheltered housing and its siting behind the frontage buildings and near open land would mean that its relatively large bulk and scale would be satisfactorily accommodated in the townscape*".

Turning now to the western element of this further scheme, which was of particular concern for the Inspector. As has been outlined above, a number of changes have been made to address this element. The revised shared access, including a pedestrian footpath 3 metres in width which would be able to accommodate mobility scooters, this proposal is an improvement from the previous scheme, in that it would now provide a much more convenient and safe access for residents, which has natural surveillance from the proposed buildings and car parking areas. As such this has provided improved legibility for residents seeking to access the facilities and shops of the District Centre.

The Inspector also considered that the previous scheme would provide a cramped layout at this western end, which was defined by a lack of space for landscaping, which would result in a poor design that would harm the character and appearance of the area, poor amenity for future residents and visitors. As has been highlighted above, this proposed scheme is approximately 7/8 metres further into the site. This, together with the proposed shared access, has allowed this area to be re-configured. The proposal is three areas of parking, one of those immediately behind the retail/residential unit, with the existing vet car parking to the south. The remaining two car parking areas set in two parking courts in front of the sheltered housing, which is surrounded by landscaping to help soften the impact of the areas of hardstanding. It is considered that this soft/ amenity landscape created by more efficient use of space together with adjusted placement of the proposed apartments, would offer a more attractive setting both on approach from Elm Grove and is more consistent with the existing street-scene context.

Having regard to the changes in this application, it is considered that subject to appropriate conditions, that this development has overcome the matters that were raised by the Inspector, and would provide an improved impact on the character and appearance of the area, together with an improved level of amenity for both residents and visitors. Overall having regard the relationship of the development to its surrounding context it is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in respect of its scale, massing and street scene implications to Elm Grove and its wider impact under the requirements of CS16 of the Core Strategy and the Design Guide SPD.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

As detailed above the site is only bordered by residential properties on the southern side. The use of the varying pitch design results in a lower overall height for the three storey element of 8.6m on this elevation. The distance between the rear of the dwellings and the three storey element is 27m at its closest, though is over 32 metres for the majority of the neighbouring properties. This is in excess of the 24m required by the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD for a three to two storey relationship between residential developments. It is therefore considered that in terms of the relationship of the new development to neighbouring residential properties, the impact upon them will be satisfactory under the requirements of policy CS16 of the Core Strategy.

With respect to the amenity of the residents within the sheltered apartment development the ground floor units have doors to outside patios and there is a garden provided on the south side. The wing on the west side of the southern frontage element of the building makes this area secluded from the activity on the Elm Grove frontage. There is scope within the garden and on the boundaries of the site to implement the planting scheme that is considered suitable. In addition, as has been outlined above, this application provides a secure route to the apartments which largely prevents the need for the elderly to cross the car park and conflict with any vehicle turning movements. On this basis it is considered the environment for the residents will be acceptable.

(iv) Highway and parking considerations

As has been outlined the Inspector, in the previous appeal considered this matter in details and outlined that:

*The shortfall in car parking provision against likely demand, the lack of disabled spaces, the lack of parking or turning areas for larger service vehicles and the inadequate provision for refuse servicing are further consequences of the restricted space available around the building because of its large footprint. Neither do the submitted drawings identify any location for short or long term secure cycle storage as required by the Parking SPD.*

The Inspector went on to conclude "*that whilst the evidence indicates that the Parking SPD requirement of 1 parking space per flat is unnecessary, it also suggests that a ratio as low as 0.32 would be inadequate. As a lack of parking could have adverse consequences for the vitality of the district centre (and also for congestion on local roads should it encourage illegal on-street parking that may be difficult to enforce against), I consider that a higher parking ratio of at least 0.40 would be necessary to reduce the risk of such impacts at this location. The lack of provision for disabled parking or cycle storage contravenes other provisions of the Parking SPD*".

This application has sought to address these issues, and as has been highlighted the parking and access arrangements have been amended. With regard to the parking provision The application provides 16 spaces including one disabled space for the 39 unit assisted retirement living scheme. This level of parking equates to 0.41 spaces per unit, the proposal also includes 2 cycle parking spaces for the sheltered housing, and 5 for the residential/retail units. The applicant has made reference within the Transports Statement and subsequent addendum that this level of parking has been accepted elsewhere within Hampshire. Clearly, each case is based on its merits, however these schemes are largely in similar locations near to District Centres.

A number of representations received in connection with the application make reference to car parking issues, and concern has also been expressed by Planning Policy that there may be over reliance on the free parking available in the St Mary's Road car park which is an important facility to support the local shops and businesses in providing customer parking. It has been queried that residential parking in this car park could undermine the local shops/businesses. Against the background of the appeal evidence and when recognising the sustainable location of the development adjacent to a District Centre and with options for alternative modes of transport in the form of a regular bus service, it is considered that the level of car parking proposed for the scheme is acceptable and has overcome the matters raised by the Inspector in the previous appeal. There will, however, need to be an age restriction condition included on any decision.

