
Site Address: Former site of Colt International Ltd, New Lane, Havant,
PO9 2LY

Proposal: Reserved matters application following Outline Planning Permission APP/18/00244 relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for residential development of 94 dwellings and discharge of requirements of conditions 5 (ecological mitigation and enhancement strategy), 15 (vehicular access points) and 16 (pedestrian and cycle links).

Application No: APP/19/01166

Expiry Date: 20/03/2020

Applicant: Drew Smith Homes

Agent: Mr Moore

Case Officer: David Eaves

MH Architects Limited

Ward: Bondfields

Recommendation: **GRANT APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 This site is the former Colt International industrial premises and lies to the west of New Lane, south of Bartons Road and east of Martin Road. Until recently the tall buildings fronted New Lane including offices for the business with extensive lower industrial buildings to the rear. There is a car park area to the Martin Road frontage of the site. The site is relatively flat within the area of the buildings and car park, however, there is a drop in levels between the western car park and the former site of the buildings and from Bartons Road to the site. The site has now been cleared of above ground buildings and structures.
- 1.2 With regards to surrounding uses, to the south are industrial buildings fronting New Lane and a more modern industrial estate with access to Martin Road. To the west beyond Martin Road is the Church of St Alban, a residential property (Vicarage) and a Skate Park. To the north beyond Bartons Road are residential properties and to the east are other industrial units within New Lane industrial estate.
- 1.3 The site is mainly open but with important trees to the periphery including TPO trees to the south beyond the site. There is a stream crossing the site in a man made channel.

2 Planning History

01/50098/016 - Renewal of Temporary Permission 99/50098/15 for retention of research test rig for environmental monitoring located on roof on east side of building., TPP,12/07/2001

99/50098/015 - Research test rig for environmental monitoring located on roof on east side of building, TPP,16/03/2000

93/50098/006 - Raising roof on existing store on north elevation to form test house, PERM,06/07/1993

93/50098/009 - Two internally illuminated box signs to replace existing applied neon signs., PERM,

04/50098/017 - To replace wooden perimeter fence along Bartons Road and Martin Road boundaries with galvanised steel palisade fence to a height of 2 metres., PERM,20/12/2004

APP/17/01001 - Application to determine whether prior approval is required for the method of demolition of buildings including slab removal and any proposed restoration of the site (Approved 11.10.17). Request to Discharge Condition No.s 3, 6 and 7 (16.01.18). , PAYA,11/10/2017

APP/18/00244 - Outline application with all matters reserved. Mixed use development comprising up to 100 new homes, including up to 40% affordable, 2860 sqm of employment floorspace and improved access onto New Lane and Martin Road. On-site parking for residential and employment uses. Landscaping to be provided, including acoustic bund to rear of employment units and naturalisation of existing watercourse (full details to be submitted at a later stage) (Approved 30.01.19) Request to Discharge Conditions 4 & 18 and partially Discharge Condition 8 (20.02.2019). Request to Discharge Condition 4 (6.01.20)., PERM,30/01/2019

Officer Comment:

This is the Outline Planning Application to which this application for Reserved Matters relates

S106 Agreement dated 29th January 2019 in relation to planning permission APP/18/00244.

3 Proposal

Reserved matters application following Outline Planning Permission APP/18/00244 relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for residential development of 94 dwellings and discharge of requirements of conditions 5 (ecological mitigation and enhancement strategy), 15 (vehicular access points) and 16 (pedestrian and cycle links).

The application has been submitted with a suite of supporting information including the following:

Planning, Design and Access Statement
Transport Assessment and Appendices
Landscape Maintenance & Management Specification
Landscape Design & Access Statement
Landscape CDM Risk Register
Drainage Strategy Statement
Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement
Private Lighting Report
Planning Obligations Statement
Flood Risk Assessment
Marketing Information
Contamination Assessment Report
Affordable Housing Statement
European Site Avoidance and Mitigation Checklist
Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Strategy
Ground & Water Remediation Verification Report & Additional Contamination Risk Assessment

Ground & Water Ground Investigation Report
 Material List
 Statement of Conformity with Pre-Submission HBLP 2036
 Validation Report & Further Groundwater Risk Assessment Report
 Ground & Water Additional Contamination Risk Assessment

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

CS1	(Health and Wellbeing)
CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS13	(Green Infrastructure)
CS14	(Efficient Use of Resources)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS19	(Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
CS2	(Employment)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS6	(Regeneration of the Borough)
CS8	(Community Safety)
CS9	(Housing)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM11	(Planning for More Sustainable Travel)
DM12	(Mitigating the Impacts of Travel)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM14	(Car and Cycle Parking on Development (excluding residential))
DM3	(Protection of Existing Employment and Tourism Sites)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM17	(Contaminated Land)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM18	(Protecting New Development from Pollution)
DM24	(Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

H2*	(Affordable housing)
E23	(Air Quality)
E22	(Amenity and pollution)
E21	(Aquifer Source Protection Zones)
E24	(Contamination)
DR1	(Delivery of Sustainable Development)
E20	(Drainage infrastructure in new development)

IN1	(Effective provision of infrastructure)
IN5	(Future management and Management Plans)
E2	(Health and wellbeing)
E1*	(High quality design)
H1*	(High quality new homes)
H3*	(Housing density)
IN2	(Improving transport infrastructure)
E3	(Landscape and settlement boundaries)
E12	(Low carbon design)
E19	(Managing flood risk in new development)
E15	(Protected species)
C1*	(Protection of existing employment sites)
E9	(Provision of public open space in new development)
E16	(Solent Special Protection Areas)
E14	(The Local Ecological Network)
IN3	(Transport and parking in new development)
E18	(Trees, hedgerows and woodland)
H35	(Colt Site)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist, Havant Borough Council

Further Comments

I note the revised Arboricultural report and tree protection plan and have no further comments to make.

Additional Comments

Additional comments to raise.

The Lime numbered T23 is showing dieback from having been previously topped. consider it to be a C class tree.

The Horse Chestnut numbered T24 is categorised as a B class tree however I believe it to be C class. If this tree is to be retained it should be resurveyed. Pruning of this tree will be required given the close proximity to the proposed plot 08 and details of the pruning should be included with the tree report.

If these two trees are to be retained I have reservations over the close relationship between the trees and plot 08. Pruning will certainly need to be undertaken however there is no work specified within the report. (They are not suitable to be protected by a Tree Preservation Order).

I have no objection to the felling of the Holm Oak due the bracket fungus on the stem.

Horse Chestnut numbered T20 will be in close proximity to plot 11 and there may be pressure in the future to prune or remove this tree.

All the trees listed above appear to be on a highway verge and this should be clarified.

The rest of the trees shown for removal are acceptable as are the tree protection measures.

A plan which is to scale will still be required.

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

Fire Authority and refuge access shown as possible with road layout indicated

Building Regulation application would be required for this application

Community Infrastructure

Further Comments 28.4.20

Update of Comments (in bold Italic text) . HBC Community Infrastructure Officer
28/04/20

CIL

CIL Liable: <http://www.havant.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-lew-charging-schedule>.

Given the recently submitted revised plans can the applicant/agent review CIL form 1 'Additional Information' and either confirm the figures in the form dated 22/11/2019 remain unchanged or submit a revised form.

Officer Comment: The CIL form states floorspace of 7,875sqm

We will also require completion and submission of CIL Form 10 to consider granting Mandatory Social Housing Relief. Once the relief has been granted this will reduce the CIL Liability in respect of Social Housing providing the clawback terms set out in the CIL Regulations are met. If CIL Form 10 is not received by the date of decision, the full CIL liability will apply*

(*although this can be considered post decision as long as the permission is not implemented).

S106

There is a signed S106 dated 29 January 2019 in respect of this site setting out various obligations which will need to be met. This agreement passes with the ownership of the land. The obligations set out in the S106 relating to application APP/18/00244 will apply unless these are varied through a Deed of Variation.

To enable us to confirm the figures below please can you advise the revised number of properties and corresponding number of bedrooms or direct us to the documentation in which this is stated.

Officer Comment: The schedule of accommodation confirms 2 x 1 bed, 50 x 2 bed, 38 x 3 bed and 4 x 4 bed units. This equates to a contribution of £52,226

The S106 sets out the terms of calculation of the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy Contribution as follows, plus indexation (RPI):

Number of bedrooms	Amount	Total Number of Properties	Sub Total
1	£337	2	£674
2	£487	51	£24,837
3	£637	37	£23,569
4	£749	5	£3,745
5+	£880	0	£0
	TOTAL	95	£52,825

The sum of £52,825 (plus indexation) is due to be advised to the owner within one month of the decision for APP/19/01166. The SRMS sum is due 14 days after receipt of this notification.

Original Comments

CIL

CIL Liable: <http://www.havant.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy-charging-schedule>. We will also require completion and submission of CIL Form 10 to consider granting Mandatory Social Housing Relief. Once the relief has been granted this will reduce the CIL Liability in respect of Social Housing providing the clawback terms set out in the CIL Regulations are met. If CIL Form 10 is not received by the date of decision, the full CIL liability will apply*

(*although this can be considered post decision as long as the permission is not implemented).

S106

There is a signed S106 dated 29 January 2019 in respect of this site setting out various obligations which will need to be met. This agreement passes with the ownership of the land. The obligations set out in the S106 relating to application APP/18/00244 will apply unless these are varied through a Deed of Variation.

The S106 sets out the terms of calculation of the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy Contribution as follows, plus indexation (RPI):

Number of bedrooms	Amount	Total Number of Properties	Sub Total
1	£337	2	£674
2	£487	51	£24,837
3	£637	37	£23,569
4	£749	5	£3,745
5+	£880	0	£0
	TOTAL	95	£52,825

The sum of £52,825 (plus indexation) is due to be advised to the owner within one month of the decision for APP/19/01166. The SRMS sum is due 14 days after receipt of this notification.

Councillor Alex Rennie

No comments received

Councillor T Hart - Bondfields

No comments received

County Ecologist

The application is accompanied by a revised Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Strategy (EcoSupport, April 2020). I welcome the inclusion of specific mitigation measures for on-site ecological features such as badgers (further monitoring is proposed) and nesting bird species (timing and methods of vegetation removal). Specific supervision measures are required for some features such as woody vegetation and spoil heaps.

Recommendations for lighting specifications are made and, on the basis of the submitted lighting strategy for the housing, lux levels of 0.74 are expected for most areas.

The variety of enhancement features such as bird nesting boxes and bat roosting boxes is encouraging and I welcome the additional bat roosting and bird nesting features included. The built environment, especially in a heavily urbanised borough such as Havant, has a crucial role to play in biodiversity recovery and opportunities to maximise biodiversity enhancements should be standard.

The proposed wildflower meadow planting swathe through the centre of the site is welcomed, as is the inclusion of various native-led soft landscaping features. The landscape management strategy is now aligned with the ecologists recommendations and is acceptable.

Overall, I am content with the scope of proposed ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures and, if you are minded to grant permission, can I recommend that these are secured by condition.

Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed within the Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Strategy (EcoSupport, April 2020) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement features shall be installed, managed and monitored in accordance with this document and shall be retained in a location and condition suited to their intended purpose.

Reason: to protect biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, the NERC Act (2006), NPPF and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

Original Comment

The application is not accompanied by any ecological information, although I note that an extended Phase 1 ecological survey appears on the list of documents produced: I will be happy to comment on this report when submitted.

My only other comment at this stage is on landscaping. The landscape management statement includes examples of 'wildflower' areas which do not denote UK native wildflower species (e.g. cultivated poppy species, daffodils). Can I request that any such 'wild' areas make use of UK native wildflower grassland stock, many examples of which are readily available and can be matched to existing soil conditions. The use of native UK stock will not only provide a more appropriate semi- natural habitat but will provide more beneficial nectar sources for pollinating insects and require less ongoing maintenance.

County Waste Management

No comments received

Crime Prevention -Major Apps

Further Comments 3.6.20

The letter at reference A, positively addresses a number of the points that I raised in my letter of the 5th May 2020. I am pleased to note that rear access gates will be fitted with key operated locks that operate from both sides of the gate, and that the cycle stands and lighting will be improved. However, my main concerns with this development are, the area of Public Open Space (POS) adjacent to plot number 34 and the footpath / cycleway, connecting the POS to New Lane. Whilst Drew Smith have made some changes to provide for better natural surveillance of the POS and are to provide column lighting along the footpath / cycle way, these will only give some mitigation against crime and anti-social behaviour.

I first commented on the development of this site under planning application number: APP/18/00244, on the 15th May 2018. Within that letter I highlighted my concerns with the footpath and Public Open Space (POS), see the paragraph below, which is an extract from that letter:

“A footpath is shown connecting Martin Road with New Lane running along the southern boundary of the development. There is very little natural surveillance of this footpath with connects with the areas of public open space and the proposed industrial units. This footpath significantly increases the vulnerability of the site to crime and anti-social behaviour. Planning guidance advises that layouts should “minimise the creation of unsupervised and unsafe public spaces and unsafe access routes.” To reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour this footpath should be omitted from the final scheme. If such a route is required it should pass to the front of the dwellings, not go via public open space and be isolated from the industrial units.”

The footpath / cycleway will not be safe, this connectivity will increase the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour within the POS and the wider development. This appears to be in conflict with Havant Borough Council's (HBCs) Core Strategy, Policy CS 16:

Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

2. Produces a positive relationship between buildings, street and spaces both existing and proposed, where:

a) The layout of the development reduces opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour; contributes to improving community safety; and makes provision for the management and maintenance of the development;

At reference A, Drew Smith Limited makes clear that the Public Open Space (POS) and the footpath / cycleway connecting this area of POS to New Lane is a requirement of the Section 106 agreement, which was signed on the 29th January 2019.

I have consistently raised concerns, with the POS and the footpath / cycleway and yet these features still remain, largely unaltered. No attempt has been made to address my concerns by amending the layout of the development, which is the most effective way of reducing the opportunities for crime and disorder.

Hampshire Constabulary cannot support the planning application with this arrangement of POS and the footpath / cycleway. Given that the requirement for this connectivity forms part of the section 106 agreement, which was signed after my initial comments were received, even at this late stage, we would recommend that the developer is released from the requirement to provide this connectivity and that the footpath / cycleway is removed from the approved scheme.

The prevention of crime and disorder is an objective of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended), the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. It is clear that the Government's intention is that the design and layout of a development must reduce the opportunities for crime and disorder.

Moving forward we are keen to ensure that appropriate and safe connectivity is incorporated into future development. To that end we would be grateful if you would advise us with whom we could address this issue.

Original Consultation Response 16.1.20

The National Planning Policy Framework makes clear the Government's continuing commitment to "create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion and resilience".

National Planning Practice Guidance advises, that planning has a role in preventing crime and malicious threats, it reminds Local Authorities of their obligations under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended), specifically "to exercise their functions with due regard to their likely effect on crime and disorder, and to do all they reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder."

The guidance continues "Planning provides an important opportunity to consider the security of the built environment, those that live and work in it and the services it provides.", it continues, "Good design that considers security as an intrinsic part of a masterplan or individual development can help achieve places that are safe as well as attractive, which function well and which do not need subsequent work to achieve or improve resilience." "Good design means a wide range of crimes from theft to terrorism are less likely to happen by making committing those crimes more difficult."

The documentation accompanying the application does not contain any reference to crime or anti-social behaviour nor its mitigation. Therefore, I have concluded that crime and anti-social behaviour and their mitigation have not been considered during the development of this proposal.

The Police Beat within which this development is located is an area from which we receive regular reports of crime and anti-social behaviour

The comments within my letter of the 16th January 2020 are still relevant.

The area of Public Open Space (POS) together with the associated footpath / cycle way leading to New Lane is still a cause for concern. As proposed there is some overlooking of the POS from the nearby dwellings (I do note the adjustment in the position of plot numbers 30 to 33 to provide for better natural surveillance of the POS). There is no natural surveillance of the footpath / cycleway. The POS lies on the transit route from Bartons Road to New Lane. It is an area within which people will gather (timber feasting tables and the board walk are provided) at all times of the day and night. The connectivity with New Lane will draw people into the development and provide an escape route making policing more difficult. All of which disproportionately increase the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour. To provide a safe environment for those using the path and the footpath / cycle way we recommend that the two are separated, or that the footpath / cycleway to New Lane is removed from the scheme. However, if the planning authority is minded to allow this configuration, to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour we would ask that planting within the POS and along the footpath / cycle way is such that it does not obscure natural surveillance of the POS or the footpath, nor that it creates a place within which a person might lie-in-wait. The landscape design and access statement shows bollard lighting along the footpath / cycleway, such lighting does not provide sufficient light to provide a safe environment for those using this route after dark which increases the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour. To reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour column lighting should be provided along this route.

