



Havant
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire PO9 2AX

T 023 9247 4174
F 023 9248 0263

www.havant.gov.uk

Mr G Beck
30 Carlton Crescent
Southampton
SO15 2EW

Our Ref: GEN/17/01439
Direct Line: (023) 9244 6513
Ask For: Mrs D Haywood
Email: planning.development@havant.gov.uk

16 January 20187

Site Location: Land at Lower Road, Havant, PO9 3NB
Re: Erection of 50 dwellings

Dear Sir

I am writing to you further to your enquiry received on the 05 December 2017 regarding the above address.

I have now received the responses from consultee which I set out below:-

Planning Policy

Policy Status

The Local Plan (Core Strategy) and the Local Plan (Allocations), together with the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan provide the development plan for the borough. The Local Plan Housing Statement (LPHS) is also a material planning consideration.

The following policies and documents are of particular relevance:

- . CS 15 Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk
- . CS16 High Quality Design
- . CS17 Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas
- . CS21 Developer Requirements
- . DM6 Coordination of Development
- . DM7 Elderly and Specialist Housing Provision
- . DM8 Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features
- . DM10 Pollution
- . DM13 Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development
- . DM18 Protecting new Development from Pollution
- . DM23 Sites for Brent Geese and Waders
- . DM24 Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development.
- . AL2 Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements
- . Havant Borough Council Parking SPD (July 2016)

It should also be noted that the Council is also reviewing its Local Plan, and a Draft Regulation 18 version of the document will be subject to public consultation from Monday 8 January to Friday 16 February 2018. Whilst the policies can only be afforded limited weight at this stage in the plan, the applicant should consider the requirements of the Local Plan 2036 in project planning this scheme, particularly with regards to the design and layout and he wish to consider the provisions in the emerging Draft Local Plan with regard to the reparation, submission and determination of any planning application.

All of the above documents are available at: www.havant.gov.uk/localplan.

Principle of Development:

The site currently lies outside the urban area, as defined by Policies CS17 and AL2 of the Adopted Local Plan (ALP). These policies seek to concentrate development in the defined urban area. The proposal for residential development is therefore contrary to the policies in the ALP.

The Council adopted a Local Plan Housing Statement (LPHS) in response to the high need for housing in the Borough which provides an interim step in the review of the Local Plan, whilst the Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 (HBLP 2036) is in production. The subject site is identified in Table 2 of the document as a greenfield site outside of the urban area suitable for early release. Guiding Principle 4 of the LPHS states that the principle of residential development on this site will be considered favourably in order to contribute towards the objectively assessed housing need and to significantly boost housing supply in the borough.

The development proposals are also consistent with the indicative capacity of 50 dwellings included in the LPHS. Under Guiding Principle 4 of the LPHS, all housing proposals on sites outside of the urban area (as defined by Policies CS17 and AL2), including the Table 2 sites, are expected to be accompanied by a comprehensive Infrastructure Delivery Statement (IDS). Further information is available at:

<http://www.havant.gov.uk/site-specific-infrastructure-delivery->

As such, the Council will support the principle of residential development on the site ahead of the adoption of the Havant Borough Local Plan 2036, subject to development proposals meeting the requirements of the ALP, and if accompanied by an IDS.

High Quality Design and Heritage

The site is adjacent to the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and in close proximity to the listed buildings of the Church of St Thomas and Bedhampton Rectory. In this respect, the Summary of the Site Screening Work states that:

"Due to the very sensitive location, historic asset issues may prove to be an overriding constraint to the development. Any medium or large scale development has the potential to cause significant harm to the intrinsic value of the conservation area."

The impact on the nearby heritage assets and their setting must be addressed as part of a Heritage Statement submitted with any planning application. It is recommended that the Council's Conservation Officer is consulted on the current proposal, and the applicant is strongly encouraged to engage in extensive pre-application discussions prior to the submission of any planning application.

The site has been identified as a Low Use Area as defined by the forthcoming refresh of the Solent Brent Geese and Waders Strategy (SWGS). Further information in this regard is available at Policy E17 in the Draft Local Plan.