The Inspector also highlighted concerns regarding the previous servicing arrangements, with particular regard to refuse vehicles and service vehicles (including those up to 3.5 tonnes) could include home shopping deliveries including food, furniture, and carpets and also maintenance vehicles used by gardeners, plumbers and electricians. With regard to refuse and emergency vehicle access, vehicle swept path analysis has been undertaken that both vehicles are able to enter the site, turn and exist in forward gear. Furthermore, the refuse vehicle is able to park within close proximity of the refuse storage areas for both the retail, residential and assisted living units. The Highway Authority have requested a servicing arrangements plan, as a pre-occupation condition, this will allow appropriate arrangements to be made depending on the end-user/occupier of the units, which are not yet known. However given the larger car parking and turning areas, the Highway Authority are content that an appropriate servicing arrangement can be secured that ensures that any home deliveries are appropriately secured, and do not obstruct access to both the site and the car parking spaces.

Taking all these highway factors together it is considered that the site is reasonably sustainable in transport terms. Whilst the proposed car parking provision is below standard, this has been justified by the applicant with reference to their experience at other sites and the previous guidance in the appeal decision. Overall the impacts on the highway network could not be considered to be severely harmful to the safety or free flow of the highway network and as such the development should not be refused. It is clear in the NPPF that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. Following the implementation of the agreed mitigation proposals required by conditions, these are considered to mitigate the impact of the development on the highway network and therefore a reason for refusal on this basis could not be justified. Overall the proposal is not considered to have a significant impact on the safety and free flow of the highway network and complies with policies DM7 and DM13 of the Core Strategy.

#### (v) Drainage and flood risk

In relation to drainage and flood risk, the site is located in Flood Zone 1 (low flood Risk). Foul water drainage would link to existing drainage systems and this is considered

acceptable in principle. A foul water drainage condition is recommended to ensure that details are acceptable, and protects the public sewerage network.

Surface water drainage provides soakaways, permeable surfacing and diffusers so water drains to the ground water. Subject to appropriate conditions the drainage proposals are considered acceptable in principle and initial concerns of consultees have been addressed.

(vi) Impact on ecology

The application is accompanied by an updated Ecological Impact Assessment (ECOSA, November 2019). This confirms that the site has not materially changed since the previous assessment and that the recommended ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are still valid. As such the development would not have a significant impact on the ecology of the area.

(vii) Developer Contributions/S106

The CIL rates to be applied to development are set out in the Havant Borough Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, which was adopted by the council on the 20th February 2013. This followed two public consultation exercises and an Examination into the Charging Schedule by an independent Examiner. The Examiners Report concluded that the Havant Borough Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule provided an appropriate basis for the collection of the levy in the borough. The levy is charged at £100 (plus indexation) per square metre on new floorspace (measured as gross internal area) on Hayling Island.

It is considered that there is a CIL liability for this site. A credit cannot be given for the existing floorspace within the site as the buildings need to have been occupied for their lawful use for 6 continuous months of the 36 previous months preceding decision. However a credit can be given for the sheltered element of the scheme, as this is for affordable housing. The contribution has therefore been calculated at £45,097.75 The applicant has been advised of this accordingly.

The S106 Agreement secures the following:

Financial Contribution for the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy Contribution

Other Matters:

SUDS - management and maintenance

SUDS Bond

Affordable housing

NHS - CCG contribution

## **8 Conclusion**

This proposed revised application, is considered to have addressed the previous appeal decision and as such the form of the development, including its 3 storey height, is appropriate

having regard to the site context, and that being in a sustainable location the car parking provision is acceptable on the basis of the development being age restricted. It is considered that the proposed development would make a valuable contribution to the borough's housing requirements by providing retirement accommodation on a site allocated in the Local Plan, and also provides a retail unit on the Elm Grove frontage to meet the policy requirements for the secondary retail frontage. It is therefore concluded that subject to a Section 106 securing the payment of the SRMS payment, NHS-CCG contributions, SUD's details and affordable housing that the proposal is considered acceptable.

---

## 9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00015 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:

PROPOSED SITE PLAN 19-030-002-P10  
Proposed Block & Site Location Plans 19-030-001-P5  
Proposed Roof Plan 19-030-004-P1  
Proposed Ground Floor Plans 19-030-005-P5  
Proposed First Floor Plans 19-030-006-P5  
Proposed Second Floor Plans 19-030-007-P5  
Proposed Elevations 19-030-008-P4  
Proposed Elevations 19-030-009-P4  
Proposed Elevations 19-030-010-P3  
Proposed Sections 19-030-011-P4  
Design and Access Statement 19-030 - DAS

- MicroDrainage Network Calculations; dated: July 2020.
- MicroDrainage Attenuation Calculations; dated: June 2020.
- General Arrangement Showing Drainage; Job No: 30666; Drawing No: EX.01; Rev: P3; dated: May 2020.
- SITE SPECIFIC FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT WITH DRAINAGE STRATEGY LEVEL 2; dated: December 2019.