A small area of public open space is shown adjacent to plot number 26. There is very little natural surveillance of this space, the feasting table will encourage people to gather within this space, which will increase the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour. To reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour the timber feasting table should be removed.

Officer Comment: *This table has now been omitted.*

For a number of dwellings external rear garden access is via a communal rear access footpath. Such footpaths increase the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour. Some acquisitive crimes such as burglary and theft are often facilitated by easy access to the rear of the dwelling. To reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour all rear garden access should be in curtilage. However, if the planning authority is minded to allow a design with such rear garden access arrangements to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour we would ask that:

1. All rear garden access gates should be fitted with a key operated lock that operates from both sides of the gate
2. Secure access gates are fitted at the start of each communal rear access path. These gates should be visually permeable, (perhaps a railing gate), at least 1.8m high and fitted with a locking mechanism that can be operated from either side of the gate. The design of the gate should be carefully considered to ensure that features such as locks and handles etc. do not create hand holds and footholds that facilitate climbing the gate.

Within the public realm "Sheffield Stands" are provided for visitor pedal cycle parking. Such stands only provide limited security for pedal cycles. To improve security for pedal cycles, cycle stands with secured by design accreditation (an example of which is a streetpod secure bike stand) should be fitted.

To provide for the safety and security of residents and visitors lighting throughout the development (including parking areas and external to the cycle stores) should conform to the relevant sections of BS 5489-1:2013.

Southern Water
Comments 20.1.20

Southern Water would have no objections to the reserved matters application for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

An application to communicate with the public foul sewerage system under Section 106 will be required to be submitted and approved by Southern Water Services.

The Council's Building Control officers/technical staff and the Environment Agency should be consulted regarding surface water disposal.

Southern Water have no comments to make in respect of the conditions 15 (vehicular access points) and 16 (pedestrian and cycle links) submitted by the applicant.

Engineering/Drainage
No comments received

Environment Agency

Further Comments 28.4.20

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above reserved matters and discharge of conditions (5, 15 and 16) application.

We have reviewed the information as submitted and set out our position below.

Environment Agency Position

We have no objection to the reserved matters application as submitted.

We have no comments to make in regard to the discharge of conditions 5, 15 and 16 as these are matters for the Local Planning Authority.

Please do consult us on any future applications for the discharge of conditions 8 (which has been partially discharged), 9,10 and 11 of planning permission APP/18/00244.

Original Comments 27.1.20

Environment Agency Position

We have no objection to the reserved matters application as submitted.

Please note that we recommended a number of planning conditions in our response to the outline application (our reference HA/2018/120379/01, dated 21 May 2018). Please consult us on any applications for the discharge of those conditions as applicable.

Advice to the Applicant

If during development, any significantly impacted contaminated material is encountered, then this should be appropriately investigated.

Environmental Health

There will be no adverse comments from me on this one. I note from the Decision notice for APP/18/00244 that there was an Informative only request for the external lighting and not a formal condition.

I have had a quick look at JD's previous response & I would guess that he may well have further comment to make in regard to the latest submissions.

Environmental Health (Environmental Control Officer)

Final Comments:

– originally, I was consulted on the scheme as a whole, which included drainage / SuDS & 'Air Quality relevant' elements (i.e. the reserved matters v/v layout & landscaping, and the outline conditions v/v access) – so the RM element of the application was relevant to my areas of interest. I'd reviewed the contamination documents as they were included with the application – but it would appear that the application currently on the table is entirely independent of the 'contamination relevant' outline-consent conditions.

I don't consider the contamination assessment to be material to the principle of the development (i.e. layout / access / landscaping), and it would appear that the outline conditions remain in force, under a pre-commencement clause. This completely removes the time-imperative to agree the approach to contamination risk mitigation, and would allow a formal consultation of external consultees to be undertaken when the applicant applies to discharge APP/18/00244 c.8. I am happy to provide more detailed comments to the agent in the meantime, but I don't think those comments are actually relevant to this RM application.

On that assumption, my prior comments (insofar as they are directly relevant to the 01166 application-) essentially support a positive determination.

Observations / Comments: (21st May 2020)

I have reviewed all revised documents submitted in support of this application. I will briefly update comments on transport / Air Quality. Where no specific comment is made in this revised response, it should be assumed that the comment made in the earlier response (dated 14/02/2020, ref: CONS/2-100004) remains applicable.

Transport / Air Quality (and related policy)

Enhancements to off-road hard-surface specification, refuges & signage are noted as positive 'Air Quality relevant' features.

I also note that the landscaping amendments provide enhancements to the both density, structure & distribution of planting, also increasing the proportion of Urban Tree Air Quality Score listed species - in particular the stand of *Betula Pendula* along Bartons Road. These enhancements are supported.

With respect to comments offered previously on the response to emerging policies, I would take this opportunity to highlight that emerging local policies aim to communicate the Council's interpretation of National framework requirements, taking into account the supporting evidence base & National Plans of broader scope (e.g. 25 year plan, emissions reduction strategies etc.). The 2019 revision of the NPPF appended the phrase '...and decisions' to 'planning policies...', and the same strategies and nationally derived evidence base still applies. In this way, there is legitimacy in interpreting adopted national through along the lines of the emerging local policies. Perhaps more so in respect of carbon, climate & transport policy than is the case with other combustion emissions / Air Quality; the wording of existing locally adopted policy is compatible with such interpretations. Otherwise, I've nothing specific to add.

SuDS / Drainage Provision (Pollution Control)

The landscaping amendments include reference to the creation of a more natural surface water management by means of a landscape-integrated Swale with monsoon drain retained to manage both exceedance flows and normal swale out-flows. This represents a modest enhancement over previous proposals. I have no material comments to make, and recommendations relating to the commercial phase of development remain applicable.

Contamination & Hydrogeological Risks - General & Assessment

Revised documents comprise a geotechnical ground investigation report, and a 'phase 5' supplementary site investigation under the banner of a 'remediation verification report' and 'additional contamination risk assessment' (Ref: GWPR3514NRIMarch 2020 - 'the VR report').

The geotechnical report is indirectly relevant to Contamination Risks, but does not present any additional sampling or risk assessment. It does add to the weight of evidence in supporting dismissal of risks to the principal aquifer.

I am a little perplexed at the title of the VR report - it does not report the completion of a number- (arguably any-) of the proposed remedial measures previously agreed in principle, and does not provide any compelling additional data to bolster the qualitative risk assessment & conceptual site model previously challenged by Environmental Health.

This model is re-stated again in the latest report, and reliance is placed upon its veracity to underpin the implicit conclusions. It is not at all clear that the report accepts that previously proposed remedial measures are still required - the report omits a 'conclusions' section and acknowledges a 'low-moderate' risk to perched groundwater.

It is possible that the report is intended (only) to justify a spatially limited strategy of ground raising with inert waste (risk mitigation) in favour of source removal + clean cover (remediation) in the elevated NE section of the site. If this is the case, then the authors accept that there are several outstanding remedial requirements, and use of the phrase 'verification' [of remedial measures] is a little misleading & certainly premature.

It is also worth noting that I had raised some concern over the possibility that the elevated area of the site could be more seriously contaminated than the reports suggest (identified hotspot of a greater extent than anticipated), and that a flexible approach should be taken to its removal. The 'cover & raise strategy' could be taken as having been designed to avoid any excavation & inspection of soils in this area, and I would point out that available results leave open the possibility that hydrocarbon contaminants on the elevated land may be migrating to lower lying land within the site.

If this model is correct, the contaminants would be migrating beneath the planned location of the SuDS Swale, which could represent either a mechanism for attenuation / treatment, or for rapid migration to the Lavant via the monsoon drain under period exceedance flow conditions. Not addressing the identified hot-spot leaves a good deal of uncertainty as to the appropriate level of concern.

Contamination Hot-Spot Removal

The Phase 4 investigation report (and implicit remediation method statement; Ref: GWPR3192/CARIOct 2019 v1.02. 'the RMS') concluded that at least two contamination 'hot-spots' required treatment or removal due to exceedance of either or both residential land use and commercial land use generic assessment criteria (GAC).

One treatment area comprised a region of the SE of the (wider-) site (WS16), and the other an area in the NW of the topographically 'low' portion of the site (WS1). Treatment was to comprise: "Excavation and removal/remediation of the Made Ground for a 16m radius around the WS16 hotspot in the residential area of site (which would also remove BH2), and the WS1 hotspot in the commercial area"

This recommendation is acknowledged in the VR report as a prior conclusion. However, it is unclear whether it is proposed to take either of these actions forward. The verification report does not evidence completion of this action, and no specific argument has been made to support the cover system as being adequate without removal of hotspots.

Similarly, the report also relies upon previous surface water & monsoon drain spot sampling alongside one water sample from a newly installed well at BH5 in concluding that an impact to the Lavant is 'unlikely'. This was previously challenged on the basis of the inherent difficulty of demonstrating an absence of impact in a dynamic environmental medium, and betterment was sought.

No specific implication is outlined which follows from this qualitative risk assessment, leaving proposals somewhat ambiguous with respect to the fairly-well evidenced hotspot in the vicinity of WS1, in close proximity to the Lavant Channel.

Clean Cover, former carpark (and industrial storage) area, elevated land in NW of site

The strategy for this area was driven largely by a statistical 'population exceedance' of GAC for Lead across the entire area. Ancillary to this, it was also considered prudent to address significant concentrations of hydrocarbons identified in prior investigations.

Treatment proposed was to comprise "a reduced dig of the Made Ground with regard to site levels over the north-western car parking area of site, with placement of a geotextile membrane and 750mm clean capping across all residential garden areas."

'Reduced dig' does not specify a depth, but it is implicit from the RMS that the intention is to remove some contamination impacted soils - referring to maximum excavation depths of 1 m, and provisions to cease reduced dig on encountering confirmed clean natural soils. Referral is also made to 'sufficient room' for required capping implying that overall levels / relative building heights may be a material planning consideration.

Similar to the ambiguity in the term 'reduced dig'; 'clean capping' might be generally taken to comprise 'sub-soil & topsoil', but does not specifically preclude 'chemically inert construction & demolition waste' (e.g. site-won 6f2 fill) as an alternative.

It is considered that this is the element that the report seeks to verify. Works described include the removal of -200mm macadam surface (wearing, binder & base- courses), post placement verification of thickness of placed 6f2 fill, and chemical suitability of the material (confirmation that it is not itself 'contaminated').

An average of -300mm 6f2 fill has been placed in the NW area of the site, so around 450mm cover (subsoil & topsoil) may be expected to be placed over as a suitable growing medium for amenity purposes. Reliance is placed upon the 6f2 material serving as both a 'deter to dig', and 'capillary break'. It is reported to be placed upon a terram geotextile, though no photographic evidence is included, and no pit logs are presented.

I agree that the material is chemically suitable, but it won't be possible to regard the risk mitigation measure as verified until the cover soils have been imported and demonstrated to be both suitable & placed to an adequate depth.

With respect to the 'reduced dig' being of insufficient depth to actually remove any soils identified as being impacted by PAH & Pb, there is no site betterment with respect to leachable components which contribute to the 'moderate' risk to perched waters (and to downstream surface water receptors, represented by the Lavant Channel).

With respect to human health, the approach falls short of expectation, but is acceptable. The verification report is insufficient to dismiss the need for any ongoing planning control(s).

Placed Cover, topographically low residential area, 'main' site

The area of the site at lower elevation has also received the same cover with site-won 6f2 fill (of up to 700mm depth, with reference to the Geotechnical Report position TP9), but laid without a Terram geotextile. A minimum +400mm clean soils are proposed for garden areas. The planning implications for levels are unclear, but would be a matter outside the scope of these comments.

It should be noted that no specific need for clean cover or a capillary break was considered necessary (following hot-spot removal in the vicinity of position WS16), and the placement of material this did not form a specific remedial proposal under the RMS. It is accepted that this material might be helpful in the short term as a stable platform for the piling rig, but it is unclear that the material is 'required' in the long-term (e.g. to achieve target ground levels). This may be relevant to the use of waste under an applicable exemption (e.g. a U1) or under the CL:AIRE Definition of Waste Code of Practice. It is not clear either of these apply - given that the RMS did not identify a need for this material in this area, its placement could be regarded as a 'disposal'.

Gas Protection of Buildings

The RMS proposed 'precautions up to a Characteristic Situation 2, in accordance with BS8485 (2015)' be installed within the proposed buildings. No spatial distinction was made across the site other than proposals applying to 'Residential Houses' only.

Under BS8485 (2015), both a ventilated sub-floor void and a gas resistant membrane were considered to be required.

The verification report could not include any material facts to verify installation, as buildings need to be constructed to at least 'above FFL' for this to be possible. The VR report does however include a slightly confusing schematic at Figure 7, entitled 'Anticipated Garden Construction / Finished Levels' but including annotation relating to road construction, and appearing to show a 'typical piled foundation slab detail' which does not conform to the gas protection requirements outlined elsewhere in the report (or within the RMS).

Specifically, the typical construction detail includes reference to use of 'pecavoid 225/10/15' - which product information indicates is suitable for NHBC 'clear void' requirements of 150mm. Reference to NHBC guidance does not return results for the term 'clear void', instead referring to 'void former' to protect against ground heave, and a '150mm ventilation void' requirement in addition beneath pre-cast suspended floors.

The indicative construction details provided do not make clear that a clear / unfilled ventilation void of at least 150mm is to be provided, nor does it show that a gas resistant membrane is to be specified. The VR report similarly omits any specific information on cross ventilation, ventilation free-areas, membrane jointing, or the method of verifying installation.

The verification report is insufficient to dismiss the need for any ongoing planning control(s).

Soil Strip - North Boundary (Asbestos Mitigation)

No works are documented in the VR report relating to the excavation, screening or removal of material at the North Boundary.

With reference to Appendix B, it appears that this area is likely to have been covered with placed site-won 6f2 material, probably to a depth of between 200mm & 420mm. As such, it is unclear whether the applicant still intends to undertake this previously proposed remedial measure, or whether it is intended to rely upon a 'cover & raise strategy', as is implied for other areas of the site (above).

As asbestos is not mobile within the soil matrix, a 'leave in situ' beneath a 'deter to dig' layer and a suitable level of amenity soil is potentially acceptable. With reference to definitions above, it would appear that the applicant is seeking approval of consumption of around 60% of the proposed 500mm clean cover with site won 6F2 material, leaving cover levels averaging around 200mm - it is unclear how this strategy will accommodate the landscape planting schedule without penetrating the 'deter to dig' layer to provide sufficient space for healthy root systems.

Contamination & Hydrogeological Risks - Recommendations

The phase 5 report poses as many questions as it resolves and is by any measure insufficient to verify a complete scheme of remediation or risk mitigation.

I am minded to recommend that the phase 5 & VR report (GWPR3514NRIMarch 2020) be omitted from the list of approved documents on any positive determination of this application, in favour of the phase 4 & RMS report (and all other preceding reports).

This would have the effect of requiring the proposed hotspot removals report, as well as the precautionary gas protections proposed in the RMS.

My previous recommendation in respect of fleshing out the ACM discovery strategy may remain applicable, depending on the intended piling method (the Geotechnical report does not confirm. The critical element will be whether any arisings are produced (e.g. augered piles, compared with 'no arisings' displacement piles).

A decision that the implicit 'cover & raise strategy' (and piling method) dismisses the need for a more robust ACM discovery strategy & verification plan is also dependent upon the 'existing cover + growing medium of suitable thickness' amounting to acceptable site levels (as a related planning matter).