We would nevertheless strongly encourage the applicant to engage with the Council's Ecologist and Natural England, potentially through their Development Advice Service 1, particularly with regard to any survey efforts and associated avoidance and mitigation measures.

Water Environment

The site is Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1c for the Bedhampton and Havant Springs, overlays a Principle Aquifer and is located within 500m of a known/mapped solution feature in Portsmouth Waters catchment. Policy DM10 is therefore of relevance. In this respect, the developer should be aware of the possible constraints to construction due to the presence of the Principle Aquifer and the need to protect the water environment in accordance with Policy DM10.

1 More detail is available at [hUps://www.gov.uk/guidance/developers-get-environmental-advice-on-your-planning-proposals](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/developers-get-environmental-advice-on-your-planning-proposals).

Other matters

Whilst the potential impact of noise from the adjacent railway line has been considered through a draft Design and Access Statement, it will need to be demonstrated that appropriate mitigation has been provided through design and layout as appropriate.

Developer Contributions

Havant Borough Council has an adopted CIL Charging Schedule which is applied to new residential development in the Borough in addition to the requirements of Policy CS21. The Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP) contribution will also be payable in accordance with Policy DM24. It should be noted that these charges are subject to change and that both CIL and the SRMP charges are currently under review.

Recommendation

The residential development of this site is supported in principle, subject to the development proposals meeting the requirements of the ALP, and if accompanied by an IDS. There will however, be a need to carefully consider the impact on heritage assets, particularly with the regard to the design and layout of the development proposals. It is also recommended that the applicant reviews the relevant policies in the Draft local Plan 2036 and any associated implications for the project planning in the delivery of this site.

Landscape Architect

From a landscape perspective we do not object to the principle of this development, however we have the following comments:

- We would require an Arboricultural Impact Assessment to understand the relationship between the root protection areas of the existing boundary trees and any proposed development (particularly building foundations and below-ground utilities). We are concerned with the proximity of the proposed dwellings on the western boundary and the existing line of trees, which offer a significant landscape buffer.
- SuDS (balancing ponds, rain gardens and other associated features) will need to be appropriately integrated within open space areas. They should not comprise steep-sided, fenced off features of artificial appearance. Accessible, gently graded slope sides will allow access / egress for informal play provision, ease of future maintenance and improved biodiversity. Cross-sections within the landscape context will be required, primarily to demonstrate sufficient provision of space to achieve this requirements. Outfalls / header walls and other associated elements will need to be appropriately detailed using materials to fit with the development palette.
- At present there is a lack of a defined pedestrian/cycle route to access and navigate around the site. As such we would require an appropriate sustainable transport strategy that should include a 3m wide, hard surfaced, suitably lit shared pedestrian/cycle path. Additionally we feel that it is important to ensure the layout protects the future potential for a shared pedestrian / cycle (3m width) for a southwards connection to the wider sustainable infrastructure network.
- Due to the sites proximity to the railway line to the south a robust landscape strategy to mitigate noise and overlooking should be adopted. This will also have ecological and biodiversity benefits.
- Boundary treatments will be key in how the development sits interacts with existing properties. We are pleased to see a buffer zone that includes reinforced planting along the boundary. These areas should large enough for any tree/vegetation to grow to maturity

whilst allowing access for maintenance. The proposed boundary buffer could create a green corridor that works as part of the pedestrian/cycle routes.

As such we would require the following:

- A detailed soft landscape scheme requiring submission of fully annotated plans at sufficient scale to identify species of individually planted trees, shrubs, hedges, marginal, bulbs and any areas of turfing / seeding. Planting areas should show the locations of different single species groups in relation to one another, and the locations of any individual specimen shrubs. Other information shall include plant tree pit details, specification schedules, comprising plant size, number and density, as well as, the proposed planting implementation programme.
- Boundary details requiring submission of fully annotated plans at sufficient scale showing the locations of existing, retained and proposed new boundary treatments, with scaled elevation drawings to show height, design, materials, type and colour of proposed new walling / fencing or other type of enclosure and associated gates.
- Hard landscape details requiring submission of fully annotated plans at sufficient scale that comprise a range of coloured and textured surfacing treatments, which identify:
 - finished levels
 - hard surfacing material type / product reference and colour
 - laying bond
 - edging or threshold detail / type
- Further details on building material specification for the development requiring submission including material type, product reference and colour to understand how the proposed development will affect the existing streetscape.