**Reason:** To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until:
  - a) A water efficiency calculation in accordance with the Government's National Calculation Methodology for assessing water efficiency in new dwellings has been undertaken which demonstrates that no more than 110 litres of water per person per day shall be consumed within the development, and this calculation has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority; all measures necessary to meet the agreed waste efficiency calculation must be installed before first occupation and retained thereafter;
  - b) A mitigation package addressing the additional nutrient input arising from the development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Such mitigation package shall address all of the additional nutrient load imposed on protected European Sites by the development when fully occupied and shall allow the Local Planning Authority to ascertain on the basis of the best available scientific evidence that such additional nutrient loading will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the protected European Sites, having regard to the conservation objectives for those sites; and  
c) All measures forming part of that mitigation package have been provided to the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** There is existing evidence of high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus in the water environment with evidence of eutrophication at some European designated nature conservation sites in the Solent catchment. The PUSH Integrated Water Management Strategy has identified that there is uncertainty as to whether new housing development can be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the designated sites within the Solent. Further detail regarding this can be found in the appropriate assessment that was carried out regarding this planning application. To ensure that the proposal may proceed as sustainable development, there is a duty upon the local planning authority to ensure that sufficient mitigation for is provided against any impacts which might arise upon the designated sites. In coming to this decision, the Council have had regard to Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and Policy E14 of the Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036.

- 4 No unit shall be occupied until acoustic mitigation measures, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall be installed and demonstrated through post validation testing to determine compliance that the dwellings have achieved 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. The mitigation measures shall be retained at all times, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure the residential amenity of the property is not impacted upon by any external noise levels and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 No floodlighting or other form of external lighting scheme 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 of nearby properties, on and off site, from light disturbance / nuisance in accordance with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

- 6 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.

**Reason:** To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 7 No above ground construction works shall take place until a more detailed soft landscaping scheme for all open parts of the site not proposed to be hardsurfaced 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 CS16, DM8 and DM9 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8 No above ground construction works shall take place until a specification of the materials to be used for the surfacing of all open parts of the site proposed to be hardsurfaced has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the implementation of all such hardsurfacing has been completed in full accordance with that specification.

**Reason:** In the interests of the amenities of the locality and having due regard to policies CS16, and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 9 No above ground construction works shall take place until plans and particulars specifying the alignment, type, height and, where appropriate, construction materials and design of all proposed screen walls, fences, hedges and other means of enclosure have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Authority, the development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use prior to the completion of the installation of all screening provision as is thus approved by the Authority. At all times thereafter, all of that screening provision shall be retained in a wholly sound and effective condition.

**Reason:** To safeguard the amenities of the locality and occupiers of neighbouring property and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 10 With the exception of any site manager/warden's accommodation, at no time shall the sheltered apartments development hereby approved be occupied by persons under the age of 55, unless in the case of a couple where one person is over the age of 55, the second person shall not be under the age of 55.

**Reason:** In order that the occupancy of the development is compatible with the limited amount of on-site car parking provision, and having due regard to Policies CS20 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 11 Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed within the Ecological Impact Assessment (ECOSA, November 2019) unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To protect biodiversity in accordance with the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, the NERC Act (2006), NPPF and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

- 12 No development shall start on site until a construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway 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;
- Demolition and construction work shall only take place in accordance with the approved method statement.

**Reason:** To safeguard the amenities of the locality and in the interests of traffic safety and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 13 Prior to occupation of development, a Servicing Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority containing details of the servicing arrangements for the proposed development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:** To safeguard the amenities of the locality and in the interests of traffic safety and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 14 No occupations shall take place on site until details including a timetable for implementation of the double yellow amendments to the southern layby have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, prior to any occupations on the site unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To safeguard the amenities of the locality and in the interests of traffic safety and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 15 No development hereby permitted shall commence until plans and particulars specifying the layout, depth and capacity of all foul and surface water drains and sewers proposed to serve the same, and details of any other proposed ancillary drainage works/plant (e.g. pumping stations) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use prior to the completion of the implementation of all such drainage provision in full accordance with such plans and particulars as are thus approved by the Authority.

**Reason:** To safeguard the amenities of the locality and ensure that all such drainage provision is constructed to an appropriate standard and quality and having due regard to policies and proposals CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 16 Prior to the occupation of the development details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include;
- a. Maintenance schedules for each drainage feature type and ownership
  - b. Details of protection measures.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To safeguard the amenities of the locality and ensure that all such drainage provision is constructed to an appropriate standard and quality and having due regard to policies and proposals CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 17 The development shall not be brought into use until space for the parking and turning of vehicles has been provided within the site, surfaced and marked out in accordance with the approved details. Such areas shall thereafter be retained and used solely for those purposes.

**Reason:** In the interests of highway safety and local amenity and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.