The text below (highlighted) is reproduced from the CONS/20/00004 consultation response dated 14/02/2020, for ease of reference. It is considered that this advice still applies;

Subject to the enhancement of the outline discovery strategy presented at 4.8 of the Phase 4 Report (GWPR3192v1.02) in respect of ACM, and the caveats outlined in the sections above [referring to text of the CONS/20/00004 response]; the body of documentation submitted to the Council to date essentially satisfies Condition 8 of the outline consent.

I assume that the detailed consent requires transposition of conditions, in the interests of clarity. In this respect, c.8 of APP/18/00244 may be omitted [from the reserved matters consent]. c.10 of the outline consent should be transposed. I would recommend that the condition below ('Condition A') is included on any consent granted in relation to this application, as a substitute to outline condition 9.

The informative is recommended as a guide to interpretation.

Condition A - Verification of Approved Works (in place of outline condition c.9)

"Prior to the occupation of any specific phase of development approved by this planning permission, a soil-contamination remediation & risk mitigation verification report shall be submitted to- and approved in writing by- the local planning authority.

The report shall be in general accordance with the Ground & Water Ltd. Report No. GWPR3192/CAR v1.02 (November 2019) and shall document the management of contamination-impacted soils and the effectiveness of the remediation achieved through the works set out in sections 4.5-4.6 of the GWPR3192/CAR v1.02 report.

Reason: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to human health or the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete. This is in line with DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) [2014], and paragraphs 178-180 of the National Planning Policy Framework."

Informative - Soil-Contamination Remediation & Risk Mitigation

"The Council recognises the need to respond to site conditions encountered during groundworks, and the inherent uncertainty in defining works based upon results of a finite sampling strategy. The execution of remedial works described in the GWPR3192/CAR v1.02 report- and their subsequent verification- are expected to take account the comments and requirements of relevant consultees*, where given (* The Environment Agency, Portsmouth Water Company, and Environmental Health). The GWPR3192/CAR v1.02 report describes validation / verification proposals in various sections of the report, and does not present a comprehensive stand-alone verification plan. The Council accepts a degree of 'fluidity' in response to conditions encountered, but will expect the report to include: i) results of sampling and monitoring ii) a photographic record of source removal works and iii) any other documentary evidence which describes the works (which may comprise documentation of any or all; the evidence-based decision-making processes, the definition of 'completion points', on-site waste material pre-treatment / characterisation, the movements and destination of contamination-impacted soils, and the characterisation of imported soils for cover systems). The Council will not accept a report which verifies a rigid interpretation the remedial works where this would leave an unacceptable degree of residual uncertainty. "

Original Comments dated 18.2.20

Summary;

. Proposals 'fall short' with respect to emerging 'air quality relevant' policy (e.g. IN3, E12, E23). PPUD concerns are supported.

. Landscaping scheme represents material site betterment from an air quality perspective (relative to previous use). No obvious opportunities for enhancement identified. No adverse comment.

. SuDS / drainage - no adverse comment in respect of pollution control measures. Environmental Health should still be consulted on the commercial phase drainage scheme when submitted. No adverse comment for this application.

. Contamination. Remedial method statement broadly agreed in principle, though I have some concerns relating to the characterisation of risks at the site which underpin the scope & scale of proposed works.

. A robust screening process is required during removal of identified contamination 'hot-spots'! This should account for the possibility of a wider spatial area of impact, impacted natural soils (not to rigidly restrict works to made ground), and the risk to controlled waters as characterised in the CRH report ref: 12663.

. A robust watching brief is required during all groundworks, in particular in respect of the risk of asbestos content in made and disturbed soils. It is recommended that an enhanced! more specific provision is secured either prior to approval of the Phase 4 report, or under separate cover as an addendum to the report (secured by condition).

. The detailed comments (below) outline expectations for source-removal works, the application of site screening levels.

. Levels of evidence proposed for verification of source removal & risk mitigation works are generally acceptable. Enhancements in respect of demonstrating a robust watching brief may be 'rolled into' the enhanced proposal being sought in this respect ('robust watching brief').

. Outline Condition c.8 may be omitted from any consent granted, subject to c.10 being transposed, and a condition to the effect of the wording suggested as a substitute to outline consent c.9. Wording suggested is bespoke, and is designed to manage the uncertainty, and facilitate the award of consent without the need for detailed dialogue on amendments to the submitted report / proposals. An explanatory informative is also suggested. Other approaches are possible;- highlighted in the detailed comments.

Transport / Air Quality

Cycle storage arrangements appear to be SPD compliant, and sufficiently conveniently located so as to ensure that travel by cycle is unlikely to be hampered by the location of the provision.

The comments of the landscapes consultee in respect of cycle link requirements are noted, and I assume will be taken forward on the basis of the 'transport & access' need. I would also highlight (and support) the comments of the PPUD consultee, particularly with respect to shortcomings against emerging local policy, especially IN3(ii), but also in respect of E12 & E23. Advice/recommendations were made at the outline stage to inform the kind of design response which was hoped for (E23 in particular; E12 relevant).

The submitted documents do not specifically address energy / carbon / combustion within the proposals, and I would assume from the omission of specific details that the intention is to provide conventional fossil/combustion heating & cooking services without LZC (low- or zero-carbon) support (e.g. from direct solar or through recovery of waste heat). Were the emerging policies in force / carrying full weight at the time of application, it is likely that the current proposals would be considered to be insufficient. Whilst it is accepted that there is a need to balance the proposals against the interim status of the emerging policies, I was expecting some consideration of these issues at the reserved matters stage, and it is unclear whether a 'no response' is acceptable/sufficient under the draft local plan. This is ultimately a planning decision, and these comments simply aim to highlight the omission.

More positively, I do note that the landscape strategy delivers site betterment (in terms of its contribution to local air quality) than did the previous landuse. Street, Feature, Ornamental (Garden) and Woodland area planting is proposed alongside some green boundaries (hedging), and the retention of the existing mature buffer-planting / screening to the site. A good mix of UTAQS species is proposed, with some listed species represented in all planting types, across a range of Low/Med/High categories. No specific landscape enhancement opportunities are noted / have been identified, and I therefore have no material/ adverse comments to make with respect to the landscape scheme.

SuDS / Drainage Provision (Pollution Control)

A draft scheme was reviewed at the outline stage, and Environmental Health made a recommendation for detailed drainage scheme to be subject of a planning condition. This was principally for the purpose of ensuring that the commercial element of the scheme contained sufficient pollution control elements - there were no significant

concerns about the residential phase of the scheme, and as expected, the scheme has implemented a permeable surfacing solution to address the low risk from private driveways & low traffic roads.

As the present application deals with the residential portion of the scheme only, I have no material comments to make.

Contamination & Hydrogeological Risks - General & Assessment

I concur with the view of Portsmouth Water Company on the likely level of risk posed to the principal aquifer (being acceptably low>negligible irrespective of foundation type, due to the thickness of clay at this location). I would consider that principal contamination / pollution risk drivers are related to human exposure and to impacts to the surface waters adjacent to the site (via the secondary / shallow aquifer, and/or preferentially along existing buried infrastructure.

I have reviewed the Ground & Water Contamination Assessment Report (Phase 4 investigation Ref: GWPR3192/CARIOct 2019 v1.02), who's conclusions may be broadly summarised as follows:

- . Some contamination 'hot-spots' have been identified which require treatment or removal due to exceedance of either or both residential land use and commercial land use generic assessment criteria (GAC).

- . Hotspots requiring treatment include a region of the SW of the (wider-) site, and are in the NW of the topographically 'low' portion of the site.

- . A strategy of contamination risk mitigation was also considered to be necessary across the entire former car parking area due largely to a statistical population exceedance of GAC for Lead, but also to address significant concentrations of hydrocarbons identified in prior investigations (at BH201 in particular, where results from a recent nearby trial hole classify as hazardous waste).

- . A tentatively identified hotspot in the NE of the (wider-) site, relating to PAH contamination and an asbestos find, and broadly corresponding to a RPZ of a mature boundary tree, does not require specific treatment

- . The asbestos discoveries on the Northern boundary of the site were considered to warrant a reduced dig, and clean cover system, with appropriate screening and physical pre-treatment of removed material to minimise the volume of hazardous waste disposal required.

- . Specific removal of amosite asbestos (present as free fibres) in the region of BH2 was also considered to be required, as a result of the volumetric quantification.

- . An argument for 'acceptably low' risk from chrysotile asbestos fibres and cement-bonded fragments has been made.

- . The report also concludes that the 'inconsistent contaminant concentrations recorded within the groundwater', it is unlikely that groundwater contaminants would risk impacting local watercourses surrounding the site. (It should be noted that this conclusion is nuanced and should only really be regarded as relating to a need for groundwater treatment - and not as relating specifically to the soil contaminant source, or the status of the pollutant linkage)

. Basic soil-gas protection measures are proposed to residences despite the gas screening value equating to a level where 'no protective measures would normally be required' ('CS1'). Proposed due to maximum steady state concentrations exceeding the 'typical' limits - by more than an order of magnitude in the case of methane (>13% v/v, compared with a 'typical' CS1 level of <1 % v/v)

. In addition to the above, a generic contamination watching brief is proposed, alongside specific validation requirements relating to proposed works.

I have read the most recent contamination assessment report alongside the previous documents (Most notably, WYG report no.A090070-182v2 Jun 2017 and CRH report no. 12663 Feb 2019), and note that there are qualitative associations between hotspots identified in the latest report which 'could' indicate a broader spatial area of contamination-impacted soils than is envisaged within the Phase 4 report.

The phase 4 report does consider results from other reports, but does not provide a detailed re-examination of the Conceptual Site Model from site usage research (to identify possible

sources for contamination identified, and so to consider whether contamination identified in separate trial holes might have a common source). Statistical assessment is applied with respect to the human health assessment, and the remedial strategy is based upon a 'source blind I statistically led' source & exposure area 'zoning' model.

This is acceptable for human health protection, especially given the arguably generous soil strip I clean cover system depths proposed in the areas requiring treatment. It might be less appropriate however for consideration of the controlled waters risk. With reference to Figure 5 of the CRH report, and to the grouping of trial holes in the SE corner of the site which have been identified as being 'contamination impacted' (numbering at least 7 separate holes, identifying signs of contamination in both made- and natural- soils, including those comprising the secondary aquifer which has been credibly shown to be capable of hydraulic continuity with the Lavant.

The Phase 4 report is inconsistent in its proposals for remediation, referring to a (hot-spot) treatment area comprising both 16m radius, and 16m diameter (the latter representing around 25% the area of the former). Reference is made to verification of sides I base, and extension of removal works if needed (which is welcome-); however the method statement doesn't specifically address source removal depth in terms of groundwater impact or to laboratory turn-around times and the impact this might have on operational decisions on site (long turn-around times could prejudice evidence-based decision-making). No specific reference is made to in-situ screening, though I would assume that PID screening will be employed as a practical tool for guiding source removal works. PAH is not necessarily associated with volatile contaminants, so PID screening alone will be insufficient to determine completion of removal works.

Examination of the available data show that contamination is sporadically present across the site, being present in the SE, NE, and NW corners, at the N boundary, broadly on elevated land to the west, and at the foot of the topographic transition from this land to the lower-lying land (in a proximal location). Some indications of contamination have also been identified in the central Eastern 1/3rd of the site. The associations between these areas is unclear, and in some cases no credible potential source is shown on historic mapping, or has been presented from available desk based sources in prior reports. Some chemical profiles are remarkably consistent

despite sampled being taken some distance apart; perhaps linked to the origin of source material (placed made soils from common source, used in different areas).

The contamination profile of the elevated land in the West of the site is somewhat puzzling given it's apparent history. I have looked at the available imaging timeline on streetview, and it would appear that this land has in the past been used (for a significant period of time) as open storage of industrial materials &/or products. Given the lack of alternative known I suspected contamination sources, this use is considered to be a credible potential source, alongside the source material of which the made soils comprise. I couldn't completely discount the less likely alternatives (historic site use, car parking), these remain possible contributing factors.

The lack of precision in knowledge of prior potentially contaminative use of this land hampers assessment of association (or 'separateness') of data-points - in particular whether BH201 & WS16 might relate to a common source.

Contamination & Hydrogeological Risks - Remedial Strategy

Several treatment areas are proposed across the site, and the risk that contaminated soils may be discovered elsewhere at the site is not negligible given it's scale, and the number of small scale I discrete potential contamination sources that are likely to have existed across the site throughout it's history.

Hot-spot removal:-

I am principally concerned about the possible link between contamination identified at WS16 and that identified on elevated ground, at BH201. If linked, the hot-spot area could be significant, and might warrant re-consideration (as it would demonstrate a reasonable degree of mobility).

I am similarly concerned about the scale of the hotspot in the SE of the site likely exceeding that envisaged in both plan area and depth (removal may need to include land in the vicinity of WS1-WS3, TP201, HP203 & BH5). I would also be concerned if the hot-spot removal success criteria is based upon the commercial landuse S4UL value for human exposure to contaminants, given that prior reports conclude the continuity with the surface water is likely and that both leachate & groundwater results are not substantially different in character (indicating a 'pluvial-percolation' &/or 'groundwater-level fluctuation' driven mobility risk).

I can agree the strategy in principal, as it does encompass the most concerning results and does include provision for extension of works in response to conditions encountered. I would like to make clear however that I will expect target levels 1 screening levels to be appropriate to the controlled waters risk (particularly relevant to the SE corner), and to include PID screening with particular attention given to the potential for common sources for contamination identified in different trial holes (e.g. hydrocarbons &/or coal-tar derived PAH at WS16, BH201)

Soil Strip - North Boundary (Asbestos Mitigation):-

The risks from asbestos are not laboured in the report, and there is no single section summarising the total number of finds or their distribution.

All phases of investigation have identified asbestos containing material (ACM), and quantification has identified >0.001 % as free-fibres, by volume (much more than 'trace'). This is perhaps not surprising given how extensively the material was used in the structures formerly present at the site.

The Phase 4 report s 4 of 77 (5.1%) samples testing positive for asbestos. It is unclear whether this figure includes results from prior reports; the CRH report identifies 4 positive detections of 24 samples (16.6%), and the WYG report identifies 3/27 (11 %). Several (7, of around 40) individual locations around the site have identified asbestos in soils (-17%).

I am not sure that these results should be taken to be indicative of 'specific areas affected' as they should be taken to represent a 'likely frequency of occurrence within material of similar character'. It might be just as valid to say that we are likely to identify ACM or fibres in around 1 in 10 samples taken from disturbed 1 made soils from anywhere at the site.

I don't object to the spatially specific strategy proposed (there does at least qualitatively appear to be a concentration of finds along the north boundary), but I would interpret the frequency of finds as being indicative of a site wide risk of ACM presence in made / disturbed (and top-) soils. This underscores the importance of the discovery strategy mentioned at 4.6, which is reasonably generic in it's scope and content.

I am minded to recommend that the ACM discovery strategy be fleshed out prior to approval of the RMS presented within the Phase 4 Report (or it be specifically required under a separate condition).

The principle of the strategy proposed is however considered to be a pragmatic approach to addressing a risk which is not unique to this site (or indeed limited to former industrial sites), and to minimising the volume of hazardous waste generated through development. Demonstrating that reasonable steps have been taken will be the challenge, and I think that it would be best served by a more specific proposal - in particular a more defined proposal on communication (to groundworks staff), monitoring, screening (e.g. of stockpiles), and record keeping (for verification)

Gas Protection:-

It is considered that the results could be indicative of bio-degradation of organic contaminants (e.g. fuels), and both the elevated methane and >LOD flows are of potential concern.

I agree the need for a robust basic gas protection system for residential properties given the results of spot monitoring. This could be omitted following favourable results from deployment of a continuous gas monitoring device (which would give much greater confidence in flow rates)- but in the absence of such data, precautionary mitigation is considered appropriate.

Car Park Area, Source Removal & Clean Cover:-

As discussed in the assessment section above, a number of concerns about uncertainty associated with the coherence of the CSM (i.e. the sporadic & widely distributed contamination impact) are alleviated by robust treatment in affected areas - clean cover depths of upto 750mm are very good practice, and capillary breaks are proposed where deep made soils are to be retained.