Natural England

1) The application site is within 5.6km of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and will lead to a net increase in residential accommodation. The applicant will need to comply with local plan policies in respect to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP) contribution.

2) The Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy aims to protect the network of non-designated terrestrial wader and brent goose sites that support the Solent Special Protection Areas (SPA) from land take and recreational pressure associated with new development. The Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy is currently being updated with further guidance on mitigation and compensation requirements should sites come forward for development.

In the forthcoming strategy, the whole of the application site is identified as a Low Use site (H05A). All Low Use sites have the potential to be used by waders and/or brent geese and in all cases proportionate mitigation, off-setting and/or enhancement measures will be required. Natural England strongly recommends that the applicant discusses the proposed mitigation through our Discretionary Advice Service.

3) A detailed evaluation of the biodiversity value of the site, potential losses and proposed mitigation should be undertaken. We recommend that a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan is submitted with the application to address any potential biodiversity losses, any impacts on protected species and to secure biodiversity enhancements as set out in National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 7, 109 and 118.

5) The application should assess the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land at the site. Local planning authorities are responsible for ensuring that they have sufficient detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) information to apply the requirements of the

NPPF. This is the case regardless of the size of the development. Further information is contained in Natural England's Technical Information Note 049.

Agricultural Land Classification information is available on the Magic website on the Data.Gov.uk website. If you consider the proposal has significant implications for further loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, we would be pleased to discuss the matter further.

Guidance on soil protection is available in the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites, and we recommend its use in the design and construction of development, including any planning conditions. Should the development proceed, we advise that the developer uses an appropriately experienced soil specialist to advise on, and supervise soil handling, including identifying when soils are dry enough to be handled and how to make the best use of soils on site.

6) Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights the need to protect and enhance valued landscapes through the planning system. This application may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider whether any local landscape features or characteristics (such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls) could be incorporated into the development in order to respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness, in line with any local landscape character assessments. Where the impacts of development are likely to be significant, a Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment should be provided with the proposal to inform decision making. We refer you to the Landscape Institute Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for further guidance.

8) The proposed development is within an area that could benefit from enhanced green infrastructure (GI) provision. Multi-functional green infrastructure can perform a range of functions including improved flood risk management, provision of accessible green space, climate change adaptation and biodiversity enhancement. Natural England would encourage the incorporation of GI into this development. Evidence and advice on green infrastructure, including the economic benefits of GI can be found on the Natural England Green Infrastructure web pages.

HCC Ecology

Any future application will need to be accompanied by a detailed ecological assessment. This should investigate any on-site ecological constraints such as notable/protected species or habitats as well as any issues relating to off-site ecological features. In terms of on-site issues, these are likely to be concentrated at site boundaries where mature woody vegetation occurs – trees and shrubs and any other unmanaged vegetation may support roosting/flying bats, nesting birds and common reptiles. Suitable compensatory habitat may be required within the site to accommodate any such ecological constraints, and a sensitive lighting scheme (avoiding illumination of boundary trees/shrubs) should be a prerequisite. Wherever possible, biodiversity enhancements should be provided (e.g. use of native-led plantings, bat/bird boxes, SuDS features etc.).

The site is listed within the Solent Waders & Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) as Site H05a and is classed as offering Low Use for overwintering bird species. Any ecological assessment will need to engage with the SWBGS data and carry out appropriate analysis. Proportionate mitigation/compensation measures are required for impacts to all SWBGS sites and I would echo the advice from Natural England. In this location, off-site mitigation may be readily achievable, for instance through contributions towards a permanent winter bird refuge at Broadmarsh. The proposal would also require contributions towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP): there is a public right of way linking this site to the nearby coastal areas and therefore increases in recreational disturbance are likely.

