

Application Response of Planning Policy

Application No:	APP/20/00658
Address:	Former Electricity Board Site, Bartons Road, Havant
Development:	Mixed-use development comprising 191 apartments and two drive-through restaurants
Case Officer:	DE
Comments by:	JB
Date of Comments:	20 October 2020

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 Havant Borough.

The latest Pre-Submission version of the [emerging Havant Borough Local Plan](#) was approved on 9 September 2020, and may be afforded limited weight.

Principle of development

The site lies within the urban area as defined by policies CS17 and AL2 in the context of the adopted local plan. There is therefore a presumption in favour of sustainable development subject to other considerations.

The site is allocated for 90 dwellings under site reference L145 in Policy LP1 of the Allocations Plan. The housing allocation is reaffirmed by Policy H36 in the Pre-Submission Local Plan for development of around 80 dwellings. The principle of residential development is therefore actively supported through local policy, though the number of dwellings proposed far exceeds the suggested number in the allocations in both plans. It is acknowledged that this scheme would make a significant contribution to housing need. Whether this is acceptable overall, will, however, depend on detailed considerations.

The commercial element is not envisaged through either of the site allocations. In addition, the emerging Local Plan has an increased focus on health, and in particular, emerging policy E8 seeks to restrict hot food takeaways in the Borough. These will only be supported in principle in town, district and local centres, and where the proposal does not bring the overall total above a prescribed level. I have seen no evidence that the applicant has considered the latter criterion, and it will not be possible for the applicant to address the former. The drive through element is therefore not supported in principle.

Development Requirements

Both site allocation policy set out development requirements which should be considered during the determination of this application. In addition, development requirements are set out in topic policies throughout both plan, and commentary on some key issues is offered below.

High quality new homes: The applicant has indicated that the proposed residential dwellings would meet the nationally described space standards in line with Policy H1 of the emerging Local Plan. The policy also specifically requires some of the dwellings to provide greater accessibility standards. This point has not been addressed in the applicant's planning, design and access statement.

In terms of private residential amenity space, policy H1 and its supporting text requires a minimum of 1.5 sqm of private amenity space per bedroom or 1 sqm of communal space per bedroom for flatted development. It is noted that the plans indicate some private balcony space, and the applicant states that this standard is met in the grounds of the scheme. However, in considering whether the standard for private amenity space have been met, it should be noted that private amenity space must be considered separately from public open space requirements (see below), and the grounds of the site cannot be relied up to meet both standards simultaneously.

Affordable housing: Policy H2 of the emerging Local Plan requires 30% affordable housing. It is noted that the applicant has submitted a viability assessment stating that policy compliant provision would not be viable.

Housing density: The site falls within the Leigh Park District Centre opportunity area for high density residential development as defined by Policy H3 in the emerging Local Plan which expects development to provide for a minimum of 55dph. The proposal is for a high density scheme of 159dph. Whether this density is appropriate in this location in design terms, is a matter for detailed consideration. In particular, it should be considered whether the scheme addresses the detailed design and layout considerations in the allocation policies.

Housing Mix: Policy H4 of the emerging Local Plan expects new development to provide a range of dwelling types and sizes. 35% of the overall housing mix (both market and affordable) should be two bedroom homes unless locally identified need evidence indicates an alternative approach should be taken. The applicant is proposing 168no 1-bed units and 23no 2-bed units, with 2-bed units making up just 12% of the dwellings. The applicant has justified this by reference to the sales rates of the units in one nearby scheme. It is suggested that for the degree of departure from the policy position, further evidence would be required of the need for this particular split.

Public & Private Open Space: The applicant's planning, design and access statement claims that policy E9 of the emerging Local Plan does not require on site open space for a development of this size. This is not the case, with the policy requiring open space from all developments above 50 units, and paragraph 5.91 stating that 'The new public open space should be provided on site, enhancing the quality of the development. Where it is not feasible to provide it on site due to the characteristics of the development, the Council will accept a financial contribution towards the improvement of nearby open space'. I do not consider that the characteristics of the site support an exemption from meeting the required level of public open space on site.

Sustainable Design & Construction: It is noted that the applicant has submitted a viability assessment stating that policy compliant provision would not be viable.

Amenity & Pollution: The site allocation notes the potential air quality/noise issues due to the proximity of Petersfield Road, and Havant and Waterlooville football stadium to the east. The abutment of the SSE Data Recovery and energy centre block is also noted. Given the potential for the occupiers to be affected by these sources, it is recommended that the views of the Environmental Health Team are sought. In addition, notwithstanding the in principle objection to the drive-throughs in this location, their colocation with the residential element of the scheme must be considered carefully in terms of odour, air quality and noise, in relation to policies

DM5 and DM10 of the adopted plan, and policies E22 and C8 of the emerging plan. Environmental Health may provide further detailed comments on this point.

Conclusions:

The residential development of the site is supported in principle, while the drive through element is not. In addition, the scheme appears to fall short when judged against a number of expected development standards, and in its current form, is therefore not supported in policy terms.