The approach is agreed. However, given the storage use for this land, the significant PID readings, and coal-tar / creosote associated PAH - there is potential for this area to prove to be more seriously impacted than currently thought, so it is agreed subject to the observation of the watching brief (for mobile, 'controlled waters relevant' contaminants, and for volatile or 'gas / vapour protection relevant' contaminants) and the verification evidence recommended.

Contamination & Hydrogeological Risks - Recommendations

Unacceptable contamination risks have been confirmed within the latest phase of investigative works, and a specific remedial scheme has been proposed (the remediation method statement, RMS), supported by a generic Verification Plan. The verification plan ('validation strategy' in the report) is generic in nature, but its content is reasonably inferable from the text of the report.

Subject to the enhancement of the outline discovery strategy presented at 4.8 of the Phase 4 Report (GWPR3192v1.02) in respect of ACM, and the caveats outlined in the sections above; the body of documentation submitted to the Council to date essentially satisfies Condition 8 of the outline consent.

I assume that the detailed consent requires transposition of conditions, in the interests of clarity. In this respect, c.8 of APP/18/00244 may be omitted. c.10 of the outline consent should be transposed. I would recommend that the condition below is included on any consent granted in relation to this application, as a substitute to outline condition 9.

The informative is recommended as a guide to interpretation.

Condition A - Verification of Approved Works (in place of outline condition c.9)

"Prior to the occupation of any specific phase of development approved by this planning permission, a soil-contamination remediation & risk mitigation verification report shall be submitted to- and approved in writing by- the local planning authority.

The report shall be in general accordance with the Ground & Water Ltd. Report No. GWPR3192/CAR v1.02 (November 2019) and shall document the management of contamination-impacted soils and the effectiveness of the remediation achieved through the works set out in sections 4.5-4.6 of the GWPR3192/CAR v1.02 report.

Reason: *To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to human health or the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete. This is in line with DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) [2014J, and paragraphs 178-180 of the National Planning Policy Framework. "*

Informative - Soil-Contamination Remediation & Risk Mitigation

"The Council recognises the need to respond to site conditions encountered during groundworks, and the inherent uncertainty in defining works based upon results of a finite sampling strategy. The execution of remedial works described in the GWPR31921CAR v1.02 report- and their subsequent verification- are expected to take account the comments and requirements of relevant consultees*, where given (* The Environment Agency, Portsmouth Water Company, and Environmental Health). The

GWPR31921CAR v1.02 report describes validation /verification proposals in various sections of the report, and does not present a comprehensive stand-alone verification plan. The Council accepts a degree of 'fluidity' in response to conditions encountered, but will expect the report to include: i) results of sampling and monitoring ii) a photographic record of source removal works and iii) any other documentary evidence which describes the works (which may comprise documentation of any or all; the evidence-based decision-making processes, the definition of 'completion points', on-site waste material pre-treatment / characterisation, the movements and destination of contamination-impacted soils, and the characterisation of imported soils for cover systems). The Council will not accept a report which verifies a rigid interpretation the remedial works where this would leave an unacceptable degree of residual uncertainty. "

Hampshire Fire & Rescue

Building Regulations: Access for Firefighting

Access and facilities for Fire Service Appliances and Firefighters should be in accordance with Approved Document B5 of the current Building Regulations.

Hampshire Act 1983 Section 12 - Access for Fire Service

Access to the proposed site should be in accordance with Hampshire Act 1983 Sect, 12 (Access to buildings within the site will be dealt with as part of the building regulations application at a later stage). Access roads to the site should be in accordance with Approved Document B5 of the current Building Regulations.

Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004

The following recommendations are advisory only and do not form part of any current legal requirement of this Authority.

Access for High-reach Appliances

High reach appliances currently operated by the HFRS exceed the maximum requirements given in Section 17 of the Approved Document B. When considering high rise buildings these variations should be considered as additions and incorporated as follows. Structures such as bridges, which a high-reach appliance may need to cross should have a maximum carrying capacity of 26 tonnes. Where the operation of a high reach vehicle is envisaged, a road or hard standing is required 6m wide. In addition, the road or hard standing needs to be positioned so that its nearer edge is not less than 3m from the face of the building.

Water Supplies

Additional water supplies for fire fighting may be necessary. You should contact the Community Response Support, Hampshire Fire and Rescue Headquarters, Leigh Road, Eastleigh, S050 9SJ (risk.information@hantsfire.gov.uk) to discuss your proposals.

Fire Protection

HFRS would strongly recommend that consideration is given to installation of an Automatic Water Fire Suppression Systems (AWFSS) to promote life safety and property protection within the premises.

HFRS is fully committed to promoting Fire Protection Systems for both business and domestic premises. Support is offered to assist all in achieving a reduction of loss of life and the impact of fire on the wider community.

Testing of Fire Safety Systems

HFRS strongly recommends that, upon commissioning, all fire safety systems are fully justified, fully tested and shown to be working as designed. Thereafter, their effectiveness should be reconfirmed periodically throughout their working lifecycles.

Fire-fighting and the Environment

Should a serious unsuppressed fire occur on the premises, the water environment may become polluted with 'fire water run-off' that may include foam. The Service will liaise with the Environment Agency at any incident where they are in attendance and under certain circumstances, where there is a serious risk to the environment, a 'controlled burn' may take place. This of course could lead to the total loss of the building and its contents.

Premises' occupiers have a duty to prevent and mitigate damage to the water environment from 'fire water run off' and other spillages

Timber-framed Buildings

These types of buildings are particularly vulnerable to severe fire damage and fire spread during the construction phase.

The UK Timber Frame Association publication '16 Steps to Fire Safety on Timber Frame Construction Sites' provides guidance on this issue and is available from:

<https://ttf.co.uk/download/16-steps-fire-safety-timber-frame-construction-sites/>

This guidance should be read in conjunction with the 'Joint Code of Practice on the Protection from Fire of Construction Sites and Buildings Undergoing Renovation', published by the Construction Confederation and The Fire Protection Association (Sixth Edition, ISBN 1-902790-33-2)

Copies of the 'Joint Codes of Practice' and useful sister publication, 'Construction Site Fire Prevention Checklist' (Second edition, ISBN 1-902790-32-4), are available for purchase from the Fire Protection Association: (www.thefpa.co.uk) and from the Construction Industry Press:

(Publications for Construction Professionals and Builders | CIP Books)

If have any queries concerning these matters may be directed to the inspector named above, but all correspondence should be addressed to the Chief Officer.

Hampshire Highways

Final Comments

Thank you for re-consultation on the above planning application. The applicant has submitted additional information to address the comments raised in the Highway Authority's response dated 10th February 2020. The suitability of the updated information is addressed below.

Internal Layout

It is understood that the applicant intends to keep the internal roads private, rather than offer them for adoption to the Highway Authority. Nevertheless, comments were raised in the Highway Authority's previous response regarding the suitability of the internal layout which have now been addressed.

Drawing number 039.5018.003 Rev D relocates 2 of the parking bays away from the site access onto Martin Road to the east of plot no. 6. Tracking has been provided for one of the two remaining parking bays which indicates that a vehicle can manoeuvre in and out of the space with sufficient distance from the site access. The relocation of parking for units 06 and 07 is therefore considered acceptable. The swept paths provided for vehicles entering and egressing bays throughout the development indicate that there is sufficient space to undertake these manoeuvres.

A minimum 2.5m wide shared use path is provided through the site, providing connection to the off-site shared use provision to the north on Bartons Road and the east towards New Lane. Drawing number 18-197-0004 Rev A05 indicates the shared use path terminating in the 'employment zone' to the east. The Highway Authority requires the shared use path to be connected into the wider infrastructure on New Lane once a Reserved Matters application is submitted for the employment land.

Drawing number 039.5018.004.C provides visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m (commensurate with the speed limit) from the new site access onto Martins Road which is considered acceptable. To construct the access, the applicant is required to enter into a S278 agreement with the Highway Authority. Detailed design matters will be picked up as part of the design check process.

Off-Site S278 Works

The applicant has produced updated drawings detailing the off-site S278 works associated with the application.

039.5018.101. Rev C

To connect cyclists into the wider network, Rev C now provides a 3m wide shared use path to the north to Sharps Road. At the point at which the path joins Sharps Road, cyclists are expected to rejoin the carriageway.

Owing to land constraints along Martin Road, the applicant is unable to provide a shared use path from the site access to the junction with Bartons Road. Instead, a slip for cyclists to rejoin the carriageway heading southbound on Martin Road will be provided. This will provide onward connections to the south towards Havant. Given that the applicant is providing pedestrian/cycle connections through the site to the north to Bartons Road and east to New Lane, this arrangement is acceptable.

The updates to drawing number 039.5018.101 Rev C have been reviewed and are now considered acceptable.

039.5018.102. Rev C

In line with the S106 agreement for the outline planning permission associated with the development, an additional section of shared use path is now being provided to the east, connecting into the wider provision along Bartons Road.

The pedestrian/cycle refuge on New Lane has now been widened to 2.4m to provide room for a cyclist to wait for a vehicle to pass. The updates to both drawings now align with the pedestrian/cycle works agreed during outline and are therefore acceptable.

Recommendation

The applicant has suitably overcome the comments previously raised. The Highway Authority therefore raise no objection to the application, subject to the applicant entering into a Highway agreement prior to commencement for the off-site S278 works (detailed in drawing numbers 039.5018.101 Rev C and 039.5018.102 Rev C) and to implement these works prior to occupation (as obligated under the S106 agreement). The following planning condition is also required:

Prior to commencement of development, the applicant shall enter into a Highways agreement for the site access works onto Martin Road. Prior to occupation of the development, the applicant shall implement the access works as detailed in drawing number 039.5018.101 Rev C.

Reason:

To provide vehicular access to the development.

Original Comments 10.2.20

The following are the Highway Authority's comments on the on and off site highway works :-

PBA drg 039.5018.101 OFF-SITE HIGHWAY PROPOSALS SHEET 1 OF 2

1. Shared use footway / cycleway to be minimum 2.5m wide
2. Minimum footway widths to be 2m
3. New entrance into development from Martin Rd :
 - i. CBR values to be determined to ensure pavement depth is suitable.
 - ii. Road gullies to be located to minimise surface water flow into development from the highway
 - iii. Tactile paving layout for uncontrolled crossing to be in accordance with HCC Standard details (ie 2 rows x 6 columns - absolute minimum to be 2 rows x4 columns)
 - iv. Visibility splays from junction at Martin Rd to be minimum 2.4m x43m
4. All road markings and signing must be referenced to the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.
5. Junction should be min 5.5m wide with minimum 6m radius kerbs

PBA drg 039.5018.102 OFF-SITE HIGHWAY PROPOSALS SHEET 2 OF 2

1. Shared use footway/cycleway to be minimum 2.5m wide
2. There is another shared use footway cycleway proposed as part of a separate development on the east side of New Lane. The central island should be widened to a minimum of 2m to provide a safer refuge for cyclists and provide continuity for cyclists crossing New Lane. Vehicle swept paths to be reviewed.
3. Confirm continuation of shared use footway/cycleway further south. If there is no continuation, engineering measures should be made to get cyclists off the carriageway to join the new cycleway. Current proposal adds risk of conflict with vehicles at the junction.

PBA drg 039.5018.004 Rev A JUNCTION AND FORWARD VISIBILITY SPLAYS

1. Visibility splays to be shown on drawings based on measured speeds. In the absence of measured speeds it is recommend minimum visibility splay from Martin Rd to be 2.4m x43m based on the existing speed limit.
2. Visibility splays conflict with parking bays. Parking bays to be removed or relocated out of the visibility splays.
3. Trees and street lighting columns mustn't be placed in visibility splays.

4. Minimum 25m forward visibility is to be provided within the development around all bends that aren't junctions. Show visibility splays around bends.
5. No houses or other obstruction are to be built in the forward visibility splays.
6. All visibility splays are to be within proposed highway otherwise a restrictive covenant is required
7. Recommend minimum carriageway width within development is 5.5m to improve visibility and turning circles for vehicles
8. Parking space must be a desirable minimum of 2.5m and 5.5m length for those at 90 degrees to carriageway. Parallel bays to be minimum 6m length.
9. Parking bays at 90 degree to the carriageway should also have minimum 1 m hardened margin I footway to allow drivers & passengers to alight from vehicles.
10. Ensure swept path of cars can access last bay at end of car park. Re-position kerbline if necessary to improve turning circle. The width of these spaces on the end of lines to be widened to a minimum of 2.7m.
11. Parking bay on corner may restrict turning and any parked car may get damaged.

If you think a meeting with or without the developer would be useful either I or a colleague will happily attend.

Housing Havant Borough Council

Final Comments 15.6.20

The accommodation schedule and the applicants notes do make their proposals much clearer so I am now happy to agree the affordable housing provision.

Further Comments 8.6.20

As far as the mix is concerned I can confirm that I would be happy to accept this.

Further Comments (12.5.20)

Housing:

This Reserved Matters application concerns proposals for residential development of 95 new dwellings consisting of 1,2, 3, and 4-bedroom homes

Current planning policy requirements Core Strategy policy CS9. 2, the Havant Borough Housing SPD (July 2011), mean that new residential developments of this size would be required to provide 30-40% affordable housing on site.

The Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 (HBLP 2036), which was approved by the Council on 30/01/2019, but at this time carries limited weight, further reinforces this policy (see emerging Policy H2 / Affordable Housing) by setting out a requirement for 30% affordable housing on sites resulting in a net gain of 10 or more dwellings. However, the requirement is 20% in the town centres of Havant, Waterlooville, and Leigh Park.

To address locally identified need the HBLP 2036 states that, as this site is over 50 dwellings, 2% of the overall housing provision should be designed to meet the wheelchair accessible homes standard.

The proposals for the 95 dwellings comprise of:

Total Units	Beds	Persons	House or Apartment	% of overall site
2	1	2	A	2
11	2	3	A	12
19	2	4	A	20
21	2	4	H	22
37	3	5	H	39
5	4	7	H	5
95				100

Table 1

Since the outline application ref number APP/18/00244 the number of proposed units has reduced from 99 to 95, and the overall housing mix differs significantly as can be seen by the table below which details what was stated in the previous submission:

Total Units	Beds	House or Apartment	% of overall site
29	1	A	29
30	2	A	31
17	2	H	17
19	3	H	19
4	4	H	4
99			100

Table 2

The demand for affordable housing remains high within Havant borough; as of 12th May 2020, there are 1617 households registered on Hampshire Home Choice seeking accommodation in our area and of these 761 are waiting for a one-bedroom home, 517 for a two bed, 269 for a 3 bed, and 70 for a 4+ bedroom home. Waiting times for Band 3 applicants for April 2018 to March 2019 are within the range of 3 to 6 years depending on the property size.

The applicants are now proposing a higher % (54%) of two-bedroom homes over the whole site which consists of both market and affordable homes: this increase is higher than I would expect to create a sustainable community in what is predominantly a family location.

In addition, the affordable provision has been significantly amended in this submission. The applicants are now proposing:

Total units	Beds	Persons	House or Apartment	% of Affordable provision
2	1	2	A	6
10	2	3	A	29
18	2	4	A	53
2	2	4	H	6
2	3	5	H	6
34				100

Table 3

This illustrates that 88% (30 of the 34 units) of the affordable provision consists of two- bedroom homes, and of these 30 units over 93% (28 units) are apartments. Even though the apartments do differ in size, and therefore could accommodate

either up to a 3 or 4-person household, the proposed number of two- bedroom homes is not acceptable. It does not meet current policy requirements, or the need

as demonstrated by the current waiting list figures. There will need to be re-consideration of the affordable provision; there needs to be a decrease in the number of 2-bedroom apartments, and an increase in the number of 1- bedroom apartments, and 2 and 3- bedroom houses. Additionally, I would expect to see at least one 4-bedroom home available for Affordable/Social Rent to help meet local housing need.

The applicants, in the submitted Affordable Housing Statement, say that this latest mix has been derived from early engagement with the councils housing enablement team. However, discussions at the time of the Outline application, back in 2018, were based around the originally proposed overall housing mix (see table 2). Suggestions, as detailed below, were made to aid the applicants in producing a mix that would meet local needs:

Unit type	Number
1 Bed flat	10
2 Bed Flat	10
2 Bed- house	7
3 Bed-house	7
4 Bed-house	1
TOTAL	35

Table 4

As already noted, both the overall, and consequently the affordable mix, has now been significantly amended.