Wildlife Trust

STATUTORY DESIGNATED SITES:

CHICHESTER & LANGSTONE HARBOURS – RAMSAR, SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA (SPA)

SOLENT MARITIME – SPECIAL AREA OF CONSERVATION

LANGSTONE HARBOUR – SITE OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST (SSSI)

MANOR FARM A – SITE OF IMPORTANCE FOR NATURE CONSERVATION (SINC)

Thank you for consulting the Wildlife Trust on this pre-application. We note that at present there is no ecological information to support this application and therefore our comments are limited to our existing knowledge of the site.

As you will be aware the Wildlife Trust is currently leading on the delivery of a new and significantly updated Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy. The purpose of this strategy is to update the current survey information, identify the network of sites used and try to secure them for waders and brent geese in perpetuity. It is hoped that the update will help inform emerging Local Authority development plans; steering development to areas where they will not result in the loss of important wader and brent goose feeding/roosting sites located outside of the SPA.

The Land at Lower Road site (H05A) was first identified in the 2002 Brent Goose Strategy as a site of 'High Importance' and of regional significance, with occasional counts of brent geese within the 200 – 999 bracket using it. Subsequently, there has been limited coverage of this site and in the 2010 strategy it was categorised as 'uncertain due to a lack of survey information. Other than a record of 50 lapwing feeding on the site in 2013, there have been no further records of the site being used up to the commencement of the latest survey work. The surveys to inform the emerging 2019 strategy did not include any further counts of waders or brent geese using this site, and as such it will likely be categorised as a 'low use site in the new strategy.

The difficulty with using survey data to validate the importance of a site is that where suitable sites are maintained in an 'unfavourable condition, their true value for over wintering birds will not be evident. In addition, the function that a site could play when the population is higher, such as after a good breeding season, during periods of adverse weather or by adding future resilience to the network, in the event of predicted sea level rise, will also not be evident. As such it is possible that the loss of sites like H05A could in fact lead to an adverse effect occurring on the SPA in the long term. We consider that as part of the Local Plan process sites should be identified and secured for the future. These sites should be positioned strategically in order to maximise their function as part of the network and as 'stepping stones enabling geese to move around the network whilst expending the minimum amount of energy. However, we acknowledge that it is difficult to protect sites when there is no or little evidence to justify its protection. We are aware of several sites, such as this one, across several Local Authority areas that are being considered for development. We are concerned that if these sites are lost they will significantly impact the function of the SPA. We therefore urge the Borough Council to identify a network of sites, and secure them as sanctuary sites for waders and brent geese in the future.

Arboriculturalist

This site has been assessed in the past for suitable trees to TPO and all such trees worthy of such designation have already been protected.

These trees will obscure light in the mornings to the proposed properties but at least they appear to have been orientated parallel to the row of trees in a north to south lineage. Provided that the building works take place outside of their RPA's then I would not see the development as a particular threat to their future.

Having said this it is not totally clear from the master plan layout but there is a note to the effect that a track will be provided for the land owner to access his fields – this could pose a direct threat to the retention of these trees?

There is a Holm Oak TPO'd individually as part of TPO 0496 but this is well off site within Manor Barn ground and the development proposed poses no risk to same.

There is a small young Sycamore tree just off site in front of the Manor Barn Cottages land which appears to be shown retained but there is a turning head nearby which might impact on the RPA.

The Master Plan does not appear to have been accompanied by a Tree Survey / Root Protection Schedule and Tree Constraints Plan in accordance with BS5837:2012 recommendations.

Conclusions: _

I do not see any reason to object to the principle of development here but will need to be assured that the TPO trees and other off site retained trees have been duly respected/protected within the layout proposals.

Recommendations: _

I raise no strong objection but would expect to see this application accompanied by an AIA & Tree Constraints Plan report and also an AMS & Tree Protection Plan report prepared by an experienced and qualified Arboricultural Expert.

Development Engineer

The existing Bedhampton Road/Brookside Road Junction has a short left turn storage lane and any increase in vehicles queuing (to make this movement) may cause problems with the adjacent Belmont mini roundabout. This junction needs to be modelled as part of a required Transport Assessment

The roads, in Old Bedhampton are rural in character and there will be local concerns with the environmental/ amenity impact of the traffic. A 106 contribution may be required to formalise the cycle use of the local roads and increase pedestrian safety.

The new junction from the new development into Lower Road, should be a standard radius junction with sight lines that are suitable for the measured speed on the adjacent highway. The junction should remove the minimum amount of the hedge on the south side of Lower Road .

A footway will be need to be provided to Lodge Road within the proposed development in a form that will enable wider public use with the retention of the existing hedgerow and informal character of Lower Road; Lodge Road has an existing footway link to Bedhampton Hill and this existing route should be upgraded to provide a safe route for cyclists and pedestrian from the new development to the north.

There are two stretches of Lower Road between the 'bends' and towards Lodge Road which have no footway but operate as a shared surface benefiting from very low traffic flows and speeds. The layout of the new development should be in the design style recommended in Manual for Streets and reflect the existing historic Conservation Area character of speed reducing bends with shared surfaces.

The agricultural access bridge across the railway could be used as a cycleway/pedestrian route to the south to link with the Shipwright Way and the link to the Harts Farm Way Industrial Estate. The development ownership does not include the bridge but the proposed estate layout must not compromise future access to it.

County Archaeologist

The site is located in an area of good archaeological potential. The remains of Iron Age hearths and a possible boiling site along the former shoreline were identified immediately to the south of the site during construction of the A3 dual carriage way in the mid -1970s, while the projected route of the Chichester to Bitterne Roman road is located around 475 metres to the north east. The former medieval manor of Bedhampton, including the site of the

former Manor House is located immediately to the north east of the site, while the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) has reported stray finds dating from the Roman, medieval and Post-medieval periods have been recovered from within the site itself. It is therefore likely that further, as yet unrecorded, heritage assets could exist within the site. The historic mapping of the area shows that the site has remained as fields over the past 150 years and does not appear to have been impacted by any recent development. It is therefore likely that any archaeological assets that are located within the site will be relatively well-preserved.

I note that the DRAFT -DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT (DAS) which is included among the documentation attached to the application on your website includes a paragraph that mentions an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) that was prepared for the applicant by L-P Archaeology. This DBA was not included with the documents on your website at the time of writing, but I assume that it has reached similar conclusions on the archaeological potential of the site to myself. The DAS mentions the possibility that recent ploughing will have impacted on any archaeological features, while such an impact is possible I very much doubt that this impact would be significant. The DAS also states that it is:

‘...likely that a further programme of archaeological investigation will be required in order to confirm the extent and significance of any archaeological remains that may exist on site.’

I would concur with this conclusion and therefore while there is no indication that archaeology presents an overriding concern, I would advise that the assessment, recording and reporting of any archaeological deposits affected by development be secured through the attachment of suitable conditions to any planning consent that might be granted. For instance:

1) That no development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological assessment in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) that has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority in order to recognise, characterise and record any archaeological features and deposits that may exist here. The assessment should take the form of trial trenches that are located across the whole of the application area.

Reason: To assess the extent, nature and date of any archaeological deposits that might be present and the impact of the development upon these heritage assets.

2) That no development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological mitigation of impact, based on the results of the trial trenching, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation that has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To mitigate the effect of the works associated with the development upon any heritage assets and to ensure that information regarding these heritage assets is preserved by record for future generations.

3) Following completion of archaeological fieldwork a report will be produced in accordance with an approved programme submitted by the developer and approved in writing by the local planning authority setting out and securing appropriate post-excavation assessment, specialist analysis and reports, publication and public engagement.

Reason: To contribute to our knowledge and understanding of our past by ensuring that opportunities are taken to capture evidence from the historic environment and to make this publicly available.

Environment Agency

Having reviewed your proposal we are providing you with a preliminary opinion, which outlines the key environmental issues within our remit and provides guidance on any actions you need to undertake. It also provides hyperlinks to where you can obtain further information and advice to support your planning application. We offer one free preliminary opinion per site, per applicant /developer.

We have not identified any Environmental Constraints on this site and based on the information currently available, the development raises no environmental concerns for us. However, you should still adhere advice contained in the attached preliminary opinion.