The applicants responded to this original consultation response in February 2020 quoting the PUSH SHMA (Affordable) analysis.

This states requirements as follows:

1 Bed	41.6%
2 Bed	36.0%
3 Bed	19.6%
4 Bed	2.8%

Unfortunately, the applicants do not appear to have amended the mix of the affordable provision in line with this. Therefore, I must re-iterate that their current proposed mix for the affordable units that will, the details of which will form part of the s106 legal agreement, are not acceptable.

The location of the development is near to local services (bus transport, retail, medical, and educational), and for this reason I would expect the affordable provision to include all the sizes and types of home as all household types from single people through to larger families,

The proposed tenure mix, of around a 70/30 in favour of affordable rented homes, is acceptable.

The final affordable mix will be required to be agreed with the Council and will form part of the S106 agreement.

I am very pleased to see that the applicants will be constructing these homes to lifetime Homes standards and that a lift will be provided to enable those residents, or their visitors, with mobility issues to access the new homes.

Original Comments 23.1.20

Housing:

This Reserved Matters application concerns proposals for residential development of 95 new dwellings consisting of 1,2, 3, and 4-bedroom homes

Current planning policy requirements Core Strategy policy CS9. 2, the Havant Borough Housing SPD (July 2011), , mean that new residential developments of this size would be required to provide 30-40% affordable housing on site.

The Pre-Submission Havant Borough local Plan 2036 (HBIP 2036), which was approved by the Council on 30/01/2019, but at this time carries limited weight, further reinforces this policy (see emerging Policy H2 / Affordable Housing) by setting out a requirement for 30% affordable housing on sites resulting in a net gain of 10 or more dwellings. However, the requirement is 20% in the town centres of Havant, Waterlooville, and Leigh Park.

To address locally identified need the HBIP 2036 states that, as this site is over 50 dwellings, 2% of the overall housing provision should be designed to meet the wheelchair accessible homes standard.

The proposals for the 95 dwellings comprise of:

Total Units	Beds	Persons	House or Apartment	% of overall site
2	1	2	A	2
11	2	3	A	12
19	2	4	A	20
21	2	4	H	22
37	3	5	H	39
5	4	7	H	5
95				100

Table 1

Since the outline application ref number APP/18/00244 the number of proposed units has reduced from 99 to 95, and the overall housing mix differs significantly as can be seen by the table below which details what was stated in the previous submission:

Total Units	Beds	House or Apartment	% of overall site
29	1	A	29
30	2	A	31
17	2	H	17
19	3	H	19
4	4	H	4
99			100

Table 2

The demand for affordable housing remains high within Havant borough; as of 23rd January 2020, there are 1624 households registered on Hampshire Home Choice seeking accommodation in our area and of these 772 are waiting for a one-bedroom

home, 532 for a two bed, 251 for a 3 bed, and 69 for a 4+ bedroom home. Waiting times for Band 3 applicants for April 2018 to March 2019 are within the range of 3 to 6 years depending on the property size.

The applicants are now proposing a higher % (54%) of two-bedroom homes: this increase is higher than I would expect to create a sustainable community in what is predominantly a family location.

In addition, the affordable provision has been significantly amended in this submission. The applicants are now proposing:

Total units	Beds	Persons	House or Apartment	% of Affordable provision
2	1	2	A	6
10	2	3	A	29
18	2	4	A	53
2	2	4	H	6
2	3	5	H	6
34				100

Table 3

This illustrates that 88% (30 of the 34 units) of the affordable provision consists of two- bedroom homes, and of these 30 units over 93% (28 units) are apartments. Even though the apartments do differ in size, and therefore could accommodate either up to a 3 or 4-person household, the proposed number of two- bedroom homes is not acceptable. It does not meet current policy requirements, or the need as demonstrated by the current waiting list figures. There will need to be re-consideration of the affordable provision; there needs to be a decrease in the number of 2-bedroom apartments, and an increase in the number of 1- bedroom apartments, and 2 and 3- bedroom houses. Additionally, I would expect to see at least one 4- bedroom home available for Affordable/Social Rent to help meet local housing need.

The applicants, in the submitted Affordable Housing Statement, say that this latest mix has been derived from early engagement with the councils housing enablement team. However, discussions at the time of the Outline application, back in 2018, were based around the originally proposed overall housing mix (see table 2). Suggestions, as detailed below, were made to aid the applicants in producing a mix that would meet local needs:

Unit type	Number
1 Bed flat	10
2 Bed Flat	10
2 Bed- house	7
3 Bed-house	7
4 Bed-house	1
TOTAL	35

Table 4

As already stated both the overall, and consequently the affordable mix, has now been significantly amended.

The location of the development is near to local services (bus transport, retail, medical, and educational), and for this reason I would expect the affordable provision to include all the sizes and types of home as all household types from single people through to larger families,

The proposed tenure mix, of around a 70/30 in favour of affordable rented homes, is acceptable.

The final affordable mix will be required to be agreed with the Council and will form part of the S 106 agreement.

I am very pleased to see that the applicants will be constructing these homes to lifetime Homes standards and that a lift will be provided to enable those residents, or their visitors, with mobility issues to access the new homes.

Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council

Final Comments

I accept that at this stage getting the location of the POS altered is realistically not achievable. However it is a comment that we have been reiterating throughout the application and it's a shame that the location of the open space has been pushed to the margins, and in my view is to the detriment of its quality.

With regards to the parking to the frontage of the open space I do feel that this is still a problem but it's the same old clash of managing parking requirements and trying to achieve the best quality open space. I had been liaising with Jacqueline regarding *Provision of public open space in new develop policy E9* and the current layout is contrary to the guideline; *5.92 On-site space should generally be provided largely as one principal park providing a focal point for the development. This also means that other elements of the site layout, such as car parking provision, should not create undue physical or visual barriers around the open space. It must also be connected appropriately to all parts of the development by surfaced footpaths.* I must add that this policy is taken from the 2036 local plan, which as far as I am aware is not adopted yet? So whether this would diminish its weight I am not sure.

Just looking at the layout it does seem possible to relocate 2 parking spaces which would go some way to helping with the surveillance of the open space. Perhaps we could put this to the applicant and see if it would be achievable?

Officer Comment - *Plan extract provided and layout changed in relation to repositioning 2 parking spaces from in front of the POS.*

I must have missed the agents response in relation to the planting outside plot no. 66 and its effects on the visibility splay. As such we should look for feature low level planting to frame the bell mouth whilst still retaining the proposed tree north of plot no. 58.

Officer Comment: *A condition is recommended to secure feature low level planting to the south of plot 66.*

Happy with the approach on the lighting. I just wanted to ensure that the access route through the open space was adequately lit and the bollards did not feature on lighting drawing.

Further Comments

From a landscape perspective we have the following comments:

Layout

- The amendments to our initial comments in relation to the layout have been addressed.

Open Space

- The location of the open space appears remnant 'left at edges?' and is deemed to be a missed opportunity to be integrated into the design and the focal point for the site.
- The siting of the open space into the at the edge of the site reduces the natural surveillance and increases the potential for anti-social behaviour. The visual permeability has been slightly improved by orientating units 30-33 to face onto the open space. Unfortunately by not relocating the car parking spaces north of the open space the effectiveness of re-orientating the plots no. 30-33 has been diminished.
- The provision for equipped/designated play space does not conform to the fields in trust guidelines which states that a development with a scale of 10-200 dwellings in require to provide a local area of play (LAP), locally equipped area of play (LEAP) and a contribution to a multi-use games area (MUGA)

Appearance

- The reduction of the grey cladding on block B is noted.

Landscaping

- There seems to be a missed opportunity to plant a trees in the area of landscaping south of unit 66 which would frame the belmouth.
- We have concerns with the amount of construction which is occurring within the RPA of offsite trees in particular the trees around the site entrance. There seems to be a lack of mitigation strategy to ensure the roots are not impacted by the construction process.

Lighting

- The lighting does not include all the proposed lighting as set out in the landscape design and access statement. The lighting strategy must include all lighting including bollards mounted lights and tree uplighters.

Further Comments

Layout

Plots no. 1-5 do not conform to the back-to-back distances as set in the HBC design guides which states '20m minimum distances between first floor habitable room windows' 'Plus 4m for each additional storey. The proposed dwellings are 2.5 storey so we would require a minimum distance of 22m the current distance. At present the distance is 6.5m which is not deemed acceptable. Furthermore units 1-5 do not conform to the minimum distances required for daylight standards which should be a minimum distance of 10m.

Plots no. 2-4 have a full height window in the living room which look directly (1500mm distance of garden) out on a close board fence, which is deemed to be a poor design.

Plots no. 9 and 10 do not meet the minimum garden length of 10m.

We have concerns with the parking configuration for plots no. 6-8 and the proximity of the parking spaces to the only site access/egress. As stated in the GEN application this layout creates a number of potential tensions, firstly should the residents of plots 8 own a large vehicle (van, estate etc.) there vehicle could protrude onto the footway and force users into the carriageway which is not acceptable. Secondly we have concerns that drivers reversing from their parking bays will not have adequate sight lines to view oncoming traffic turning in from Martin road and traffic leaving the site.

We require a cycle/pedestrian link north onto Bartons Road to future proof the site and to coordinate with HBC aspirational 2036 cycle network to encourage sustainable transportation.

Open Space

The location of the open space appears remnant 'left at edges' and is deemed to be a missed opportunity to be integrated into the design and the focal point for the site.

The siting of the open space into the at the edge of the site reduces the natural surveillance and increases the potential for anti-social behaviour. The visual permeability could be improved by orientating units 30-33 to directly face onto the open space, relocating 2-3 of the visitor car parking spaces west of the shared footpath and the use of fastigate deciduous trees to the north of the open space.

The provision for equipped/designated play space does not conform to the fields in trust guidelines which states that a development with a scale of 10-200 dwellings in require to provide a local area of play (LAP), locally equipped area of play (LEAP) and a contribution to a multi-use games area (MUGA)

The decision to not open up / re-naturalize the watercourse at the base of the embankment is deemed to be a missed opportunity to create an interesting landscape feature, which would have ecological and place making benefits. The landscape design and access suggests the character of the area will create a strong 'green heart' for the site. Unfortunately the reality is this area is dominated with car parking with sections of the path having a distance of 1500mm from parked vehicles. Which is contrary to the proposed robust shrub planting stated in the design and access statement.

Appearance

The massing of the profiled grey cladding on block B flats is deemed to be over bearing and not in keeping with the residential build form of adjacent dwellings. The north elevation in particular needs to be amended and we feel from a landscape character perspective the cladding should be used to accent the building rather than being the main material of the façade.

We require product specification on all proposed building materials to include materials, colour, manufacturer etc. to ensure the landscape character of the development is appropriate to its location. Some details that have been submitted are too ambiguous for example in brick colour has been stated as red / grey within the elevation materials drawing no. 0131 which is not acceptable.

Landscaping

We require replacement trees to mitigate the removal of trees on Martin Road.

We require a line of fastigate trees to the north of plots no. 70 and 71 to help soften the development into the landscape. Species such as *Betula pendula* fastigate or *Quercus robur* fastigiata would be deemed appropriate.

There seems to be a missed opportunity to plant a trees in the area of landscaping south of unit 66 which would frame the belmouth.

The areas of soft landscaping to break up the massing of the car parking north of plots no. 59-64 is deemed to be too small to effectively break up the massing. We would

prefer to see 1 or 2 larger planting areas with planted with trees to offer a vertical form. We have concerns with the amount of construction which is occurring within the RPA of offsite trees in particular the trees around the site entrance. There seems to be a lack of mitigation strategy to ensure the roots are not impacted by the construction process.

Original Comments

Condition 15 ? No adverse comments.

Condition 16 ? The decision notice for condition 16 (ii) states that the provisions for a pedestrian / cycle route to Bartons road shown indicatively on drawing No. A090070-182(STI)31 RevA. However the submitted drawings indicate a pedestrian route only which is not wide enough to be appropriate for cycle / pedestrian use. A layout which provides a north / south cycle link should be provided as per the details in the condition.

Officer Comment: *This has now been amended.*

Local Lead Flood Authority HCC

Further Comments 7.5.20

Thank you for consulting us on the above planning application regarding amended plans.

The updated Drainage Layout within the planning website does not significantly change the way that Surface Water would be managed when you compare it with the previously submitted.

Therefore, our formal response dated 14 January 2020 still stands.

Original Comments 14.1.20

Hampshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority has provided comments in relation to the above application in our role as statutory consultee on surface water drainage for major developments.

In order to assist applicants in providing the correct information to their Local Planning Authority for planning permission, Hampshire County Council has set out the information it requires to provide a substantive response at <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/landplanningandenvironment/flooding/planning>

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

- . FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM; Document Reference: 19142-WFB-VY-XX-RO-C-0001; dated: 19/12/19.
- . Drainage Strategy Statement; Project Name: 19142; dated: 19/11/19.

The information submitted by the applicant in support of this planning application indicates that surface water runoff from the application site will be managed through tanked permeable paving and cellular storage tanks.

Additionally, surface water will be discharged, at discharge rates of 14.641/s (area1) & 50.331/s (area2), to the existing monsoon drain within the site which finally discharged to the adjacent Lavant Stream which is a designated main river. This is acceptable in principle since the proposed discharge rates provide a betterment of 84% & 85% for areas 1 & 2 respectively over the

existing in 100 year + 40% climate change storm events.

The information submitted by the applicant is acceptable and has addressed our concerns regarding Surface Water Management and Local Flood Risk. Therefore, the County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has **no objection** to the proposals subject to the following condition:

1. No development shall begin until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the principles within the FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM, has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should include:

- a) The condition of the monsoon drain within the application site should be investigated and any required improvement should be carried out. Evidence of this, including photographs should be submitted before any connection is made.
- b) Confirmation on how impacts of high groundwater will be managed in the design of the proposed drainage system to ensure that storage capacity is not lost, and structural integrity is maintained.
- c) A maintenance and management plan for the entire surface water drainage system, including a plan illustrating the organisation responsible for each element, should be submitted to the LPA and LLFA.

We would also recommend that the applicant is directed to our website <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/flooding/hampshireflooding/drainagesystems.htm> for further information on recommended surface water drainage techniques.

Please note that Hampshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority will not comment on the fluvial systems as these are outside our remit.

This response has been provided using the best knowledge and information submitted as part of the planning application at the time of responding and is reliant on the accuracy of that information.

Planning Policy

Further Comments

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 [Pre-submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036](#) (HBLP 2036) was approved by the Council on 30 January 2019 and can be afforded limited weight.

The following policies are of particular relevance:

- CS2 – Employment
- DM3 – Protection of Existing Employment and Tourism Sites
- CS6 – Regeneration of the Borough
- CS9 – Housing
- CS16 – High Quality Design
- CS19 – Effective Provision of Infrastructure
- CS21 – Developer Requirements
- DM10 – Pollution

- DM13 – Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development

In the Pre-submission Plan the following policies are of particular relevance:

- C1 | Protection of existing employment sites
 - H1 | High quality new homes
 - H3 | Housing density
 - E1 | High quality design
 - IN1 | Effective provision of infrastructure
 - IN3 | Transport and parking in new development
 - E22 | Amenity and pollution
-
- H35 – Colt Site

This response should be read in conjunction with policy comments dated 20th January 2020.

Compliance Check

The applicant has submitted a compliance check against emerging policies to enable an assessment of the scheme's compliance with emerging policy.

Policy	Requirement	Comment
Internal Space Standards (Policy H1)	A requirement for dwellings to meet the nationally described internal space standards	The submitted Conformity Check indicates that all of the dwellings would meet NDSS.
Enhanced Accessibility Standards (Policy H1)	30% of proposed dwellings to meet enhanced accessibility standards (M4(2)) and 2% of the total proposed dwellings to meet wheelchair accessible standards (M4 (3))	It is noted that the applicant is proposing that 30% of the dwellings would meet category M4(2) and that 2% would meet M4(3). In the case of the latter the local authority will need to be able to nominate or allocate a person to live in that dwelling. The Council's Housing Officer will be able to offer further advice on this matter.
Private Amenity Space (Policy H1)	Requires sufficient private and/or communal outdoor amenity space to be provided.	The applicant has not addressed this requirement. However, it is noted from the submitted site plan that the houses would benefit from private gardens to the rear. No balconies are proposed to the apartments, although it is noted that some communal space would be provided around the relevant blocks. Officer Comment: <i>Balconies and terraces are proposed to the flats except for the 2No. 1 bed ground floor units.</i>
Housing Mix (Policy H4)	Development proposals should provide a range of dwelling types and sizes to meet identified housing.	The submitted accommodation schedule indicates that 51 of the 95 dwellings (54%) would be provided as two-bedroom homes.
	This should incorporate approximately 35% as two-bedroom homes as part of	In terms of the overall affordable housing mix, 85% would be provided as affordable housing, whilst two-bedrooms

	the overall housing mix (both market and affordable).	would account for 35% of the market housing provision.
Low Carbon Design (Policy E12)	Residential development is expected to achieve a 19% reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate.	The submitted Compliance Check indicates that the dwellings would be designed with a fabric first approach, to improve on building regulation requirements by 19%.
EV Charging Infrastructure (Policy IN3)	Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure should be provided for each new residential unit with private off-street parking.	The applicant does not propose to meet this requirement. General commentary on parking provision is provided below.
Management Plans (Policy IN5)	A management plan is likely to be required through a legal agreement to establish the whole life management and maintenance of the common parts within the development.	It is noted the applicant is proposing to form a Residential Management Company for the ongoing management of the site, in accordance with S106 requirements from the outline consent.
Regeneration (Policy DR2)	A requirement for a financial contribution towards employment and skills training and a community officer.	The applicant has not addressed this requirement. Officer Comment: <i>This requirement would have needed to be secured in the Outline Consent S106 Agreement.</i>

Parking:

The submitted Transport Assessment suggest that “a total of 173 spaces would be provided split between allocated, unallocated and visitor parking spaces. Of these, 19 would be for visitors. It is understood that most the houses would have allocated parking, and the flats would have unallocated. There would also be some other unallocated parking for some units and visitor parking.

The Parking SPD is clear that spaces should not be owned or attributed to a specific property so they should not be marked or specifically allocated to an individual property to allow for flexibility of use. It also suggests that it may be appropriate to secure this via condition, and potentially a legal undertaking. It is also noted that the SPD indicates that allocated parking is usually provided through curtilage parking or parking courts where spaces are marked or belong to individual properties.

It is considered there would be likely to be a slight under provision of visitor parking spaces. It is noted this would be likely to be offset through flexibility as some of the houses have unallocated spaces.

Summary:

Whilst the submitted development scheme largely complies with the emerging policies, there are some areas where the scheme falls short. However, it should be noted that these policies can only be attributed limited weight.

Parking would be provided through a combination of allocated and unallocated spaces. Whilst it is noted there would be a slight under provision of visitors parking, there would be flexibility through a number of unallocated spaces associated with some of the

housing units.

Original Comments

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 Pre-submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 (HBLP 2036) was approved by the Council on 30 January 2019 and can be afforded limited weight.

The following policies are of particular relevance:

- . CS2 - Employment
- . DM3 - Protection of Existing Employment and Tourism Sites
- . CS6 - Regeneration of the Borough
- . CS9 - Housing
- . CS16 - High Quality Design
- . CS19 - Effective Provision of Infrastructure
- . CS21 - Developer Requirements
- . DM10 - Pollution
- . DM13 - Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development

In the Pre-submission Plan the following policies are of particular relevance:

- . C1 Protection of existing employment sites
- . H1 High quality new homes
- . H3 Housing density
- . E1 High quality design
- . IN1 Effective provision of infrastructure
- . IN3 Transport and parking in new development
- . E22 Amenity and pollution

- . H35 - Colt Site

Principle of Development:

Policies CS2 and DM3 of the Core Strategy generally safeguard the land or premises which were currently or last used for B use class employment purposes from other uses. However, the site is also allocated for development of about 90 dwellings and about 2,900 sqm of employment floorspace (classes B1, B2 and B8) under Policy H35 in the emerging Local Plan which can be afforded limited weight at this stage.

Outline planning permission ref. APP/18/00244 is reflected in criterion d. of the policy which states "there is no overall net loss in the number of jobs when compared to the last occupation of the site for employment purposes." There is also an emerging requirement which refers to the need for the appropriate size, format and layout of the employment units to be provided to be attractive to prospective occupiers in the locality and the wider Havant area.

In addition, the S106 agreement attached to the planning permission requires that the 2,860 sqm of employment floorspace is marketed alongside the residential element of the scheme. Given that there is not detail regarding the employment development, it is questioned whether this has taken place.

Officer Comment: *The S106 requires the following:*

Employment Units:

1. MARKETING STRATEGY

1.1 No later than the Commencement of the Residential Development (or such other date as may be agreed in writing with the Council) the Owner shall submit to the Council and obtain the Council's prior written approval to the Marketing Strategy.

1.2 The Residential Development shall not Commence until the Council has approved in writing the Marketing strategy or deemed approval applies.

The corner of Bartons Road and New Lane forms part of the gateway to the New Lane industrial area, and employment use(s) should be retained in this location accordingly. Criterion e. i. of the site allocation policy clearly states that planning permission will only be granted where the design and layout *"retains appropriate employment users) on north-west corner of New Lane and Bartons Lane to act as a gateway to the wider New Lane established employment area."*

The submitted Block Plan indicates a retained "Employment Zone" to the New Lane frontage which is supported in principle. However, there is very limited other evidence to show that employment would be re-provided on this part of the site.

Development Requirements

It was previously advised the development proposals should be designed to meet the requirements in the Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan which can be afforded limited weight.

The full set of developer considerations can be found in the emerging allocation policy; please see Policy H35 in the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan. Criteria d. relating to the design and layout of the site will be of particular relevance to the residential element of the development proposals.

Analysis of the scheme's compliance with various emerging policies is set out in the table below:

Policy	Requirement	Comment
Internal Space Standards (Policy H1)	A requirement for dwellings to meet the nationally described internal space standards	It is unclear whether the scheme is policy compliant on the basis of information provided.
Enhanced Accessibility Standards (Policy H1)	30% of proposed dwellings to meet enhanced accessibility standards (M4(2)) and 2 of the total proposed dwellings to meet wheelchair accessible standards (M4 (3))	The applicant is not proposing to provide dwellings that meet these standards.
Private Amenity Space (Policy H1)	Requires sufficient private and/or communal outdoor amenity space to be provided.	Again, it is unclear whether the scheme is policy compliant on the basis of information provided
Housing Mix	Development proposals	The submitted

(Policy H4)	should provide a range of dwelling types and sizes to meet identified housing. This should incorporate approximately 35% as two-bedroom homes as part of the overall housing mix (both market and affordable).	accommodation schedule indicates that 51 of the 95 dwellings (54%) would be provided as two-bedroom homes. In terms of the overall affordable housing mix, 85% would be provided as affordable housing, whilst two-bedrooms would account for 35% of the market housing provision.
Low Carbon Design (Policy E 12)	Residential development is expected to achieve a 19% reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate.	Again, it is unclear whether the scheme is policy compliant on the basis of information provided.
EV Charging Infrastructure (Policy IN3)	Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure should be provided for each new residential unit with private off-street parking.	It does not appear as though the applicant proposes to address this policy requirement.
Management Plans (Policy IN5)	A management plan is likely to be required through a legal agreement to establish the whole life management and maintenance of the common parts within the development.	It is noted the applicant has submitted a landscape maintenance and management specification. However, this only covers one type of common part in the development.

In order to more effectively assess the scheme's compliance with emerging policy, it is recommended that the applicant should submit a Compliance Check.

Affordable Housing:

Policy CS9 sets out an affordable housing requirement of 30-40% on sites or 15 dwellings (gross) or more. This is reinforced by emerging Policy H2 which sets out a requirement for 30% affordable housing on sites resulting in a net gain of 10 or more dwellings. Of the 95 dwellings proposed, 34 of the units are proposed to be affordable equivalent to 35% across the site.

Criterion b. of the emerging policy sets out that 10% of the total of new homes (gross) should be shared ownership (as part of the affordable housing), with the balance being rented. This is because the Council's preferred route to affordable home ownership is shared ownership in the context of Annex 2 of the 2019 NPPF. It is noted that 10 of the 34 affordable units will be provided as shared ownership, equivalent to 10.5% of the total new homes. The Council's Housing Officer will be able to provide further advice in terms of the mix should be provided.

Parking:

The proposals would need to ensure that appropriate parking provision is provided in accordance with Policy DM13, emerging policy IN3 and the Council's Parking SPD.

The submitted Transport Assessment indicates that a total of 173 spaces would be provided split between allocated, unallocated and visitor parking spaces. Of these, 19 would be for visitors. Based on the submitted housing mix, the allocated parking space requirement would generate a total requirement of 190 spaces:

Size of Dwelling	No. of Units	Minimum car Parking Requirements	Number of Spaces Required
Allocated Spaces			
1 Bed Unit	2	1 Space	2
2 Bed Unit	51	2 Spaces	102
3 Bed Unit	37	2 Spaces	74
4 Bed Unit	4	3 Spaces	12
Total			190

With an additional 20% of unallocated parking for visitors (38 spaces), there would be an overall requirement of 228 spaces. Overall, there would therefore be a deficit of 55 car parking spaces. Paragraph 3.07 of the Parking SPD indicates that outside of the town centres, this will be assessed on a case by case basis. A justification would need to be provided which considers accessibility to shops and services, accessibility to public transport and the site's relation to the relative accessibility of different areas (as set out in table 3.1 of the SPD).

It is noted the applicant proposes to provide cycle parking spaces in accordance with the requirements of the Parking SPD.

Summary:

Notwithstanding the very limited evidence that has been provided in respect of the commercial element of the scheme, the development proposals are broadly supported in policy terms. In addition, the applicant should be aware that there is clear requirement in the S106 attached to the outline consent for the commercial element to be marketed alongside the residential scheme.

There are various shortcomings against the emerging requirements in the Pre-Submission Plan. It is recommended that a Compliance Check is sought in order to better understand the extent to which the scheme complies with emerging policy which has limited weight at this stage. It is also noted the site is situated within the built-up area and is generally compliant with the Adopted Local Plan which is a consideration.

It is noted that the applicant proposes more than 30% affordable housing (at 35%) and this is welcomed. However, it is noted that insufficient level of car parking is proposed against the Council's adopted car parking requirements. As such, the applicant will need to provide justification which assesses the site's accessibility as set out above.

Portsmouth Water Company

Further Comments 7.5.20

Portsmouth Water have no objections to the reserved matters application as submitted. We have no comments to make concerning the discharge of conditions 5, 15 and 16, as these are matters for the Local Planning Authority.

Please do consult us on any future applications for the discharge of conditions 10, 11, 17 and 18 of planning permission APP/18/00244

Property Management (formerly County Estates Department) Hampshire County Council

No comments received

Public Spaces

No comments received

Southern Electric

No comments received

Southern Gas Network

No comments received

Traffic Management

Further Comments

The Traffic Team have no further comment to make.

Original Comments

The Traffic Team have no adverse comment to make.

Waste Services Manager

No comments 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: 35

Number of site notices: 6

Statutory advertisement: 10/01/2020

Number of representations received: 0

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highways, parking and accessibility issues
- (v) Drainage and flood risk
- (vi) Contamination Issues / Air Quality
- (vii) Ecology

- (viii) Housing issues/ Affordable Housing
- (ix) Arboricultural impacts
- (x) Archaeology
- (Xi) Education
- (xii) Developer Contributions/CIL and S106 requirements

(i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The site forms part of a larger development site granted outline planning permission under planning permission APP/18/00244 with the following description:

Outline application with all matters reserved. Mixed use development comprising up to 100 new homes, including up to 40% affordable, 2860 sqm of employment floorspace and improved access onto New Lane and Martin Road. On-site parking for residential and employment uses. Landscaping to be provided, including acoustic bund to rear of employment units and naturalisation of existing watercourse (full details to be submitted at a later stage).

The outline consent was granted on the 30th January 2019; there was also an associated S106 Agreement in relation to the outline consent.

- 7.3 The site lies within the urban area as defined by Policies CS17 and AL2 of the Local Plan which seek to concentrate new development within the five urban areas of the Borough. The development of the site is therefore acceptable in principle subject to other development management criteria.
- 7.4 Policies CS2 and DM3 of the Core Strategy generally safeguard the land or premises which were currently or last used for B use class employment purposes from other uses. However, the site is also allocated for development of about 90 dwellings and about 2,900 sqm of employment floorspace (classes B1, B2 and B8) under Policy H35 in the emerging Local Plan which can be afforded limited weight at this stage.
- 7.5 The site was formerly occupied by Colt International and the site was extensively covered by buildings ranging from a tall 5 storey block on the New Lane frontage to extensive lower workshop buildings to the rear. The uses on site were generally within the B use class of the use classes order. The buildings have now been demolished.
- 7.6 Whilst this application does not impact the employment land which formed part of the wider outline consent the S106 Agreement associated with that consent requires that the 2,860 sqm of employment floorspace is marketed alongside the residential element of the scheme. These issues have been explored in detail at the outline consent stage and it is not considered that determining the Reserved Matters application for the residential area would prejudice the employment land and its development.
- 7.7 The residential element of the wider development would provide much needed housing on the site to support the Councils housing delivery requirements.

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

- 7.8 This Reserved matters application follows the general layout approach of the Outline planning consent.

- 7.9 Vehicular access to the site is indicated to be from Martin Road. The access point is in the position of the existing access point to the Colt International development. Whilst the outline consent indicated two vehicular access points the development is now proposed to be served from one vehicular access. This is considered acceptable.
- 7.10 The Residential development is arranged in two areas, firstly the western end section (former Colt car park) which is elevated above the rest of the site. This area includes a cul-de-sac arrangement with 12 houses and a three storey block of 12 flats on the corner of Bartons Road/Martin Road frontage. This area is linked with pedestrian / cycle routes to Martin Road and Bartons Road. Given the character of the surrounding area, which includes three storey flatted blocks, the three storey frontage of the flats is considered acceptable in terms of the potential visual impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene.
- 7.11 The main part of the residential development is set at a lower level and is set down from the adjacent Bartons Road to varying degrees. The layout includes mainly short terraced development and with four pairs of semi-detached properties. There is also a flatted block of 4 storey (20 flats) on the Bartons Road frontage. It is noted that the height of the building relative to the street scene and residential properties opposite would be reduced by the drop from the road. Overall the Bartons Road frontage area to the site is considered to provide an opportunity to provide taller development given the levels, the significant width of Bartons Road and its surroundings and distance to residential properties to the northern side of Bartons Road.
- 7.12 The internal layout does result in areas of hardstanding to the south of the flats however this has been softened where possible by the introduction of landscaping to break up the run of spaces. The stream and banked area adjacent allow for opportunities to provide landscaping, ecological enhancement and attractive routes alongside this area. The naturalising of the stream has been raised with the developer and this has resulted in additional SUDs features, it has not unfortunately been possible to agree the naturalisation of the stream itself which runs through an engineered route and would continue to do so. There are also areas to the south of the site where limited open space and pedestrian/cycle routes linking Martin Road and New Lane are proposed. This area has been subject to detailed discussion seeking to provide an attractive space, whilst maximising overlooking, providing appropriate lighting and addressing security as far as possible. This aspect is considered further below.
- 7.13 To the east of the residential area is a proposed bank and acoustic fence. These features are required in order to provide a physical separation and barrier between the proposed employment uses to the east and the residential development. Requirements in terms of the management and maintenance of all common parts are secured through a S106 Agreement.
- 7.14 In relation to materials, alterations were sought and achieved to reduce the extent of metal cladding to the flats. The final details will be secured by condition.
- 7.15 Overall the site is relatively insular in terms of its impacts beyond the site with the change in levels dropping down from Bartons Road and existing trees to Martins Road and to the southern boundary reducing impacts beyond the site. The development would have a contemporary feel with modern designs helping to provide the development with its own sense of place. Whilst it is noted that the emerging contaminated land strategy is likely to introduce some land raising to cap the land, it is considered unlikely that this would result in unacceptable impacts beyond the site. A levels condition imposed on the Outline Consent will also be required to be

discharged.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.16 There are considered to be two aspects to the consideration of impacts on residential amenities, firstly the impacts on existing residential uses (in particular to the north of Bartons Road and the vicarage and properties further south in Martin Road) and for the future residents of the scheme.