LLFA will be responsible for commenting on any full application. At this stage, need to note that ground conditions which comprise heavy soil will require careful attention in the design of the proposed pond and any attenuation feature(s) as part of a SuDS scheme. The surface water from the site, once attenuated, will be disposed to the lower reaches of the Brookside Stream which is a main river and therefore consent of the EA for any outfall will be required.

Southern Water

Southern Water's current sewerage records show that there is surface water sewer within the proposed development site and foul sewer within the access to the site. No new development/building works will be permitted to be constructed over or within 3.0 metres of the existing sewers. Sewer record attached for your information. The impact of any highway works on public apparatus shall be agreed and approved by Southern Water under NRSWA enquiry.

In addition due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer/s now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property.

Due to the size of the development capacity assessments will be required to determine if the existing sewerage system can accommodate the proposed development flows.

Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul and surface water sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

·It is the responsibility of the developer to make suitable provision for the disposal of surface water. Part H3 of the Building Regulations priorities the means of surface water disposal in the order of:-

- a Adequate soak away or infiltration system
- b Water course
- c Where neither of the above is practicable sewer

Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public water main to be made by the applicant or developer.

In order to determine whether a water supply will be available to service this development, the applicant or developer is advised to contact Southern Water in order to initiate a Water Capacity Check. Southern Water subsequently requires a formal application for connection and on-site mains to be made by the applicant or developer.

Portsmouth Water

The site is located south of our source Protection Zone One (SPZ1) for the Havant and Bedhampton Springs Public Water Supply. Groundwater at this location may be shallow and therefore we would request the applicant considers groundwater protection measures at the detailed design phase and during construction (in the form of a CEMP).

Details of drainage proposals should be submitted for comment as well as the foundation designs and plans, particularly if considering SUDs and piled foundations.

We have no further comments at this stage.

HBC Engineering/Drainage

LLFA will be responsible for commenting on any full application. At this stage, need to note that ground conditions which comprise heavy soil will require careful attention in the design of the proposed pond and any attenuation feature(s) as part of a SuDS scheme. The surface water from the site, once attenuated, will be disposed to the lower reaches of the Brookside Stream which is a main river and therefore consent of the EA for any outfall will be required.

Environmental Health

I have reviewed the submitted documents, and note that both the scheme and the location are relatively uncontroversial with respect to constraints / issues relevant to Environmental Health.

I will provide some brief comments below on SuDS / Air Quality, Pollution & Contamination
Contamination

I note that the application plot comprises previously undeveloped, Greenfield land formerly comprising a Dairy Farm (Manor Farm Dairy). There are few potential sources of contamination associated with agricultural fields, being typically associated with deliberately deposited materials for the purpose of waste disposal or track construction. Contamination is typically associated with Farm buildings, and could in principal be associated with proximity to railway land – however neither of these land uses are considered to be a high risk of representing a mobile source of contamination likely to significantly affect adjacent land, and the site layout proposes a landscape buffer to the former farm complex, and a significant area of green space adjacent to railway land.

It may be appropriate to undertake some limited environmental sampling as part of a geotechnical investigation, in order to confirm the suitability of soils - but significant contamination would not be anticipated to be encountered.

UXO

As noted above, the application site is previously undeveloped land. It is also reasonably close to military land at Portsdown Hill, Farlington Redoubt & Fort Purbrook, being <1.5km from strategic military targets, and decoy sites. The undeveloped nature of the site means that any UXO / UXB falling on the site during the war could have remained undisturbed. There may be an elevated UXO risk, and I would recommend that the applicant consider commissioning a desk based risk assessment.

SuDS

I note that a rain-garden interception & filtration feature is proposed within the landscape buffer, with onward discharge likely to be direct to watercourse (with
This feature is adequate to manage (provide interception and treatment of-) the anticipated rate of pollutant inputs to the surface water collection system. I have no concerns with the outline proposals.

The LLFA will comment on the calculations of runoff rates, and the

Noise

Noise has rightly been identified as a material constraint. It is understood that an acoustic survey have been undertaken, concluding that acceptable levels can be achieved through the provision of a suitable buffer & specification of glazing.

The report has not been provided with the application for pre-application advice, and so no detailed comments can be made. I do not anticipate that noise is likely to be an issue which is material to the principle of development, nor the quantum & layout - however the mitigation measures that the applicant is anticipating may or may not be adequate to meet appropriate standards. I anticipate that this will be dealt with in detail as part of the full plans application.