Impacts on existing residential properties

- 7.17 To the north of the site is Bartons Road and beyond this are residential properties in West Leigh/Bartons Green. These properties are generally terraced houses with taller blocks of flats set further back from Bartons Road. The main impacts from the development are the potential for overlooking from the flats proposed.
- 7.18 The proposals show two blocks of flats fronting Bartons Road (the outline consent anticipated three blocks between three and five storeys).
- 7.19 The most eastern block is shown as four storeys in height. The site levels at this point are close to those of the road at the eastern end of the block. The distance to the closest residential dwelling house is approximately 31m to No.2 Kitwood Green, 33.5m to 1 Passfield Walk and 40m to No.1 Kitwood Green. These properties have principally flank walls facing towards the application site. Guidance in relation to appropriate separation distances between properties is provided in the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011. When considering back to back distances (a more direct relationship than to a flank wall) there should be a minimum separation of 20m. This is increased by 4m for each additional storey. The relationship here is 4 storey flats to two storey houses, therefore the minimum separation distance would be 28m and this is clearly exceeded and an acceptable relationship can therefore be achieved.
- 7.20 The western block is shown as three storey. It is noted that at this point the site is at a level commensurate to Bartons Road. The properties to the north set closest are two storey houses 89 and 91 Bartons Road which front Bartons Road. It is noted that they would not directly face the proposed flats. The distance between the flats and these properties at its closest point is approximately 34m. The minimum separation distance for 2 to 3 storey properties is 24m and this is easily exceeded. This relationship is considered acceptable.
- 7.21 To the west of the site is Martin Road with the Church of St Alban and a vicarage. The vicarage is located opposite two storey houses and a 2 1/2 storey house. The minimum separation distance is approximately 25.5m to the 2 storey houses and 30m to the 2 1/2 storey house, which exceeds the requirement to achieve a 20m separation to the 2 storey houses and a 22.5m separation for a 2 to 2 1/2 storey relationship. It is also noted that existing trees further screen the vicarage.
- 7.22 The outline application proposed a vehicular access opposite the Vicarage this is now not proposed in the current layout and this reduces impacts from traffic movement, it should also be noted that the Colt site provided access to the car park opposite the vicarage, there is an improvement therefore when compared to the business operation of the site in terms of impacts from vehicle movements opposite the vicarage.
- 7.23 The residential properties to the south west are set beyond Nest Business Park and some 76m from the closest part of the site. The main potential impact from the development to these properties is considered to relate to vehicular movements. Given

the separation distance and the previous use of the whole site as a business premises, the impact of residential traffic is considered acceptable.

Impacts on future residents

- 7.24 In relation to future residents there are considered to be three main issues, the relationship to the employment site, the layout of the development and relationships between properties and the adequacy of private or communal amenity spaces.
- 7.25 The mixed use development proposed by the outline consent and the requirements in policy terms to retain employment on the wider site brings with it challenges with regard to the relationship between the employment and residential elements. The employment site could include B2 general industrial uses and it is therefore necessary to ensure that this use would not be harmful to residential amenity particularly in relation to the nearest proposed residential properties. The site layout indicates that houses and flats back onto the employment site. The layout includes space for landscaping including a bank and acoustic fence and this would be secured as part of the employment development. The vehicular access points for the residential and employment sites would be separate and the business units would need to be serviced from the New Lane frontage. It is considered that subject to appropriate mitigation measures for the houses and flats, and the design of the industrial units the potential impacts from noise and odours can be suitably managed and mitigated to secure appropriate residential amenities for future residents.
- 7.26 The western part of the site is elevated above the eastern part. The area is served by a cul-de-sac and includes a three storey flat block with 12 flats and terraced, semi-detached and detached houses. This area has presented particular challenges in terms of making the best use of previously developed land whilst ensuring acceptable relationships between dwellings. This has resulted in amendment to the layout and the removal of one unit. As a result, the 12 houses in this part of the site have achieved 10m garden depths and appropriate levels of privacy between them.
- 7.27 The three storey flats are 11 x 2 bed and 1 x 1 bed units. The flats have limited shared amenity space, however with the exception of the ground floor 1 bed unit have either ground floor terraces or balconies to provide outdoor space. The flats would be sited closest to unit 4 set approximately 15m off with parking and a roadway between. Plot 4 has a flank wall facing with two landing windows in the elevation facing the flats. The Borough Design Guide recommends a 12m separation distance for a three to two and a half storey flank to front relationship. It is considered that the western part of the site provides appropriate residential amenities for future residents.
- 7.28 The eastern part of the site is served by one road which leads to cul-de-sacs. This area includes a four storey block of 20 flats together with 50 terraced and semi-detached houses. The dwellings are provided with 10m deep gardens and are laid out to provide acceptable separation distances as required by the Havant Borough Design Guide.
- 7.29 The flats are 19 x 2 bed and 1 x 1 bed units and with the exception of the 1 bed ground floor unit have either external terraces (ground floor) or balconies to provide outdoor space. The flats would be sited closest to units 71-73 with unit 71 in particular having the most direct relationship. The front of No.71 partly overlaps the closest part of the flats with a separation distance of approximately 9m across an access road. Whilst this is a tight relationship it is noted that the flats are orientated to the east with impacts on sun light limited to earlier morning times. After that the sun would move to the south of the flats and light the front of No.71. In relation to potential overlooking it is considered

important to restrict views from the floors 2, 3 and 4 from the nearest windows and balconies - a condition is therefore recommended in relation to obscure glazing to lounge/dining room windows (dual aspect rooms) and balcony part screen.

- 7.30 Overall, it is considered that the proposed layout is acceptable subject to appropriate conditions to ensure that residential amenities are appropriately addressed.

(iv) Highways, parking and accessibility issues

- 7.31 The application has been submitted with a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan forms part of the S106 requirements from the outline planning permission. The Highway Authority (HCC) have reviewed the proposals and the application has been amended where necessary to address issues identified. The internal layout is considered acceptable.
- 7.32 There are considered to be three main issues in relation to the highways aspects. The first relates to the suitability of the access points into the site and the suitability of the wider highway network to serve the development, secondly the parking proposed, thirdly the wider sustainability issues and links.

Access and highway networks

- 7.33 The proposed vehicular access point is from Martin Road to the residential areas. The access point is in the position of an existing access into the site and formerly served the Colt International business. The access point is considered acceptable by the Highways Authority.
- 7.34 In terms of the impact on the wider network, it is noted that the outline planning permission was for up to 100 units. The current application proposes 94 units (a slight reduction). Modelling in relation to relevant junctions has been carried out previously and HCC Highways have tested the modelling. This demonstrates that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the wider transport network. In addition, the Travel Plan in relation to the residential site, secured in the associated S106 Agreement, would seek to further reduce reliance on the private car and to encourage use of sustainable transport including walking, cycling and bus services. Off site highway improvements have been secured and a condition in relation to the need to enter into a S278 agreement has been recommended by HCC Highways.

Car and Cycle Parking

- 7.35 Car and cycle parking requirements have been assessed against the Councils Parking Standards SPD.
- 7.36 The western part of the site includes a block of 12 flats and 12 houses served off a cul-de-sac. The flats would require 15 spaces and 15 are proposed. The houses units 1-4 are 4 bed units which require 3 spaces per unit. This is achieved for units 3 and 4 but units 1 and 2 have 2 spaces. Units 6-13 are three bed units requiring 2 spaces each and this is achieved. In addition to the allocated spaces there are a further 2 unallocated spaces which would serve the shortfall for units 1 and 2.
- 7.37 The eastern part of the site includes a block of 20 flats and these would require 26 spaces and 26 are provided. With regard to the dwellings the following provision is noted:

Units 26 and 29 – 2 spaces required and provided,
 Units 27 and 28 – 3 unallocated spaces required and provided
 Units 30, 33 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 31 and 32 – 3 unallocated spaces required and provided
 Units 34 and 37 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 35 and 36 – 3 unallocated spaces required and provided
 Units 38 and 41 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 39 and 40 – 3 unallocated spaces required and provided
 Units 42 and 45 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 43 and 44 – 3 unallocated spaces required and provided
 Units 46 and 49 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 47 and 48 – 3 unallocated spaces required and provided
 Units 50 to 53 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 54 to 57 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 58 and 61 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 59 and 60 – 3 unallocated spaces required and provided
 Units 62 to 65 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 66 and 67 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 68 and 69 – 3 unallocated spaces required 4 provided
 Unit 70 – 2 spaces required and provided
 Units 71 to 74 – 6 unallocated spaces required and provided
 Unit 75 – 2 spaces required and provided

7.38 It is clear from the above assessment and the layout proposed that the application proposes a mix of allocated and unallocated parking for the houses proposed.

7.39 In addition to the above the Councils Parking Standards require 20% visitor parking and 19 spaces are provided. If the assessment is based on the need for 0.2 space per residential unit this would require 18.8 visitor spaces are provided. If calculated as 20% of the total spaces, the Transport Assessment states that a total of 173 spaces are provided split between allocated, unallocated and visitor parking. Therefore, excluding the 19 visitor spaces there are 154 spaces requiring 31 visitor spaces. It is noted however that Planning Policy state: *It is considered there would be likely to be a slight under provision of visitor parking spaces. It is noted this would be likely to be offset through flexibility as some of the houses have unallocated spaces.*

7.40 Overall the parking layout subject to a condition in relation to the unallocated parking not being allocated to specific units, it is considered on balance that the parking provision is acceptable.

7.41 In relation to cycle parking, the Councils parking standards require 1 space per unit for 1 bed units 2 spaces per unit for 2, 3 and 4 bed units.

7.42 The submitted plans show flats (14-25) are provided with 40 spaces which exceeds the requirement for 23 spaces. Flats (76-95) are provided with 40 spaces which meets the requirement for 39 spaces. There are also visitor spaces.

7.43 The houses will also require cycle parking and a condition is recommended to secure provision for flats and houses.

Wider sustainability issues and links

7.44 The proposed development has been assessed in relation to the requirements to improve accessibility to surrounding facilities including schools and public transport

and links to wider sustainable links. The development makes provision for links from the site with a cycle and pedestrian route between Martin Road and New Lane. In addition, pedestrian access points would be provided to Bartons Road including a further route linking towards the bus stop on Bartons Road and play areas to the east. There are also pedestrian and cycle links shown to the road accesses to Martin Road. These links provide permeability to the development and would help to integrate the development into the wider context of the site. Links between the upper level and lower level of the site are also provided. These links are also secured through the S106 Agreement in relation to the outline consent.

- 7.45 With regard to improvement and links beyond the site a revised drawing has been received for the off-site pedestrian and cycle improvements. This includes the provision of a shared pedestrian/cycle route to the Bartons Road frontage, a new refuge cycle/pedestrian crossing to Bartons Road, an improved crossing to Bartons Road and New Lane. These would be secured through the S106 Agreement.
- 7.46 Overall it is considered that the development proposed would have an acceptable impact on the highway network, parking can be adequately provided and sustainable links secured.

(v) Drainage and flood risk

- 7.47 There are two main aspects in relation to drainage, surface water and foul water.
- 7.48 The site is within Flood Zone 1 (low flood risk). There is an existing watercourse on the site which runs north south and then west east across the site.

Surface Water

- 7.49 With regard to surface water it is important to note that the current site is brownfield with industrial buildings and car parking covering much of the land. The current proposal would result in more open land especially in relation to garden areas which would help to mitigate run off.
- 7.50 The Surface Water drainage strategy is a linked system to attenuation tanks with a controlled release to the Lavant water course. The proposed surface water drainage scheme has been considered by the Local Lead Flood Authority, the Environment Agency, Portsmouth Water and Southern Water. Subject to the outline conditions which remain extant and the S106 obligations the approach to surface water drainage is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.51 A foul drainage plan has been provided. This shows both the residential system linking to a foul drainage system in New Lane. The outline condition in relation to Foul Drainage remains extant. Southern Water have confirmed that they *would have no objections to the reserved matters application for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. An application to communicate with the public foul sewerage system under Section 106 will be required to be submitted and approved by Southern Water Services.*
- An informative in relation to foul drainage is recommended.

(vi) **Contamination Issues / Air Quality**

- 7.52 Contamination issues have been considered in detail by the Councils Environmental Control Officer. The EA, Portsmouth Water and the Local Lead Flood Authority also commented on the Outline and Reserved Matters Application. The Outline Application

included contamination conditions which remain extant. Whilst it is clear from the Environmental Control Officers comments that there is further work required in relation to Contamination issues these can be addressed through the necessary submissions in relation to the extant Outline Consent conditions.

- 7.53 In relation to Air Quality whilst further measures would reduce impacts the current scheme which includes additional landscaping, cycle and pedestrian links and on site provision and replaces an industrial development which formerly covered the whole site is considered to result in an acceptable impact.

(vii) Ecology

- 7.54 In relation to Ecology the application has been accompanied by Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Strategy and the application has been amended during the course of its consideration to improve landscaping provision and the area around the existing watercourse for ecology.
- 7.55 Further mitigation measures are proposed for on site ecological features such as Badgers (further monitoring) and nesting birds. Lighting is also addressed. Bird and bat boxes are included and necessary in the highly urbanised environment.
- 7.56 The proposed wildflower meadow planting swathe through the centre of the site is welcomed, as is the inclusion of various native-led soft landscaping features. The landscape management strategy is now aligned with the ecologists recommendations and is considered acceptable.
- 7.57 The Councils Ecologist confirms that he is content with the scope of the proposed mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures and a condition is recommended to secure these.

(viii) Housing issues/ Affordable Housing

- 7.58 Policy CS9 sets out an affordable housing requirement of 30-40% on sites or 15 dwellings (gross) or more. This is reinforced by emerging Policy H2 which sets out a requirement for 30% affordable housing on sites resulting in a net gain of 10 or more dwellings. The S106 Agreement with the Outline Consent requires 35% Affordable Housing Provision. Of the 94 dwellings proposed, 33 of the units are proposed to be affordable equivalent to 35% across the site. The affordable housing mix and tenure is now considered to be acceptable by the Councils Housing Officer. The S106 Agreement sets out other detailed requirements.

(ix) Arboricultural impacts

- 7.59 The Arboricultural impacts of the proposed development have been considered in detail by the Councils Arboricultural Officer. The site has been cleared and there are no significant trees within the main site area. The details are now considered to have an acceptable impact on off site trees.

(x) Archaeology

- 7.60 Archaeological requirements were addressed at outline stage by the imposition of condition 4 of planning permission APP/18/00244 this condition was subsequently discharged on the 30th January 2020.

(xi) Education

- 7.61 At Outline application stage the County Children's Services Department confirmed that they would not be seeking a contribution from this development for either primary or secondary school places.

(xii) Crime Prevention Issues

- 7.62 It is noted that concerns have been raised by the Crime Prevention Officer and the Landscape Officer in particular in relation to the cycle/pedestrian route to New Lane and the small area of landscaping/Public Open Space adjacent to it in the south-east corner of the site.
- 7.63 The link to New Lane at this point is considered to be an important feature of the site's permeability for non-car based access routes across the site for both the residential and later business development on the site. These have been secured in consultation with the County Highway Authority at outline stage and help to link the site to industrial development and employment opportunities in New Lane and routes to Havant Station, the Town Centre and Havant Bus station to the south of the site. This route has been secured through the S106 Agreement associated with the outline planning permission.
- 7.64 The small area of open space including an informal play area and landscaping have been part of the outline and reserved matters stage layouts and allow for an appropriate attractive setting for the route and the protection of off site trees. It is recognised that the area presents challenges in terms of crime prevention and security. During the course of the application various measures have been included to improve the overlooking to this area. These include the re-orientation of units 30-33 to allow more direct views; windows and front door to the elevation of unit 34 facing the cycle / footpath and open space; changes to planting to ensure more visibility into the area; the reduction in car parking to the front of the area; and amended lighting proposals. Whilst the issues of the Crime Officer are understood, it is considered that a pedestrian and cycle route at this point is a key measure for encouraging sustainable transport use and that the landscaping and open space provides an acceptable setting for the route with the enhanced measures to secure better passive surveillance of the area. A condition is recommended to secure security enhancements in this and other parts of the site.

(xii) Developer Contributions/CIL, S106 and APP/18/00244 condition requirements

- 7.65 The Reserved Matters application results in CIL being chargeable based on the residential floorspace. Exemptions in relation to Affordable Housing would need to be pursued with the appropriate forms. The total CIL liability without exemptions would be based on a floorspace of 7,875sqm - £937,337.85
- 7.66 The S106 Agreement accompanying the Outline Planning Permission secured the following:

Residential Land

Affordable Dwellings

35% of the dwellings

Affordable Housing Mix - to secure the number, size and tenure of the affordable dwellings

Affordable dwellings compatible with the design of open market dwellings

No to occupy more than 60% of open market dwellings until affordable dwellings -

completed and ready for occupation and transferred to an Affordable housing provider

Common Parts

Management and Maintenance
Management Plan

SuDs

Residential SuDs - SuDs Drainage Scheme
Residential Land SuDs - Bond
Residential Land Cash Deposit

Residential Highways Works

Residential Highways Agreement

Travel Plan

Residential Travel Plan

Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy

Financial Contribution secured prior to construction of any dwelling

Whole Agreement

Monitoring Fee - £10,000

- 7.67 The Outline Consent included a number of Conditions relating to the Residential Element of the scheme. These are outlined below including noting whether they have previously been discharged, remain to be discharged or will be discharged as part of this submission:

Outline Planning Conditions:

Condition 1 – Reserved Matters requirements - (met by this submission);
Condition 2 – Reserved Matters (access; appearance; landscaping; layout and scale) – (met by this submission)
Condition 3 – Approved Plans – Compliance Condition
Condition 4 – Archaeology – Discharged 30.1.20
Condition 5 – Ecological Mitigation – Applied for discharge as part of this application – part discharged (see APP/18/00244)
Condition 6 – Ecological Re-Survey – Extant condition
Condition 7 – Foul and Surface Water Drainage – Extant condition
Condition 8 – Contamination – Part Discharged 11.7.19 (Part 1 and 2 Only)
Condition 9 – Verification Report Contamination – Extant condition
Condition 10 – Previously Unidentified Contamination – Extant condition
Condition 11 – Piling – Extant condition
Condition 12 – BREEAM (flats) – Extant condition
Condition 13 – BREEAM (flats) – Extant condition
Condition 14 – Construction Management Plan – Extant condition
Condition 15 – Vehicular access points in vicinity of existing points – Applied for discharge as part of this application. - Part Discharged see APP/18/00244)
Condition 16 – Pedestrian / Cycle Route requirements – Applied for discharge as part of this application.- Part Discharged see APP/18/00244)
Condition 17 – Surface Water Drainage requirements – Extant condition
Condition 18 – Construction Environmental Management Plan – Part discharged 11.7.19 phase 2 enabling works.
Condition 19 – Site Levels Extant condition
Condition 20 – Arboricultural Impact Extant condition

Condition 21 – Contractors Parking and Material Storage Extant condition
Condition 22 – Employment Phase Condition – N/A
Condition 23 – Road provision prior to occupation Extant condition
Condition 24 – Employment Phase Condition- N/A
Condition 25 – Road and Footway Construction Extant condition

- 7.68 As noted above the current application seeks to discharge the following Outline Planning Permission conditions:

Condition 5:

Prior to the commencement of any specific phase of development hereby approved (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) an ecological mitigation and enhancement strategy shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It shall include (but not necessarily be restricted to): details of all measures (methods, location, timings) to protect ecological features and measures (methods, location, number, type and ongoing maintenance) to compensate and enhance the site post-development. All ecological mitigation and enhancement features shall be permanently retained and maintained.

Reason: To protect biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, the NERC Act (2006), National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011.

- 7.69 It is considered that this condition cannot be fully discharged as it relates not just to the Residential element of the Outline Planning Consent but also to the Employment element. The revised ecological condition will secure the ecological requirements for the residential element. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Condition 5 for the Residential phase only can be discharged – see separate decision letter on APP/18/00244.

7.70 Condition 15:

The vehicular access points for the site shall be provided in the vicinity of the existing access points serving the site with full details of final design, form and operation provided as part of the reserved matters planning application.

Reason: To ensure appropriate access to the development is provided having due regard to policy CS20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 7.71 This is a compliance condition not requiring formal discharge. It is however considered that the access point associated with the Residential Phase only meets the above requirement - Part Discharged see APP/18/00244).

7.72 Condition 16:

The details to be submitted in respect of the access reserved matters shall make provision for

(i) an additional pedestrian route to Bartons Road linking to a position in the vicinity of the Bartons Road Bus shelter (shown on drawing No. A090070-182(ST1)31 Rev A)

(ii) the pedestrian / cycle route to Bartons Road shown indicatively on drawing No. A090070-182(ST1)31 Rev A

(iii) the pedestrian / cycle route between Martin Road and New Lane

The routes shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: *To improve the permeability of the central area residential of the site to the surrounding area including public transport links having due regard to policies CS20 and DM11 and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

- 7.73 The submitted details secure the routes (i), (ii) and (iii) above in the positions required. The condition requires the provision of the routes prior to occupation of the dwellings. At this stage it can be - Part Discharged see APP/18/00244)

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 In conclusion, the principle of the development has been established by Outline Planning Permission APP/18/00244. The outline consent also imposed conditions in relation to the development and required a S106 Agreement.
- 8.2 The development proposes a slight reduction in the number of units (outline up to 100 units, Reserved Matters 94 units). The development generally follows the Outline layout but with 2 blocks of flats instead of 3 and with a max 4 storeys instead of 5. The quantum of development and its layout and design are considered to be acceptable and would have an appropriate impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- 8.3 The layout has been carefully considered in relation to its impact on existing and future residents and amended as necessary to ensure suitable separation distances and to avoid unacceptable overlooking. Conditions are proposed where necessary to consider and mitigate detailed impacts.
- 8.4 The impact on the highway network, improvements to non-car based links and the internal layout including parking have been assessed in detail and the development is considered acceptable.
- 8.5 Drainage and flood risk issues and contamination issues are addressed as necessary by extant Outline Conditions or new conditions as required. Ecological mitigation is secured and improvements provided when compared to the original industrial use of the whole site.
- 8.6 In relation to affordable housing the S106 set requirements which remain extant. The amended details provide 35% affordable housing with an appropriate mix.
- 8.7 Other impacts for example impacts on Trees and Archaeology have either previously been addressed or are considered acceptable. Whilst concerns have been raised by the Crime Reduction Officer in respect of the pedestrian/cycle route provided through to New Lane, it is considered that a pedestrian and cycle route at this point is a key measure for encouraging sustainable transport use and that the landscaping and open space provides an acceptable setting for the route with enhanced measures proposed and also to be secured by condition to secure better passive surveillance of the area.
- 8.8 Developer contributions in relation to CIL will be secured as a result of the development as will Solent Recreational Mitigation Strategy contributions in accordance with the S106 Agreement.
- 8.9 Overall it is considered the Reserved Matters application for the Residential element of the scheme can be recommended for planning permission and will make a significant contribution to the Councils housing needs.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS** for application APP/19/01166

(A) subject to the following conditions

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

Plans

Location Plan Drawing Number 001 Rev P01
Proposed Block Site Plan Drawing No. 003 Rev A08
Proposed Site Plan Drawing No. 0004 Rev A08
Proposed Site Sections A-A and B-B east – west Drawing Number 0015 Rev A02 (as amended)
Proposed Site Sections C-C, D-D and E-E south-north Drawing Number 0016 Rev A02 (as amended)
Block A Proposed Floor Plans Flats 14-25 Drawing No. 0040 Rev A01
Block A Proposed Elevations Flats 14-25 Drawing No. 0041 Rev A03
Block A Proposed Elevations Flats 14-25 Drawing No. 0042 Rev A03
Block B Proposed Floor Plans Flats 76-95 Drawing Number 0050 Rev A01
Block B Proposed Elevations Flats 76-95 Drawing No. 0051 Rev A03
Block B Proposed Elevations Flats 76-95 Drawing No. 0052 Rev A03
Plots 1 and 4 Plans and Elevations Drawing No. 0121 Rev A03
Plots 2 and 3 Plans and Elevations Drawing No. 0123 Rev A01
Plots 6-8 and 11-13 Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 0116 Rev A02
Plots 9-10 Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 0117 Rev A03
Plots 26-27 and 28-29 Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 0120 Rev A01
Plots 30-33 Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 0119 Rev A02
Plots 34-37 Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 0112 Rev A03
Plots 38-41 Inc 42 -45 Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 0113 Rev A03
Plots 46-49 Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 0122 Rev A01
Plots 50-53 & 54-57 Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 0118 Rev A03
Plots 58-65 Floor Plans Drawing Number 0114 Rev A01
Plots 58-65 Elevations Drawing Number 0115 Rev A02
Plots 66-70 Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 0111 Rev A03
Plots 71-75 Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 0110 Rev A02
Elevation Materials (Typical) Drawing No. 0130 Rev A02
Elevation Materials Drawing No. 0131 Rev A02
Tenure Plan received 24th June 2020
Schedule of Accommodation Rev C 24th June 2020
Off Site Highway Proposals Sheet 1 of 2 Drawing No. 039.5018.101 Rev C
Off Site Highway Proposals Sheet 2 of 2 Drawing No. 039.5018.102 Rev C
Refuse Vehicle Tracking and Strategy Review Drawing No. 039.5018.001 Rev D
Fire Tender Tracking Review Drawing No. 039.5018.002 Rev D
Car Parking Tracking Review Drawing No. 039.5018.003 Rev D
Junction and Forward Visibility Splays Review Drawing No. 039.5018.004 Rev D
Private Lighting Layout Drawing No 100102.COLT.1300 Rev P03
Private Lighting Report J Lighting 27th May 2020 100102.COLT.003.C
Foul Water Strategy Layout Plan Drawing No. 19142-WFB-XX-XX-DR-C-0501 Rev P02
Surface Drainage Strategy Layout Plan Drawing No. 19142-WFB-XX-DR-X-0500

Rev P03
Site Levels Drawing No. 19142-WFB-XX-xx-DR-C-0600 Rev P04
Landscape Site Plan Drawing No. 1501 Rev PL02
Combined Hard & Soft General Landscape Arrangement Plan – Sheet 1 of 3
Drawing Number 1502 Rev PL02 (as amended in relation to open space area south-east part of the site)
Combined Hard & Soft General Landscape Arrangement Plan – Sheet 2 of 3
Drawing Number 1503 Rev PL02 (as amended in relation to open space area south-east part of the site)
Combined Hard & Soft General Landscape Arrangement Plan – Sheet 3 of 3
Drawing Number 1504 Rev PL02 (as amended in relation to open space area south-east part of the site)
Landscape Management Plan Drawing No. 7001 Rev PL03
Tree Protection Plan Drawing Number TPP-KC/COLTS/001 Rev 0

Documents

Planning Design and Access Statement November 2019 (as amended)
Landscape Design & Access Statement Report No. D2763-FAB-00-XX-DR-L-0010 Rev PL02
Electrical and Schedules Drawing No. 100102.COLT.1400 Rev P03
Design Parameters Lighting J Lighting Project No. 100102.B
Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Strategy Ecosupport April 2020
Landscape CDM Risk Register Document Number D2763-FAB-00-XX-RR-L-0001 Rev PL02
Landscape Maintenance & Management Specification April 2020
D2763_FAB_00_XX_SP_L_07000 Rev PL03
Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement Technical Arboriculture Ref AIA/AMS-KC/DS/COLTS/001 Rev A April 2020
Affordable Housing Statement Revision C – June 2020
Flood Risk Assessment Addendum WFBA Document Ref: 19142-WFB-YY-XX-RO-C-0001 dated 19th December 2019
Drainage Strategy Statement WFBA Report Number COLTINTDS001 dated 19th November 2019
Marketing Letter re Employment Land Savills dated 9th September 2019
Reserved Matters Transport Assessment and Appendices November 2019 Rev 2 dated 11th November 2019
Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT

2 Prior to commencement of development, the applicant shall enter into a Highways agreement for the site access works onto Martin Road. Prior to occupation of the development, the applicant shall implement the access works as detailed in drawing number 039.5018.101 Rev C.

Reason: To provide appropriate vehicular access to the development having due regard to policies CS20 and DM11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3 Prior to the commencement of development a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the principles within the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include:

a) The condition of the monsoon drain within the application site, which shall be investigated and any required improvement carried out. Evidence of this, including photographs shall be submitted before any connection is made.

b) Confirmation on how impacts of high groundwater will be managed in the design of the proposed drainage system to ensure that storage capacity is not lost, and structural integrity is maintained.

c) A maintenance and management plan for the entire surface water drainage system, including a plan illustrating the organisation responsible for each element, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Local Lead Flood 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.

NO ABOVE GROUND DEVELOPMENT

4 Notwithstanding the submitted details no above ground development shall commence 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 occupied 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 policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5 No above ground construction works shall take place until plans and particulars specifying the provision to be made for external lighting of the same has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. There shall be no external lighting on the site other than as thereby approved.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality, in the interests of traffic safety and ecology and having due regard to policies CS11, CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6 Notwithstanding the submitted details no above ground works shall be commenced unless and until consolidated details of soft landscaping for the site including planting schedules, species and numbers / density of planting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall also include planting proposals to the south of plot 66 and within the public open space area to the south-east of the site.

The approved landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with any approved any timing / phasing arrangements or within the first planting season following final occupation of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner.

Any trees or shrubs planted or retained in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and 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 policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

PRIOR TO OCCUPATION

8 Notwithstanding the submitted details the residential development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until the following features aimed at improving security and safety and reducing anti-social behaviour have been provided:

- All rear access gates to residential properties shall be fitted with key operated locks which operate from both sides of the gate;
- Secure access gates shall be fitted at the start of each communal rear access path. These gates shall be visually permeable (for example a railing gate) and at least 1.8m high fitted with key operated locks from both sides of the gate;
- Within the public realm visitor cycle parking shall be provided with cycle stands with secured by design accreditation;
- Details of secure boundary treatment to the southern boundary of plot 34 in accordance with details to be submitted in relation to Condition 14.

Reason: To provide for the safety and security of residents and visitors having due regard to policy CS16 of Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of Block B (plots 76-95) hereby permitted the balconies in the first, second and third floors on the elevation facing west, serving flats 6, 11 and 16 shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, a balcony screen from the south west corner of the balcony and projecting to half the width of the balcony in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and retained in accordance with the approved details as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the future occupiers of plots 71 and 72 and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10 The unallocated parking for the flats and houses shall at no time be marked or individually allocated to a particular flat or house but shall be available for all residents of the flats and houses.

Reason: To ensure appropriate car parking is available to residents of the development and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Council Parking SPD 2016 (Partially updated September 2019) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

11 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of Block B (plots 76-95) hereby permitted the living/kitchen/dining room windows in the first, second and third floors on the elevation facing west flats 6, 11 and 16 shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the future occupiers of plots 71 and 72 and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core

Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

12 The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use unless and until details of cycle storage are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision of sustainable transport options and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 Havant Borough Parking Standards SPD 2016 (as amended) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

13 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be provided in a phased manner in accordance with a Phasing Plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be made fully available for use prior to the occupation of each related phase and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

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

14 No part of the development shall be first occupied until details of the type, siting, design and materials to be used in the construction of all means of enclosure including boundaries, screens or retaining walls, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved structures have been erected in accordance with the approved details. The structures shall thereafter be retained.

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.

COMPLIANCE CONDITIONS

15 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (Technical Arboriculture) AIA/AMS-KC/DS/COLTS/001 Rev A April 2020 and Tree Protection Plan hereby approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees in the interests of the character and appearance of the area having due regard to policies CS11 and DM8 of Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

16 Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed within the Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Strategy (EcoSupport, April 2020) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement features shall be installed, managed and monitored in accordance with this document and shall be retained in a location and condition suited to their intended purpose.

Reason: To protect biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, the NERC Act (2006), National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