Access / Air Quality

As has been noted by Highways consultees, the egress from Brookside Road is constrained by its proximity to the Belmont mini roundabout. Eastbound journeys emerging from have around 12m to cross through a lane of traffic in order to access the roundabout in the correct lane to complete a U-Turn to return to Bedhampton Road in an Eastbound direction.

Brookside road is presently lightly trafficked, serving just over a hundred properties. 50 new dwellings would not be anticipated to add a material number of new vehicle trips to a road junction, but it is acknowledged that new trips at this junction have the potential for a disproportionate 25-28K vehicles daily).

I do not anticipate that this would be directly material on air quality grounds alone, however I would support the recommendation of Highways that capacity at this junction should be modelled. I would like to see capacity demonstrated within reasonable margins, as the 'opportunities' plan identifies 'potential future links' which could be interpreted as envisaging additional development in the vicinity.

Any proposals for high density housing would be expected to address capacity issues at this junction, on both highways and air quality grounds.

I would similarly support the scheme design avoiding prejudicing use of agricultural access bridge across the railway, and the onward link to Harts Farm Way industrial estate. It is considered important to retain links to employment areas by sustainable & active travel methods, and to respect local policies which aim to encourage this.

The potential for noise pollution, from both the nearby railway and the A27, would likely impact on any future residents. I note from the Draft - Design and Access Statement that a Noise and Vibration assessment under Item 4.15, concluded that an appropriate acoustic environment can be achieved for the proposed dwellings, both externally and internally, subject to glazing & ventilation specifications. I would therefore ask that should this application be favourably viewed by Planning, that a full Noise and Vibration assessment with relevant mitigation measures be submitted at the time of the full Planning application, for review by this office. I would also be asking that the above assessment ensures that the potential for a distinctive tonal noise from traffic on the A27, especially during wet weather, is taken into consideration.

I would also be looking at the following conditions and informatives to be imposed, should any future full application be approved:

Condition 1:

The applicant to confirm that the acoustic mitigation measures to be employed with regard to the building envelope, including fenestration and ventilation, for all residential units and as recommended in the acoustic assessment, will meet BS8223:2014 standards as recommended for indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings, especially in relation to living rooms and bedrooms i.e during the day (07:00 to 23:00) 35 dB L Aeq,16 hour and at night (23:00 to 07:00) 30 dB L Aeq,8 hour for bedrooms. I would also want a post validation acoustic assessment to be carried out, prior to occupation, to ensure that all measures employed meet the abovementioned standards

Reason: To ensure the residential amenity of the property is not impacted upon by any external noise levels.

Condition 2:

No works or ancillary operations associated with the site clearance and / or construction of the development which is audible at the site boundary or at such other place as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall take place on any Sunday or Bank / Public Holiday, nor on any other day except between the following times Monday to Friday: 8.00 – 18.00 Saturday: 8.00 – 13.00 Unless in association with an emergency or with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the occupants of nearby existing residential properties from noise and

vibration nuisance.

Condition 3: 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 existing and new properties from light disturbance / pollution.

Housing Officer

Affordable Housing of 30- 40 % required equating to a minimum of 15 units for the proposed scheme. The inclusion of a number of bungalows is supported as they may suit those with mobility issues of which there is a shortage.

Waste Services

The new development should be designed to provide a suitable and sufficient service road to take a standard 26 tonne refuse vehicle (Spec – Turning Circle Kerb- Kerb 19.1meter) for undertaking waste collection.

Please note that the above comments are the opinion of an individual Planning Officer and are in no way binding upon the Council when determining an application for planning permission and nor will they prejudice the outcome of any application submitted.

This advice also only relates to planning matters, and does not relate to any other application that may be required under the Building Regulations or under any other Act, Regulation, Byelaw or Order where the Council's approval may be needed. For further guidance as to the need for consent under the Building Regulations please phone 023 9244 6571.

Yours faithfully

Mrs D Haywood
Principal Planner
Our Ref: GEN/17/01439