
Site Address:	Hayling Garage, 2-4 Church Road, Hayling Island		
Proposal:	Single storey side extension to create a work shelter. (Retrospective Application)		
Application No:	APP/20/00315	Expiry Date:	16/06/2020
Applicant:	Mr Gates		
	Hayling Garage		
Agent:	Mr Murray	Case Officer:	Selina Donophy
	I J Murray Associates Ltd		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 This application site is Hayling Garage which is located on the east side of Church Road, Hayling Island. The garage is located on the junction where Church Road meets Tournembury Lane , with a frontage along Church Road and vehicular access via Tournembury Lane. The site is opposite to a Co-op store and residential properties lie to the north and east.
- 1.2 The application site includes a car showroom forecourt located to the West of the garage building, bordering the public highway along Church Road as well as round to the South, bordering Tournembury Lane. There is a low brick boundary wall along this perimeter which runs parallel to the site where the side extension/ work shelter is proposed as part of this application- as this is a retrospective application, this has already been constructed and is currently in full use.
- 1.3 The garage currently has planning consent for the sale of cars and workshop, with office space and a residential flat above. It is noted that there have been two applications submitted for a similar scheme, one in 2010 under reference 10/51526/003 which was refused and another in 2020 under reference APP/20/00032 which was also refused planning permission.

2 Planning History

10/51526/003 - Single storey side extension (south.), REF,21/06/2010

APP/20/00032 - Retrospective application for single storey side extension to create work shelter., REF,06/03/2020

3 Proposal

Single storey side extension to create a work shelter. (Retrospective Application)

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS2 (Employment)
CS3 (Skills and Employability)
DM10 (Pollution)
DM14 (Car and Cycle Parking on Development (excluding residential))

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

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

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Leah Turner - Hayling East

No comment received

Councillor M Wilson - Hayling West Ward

No comment received

Councillor R Raines - Hayling East

No comment received

Economic Development, Havant Borough Council

No comments received

Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

No comments received

Hampshire Constabulary, Tasking & Co-Ordination Directorate

No comments received

Hampshire Highways

The proposal has been subject to a previous application that was refused. The Highway Authority was previously consulted and made the following comment:

"The development has not affected any accesses to the highway network, I therefore confirm the Highway Authority have no objection."

The previous application was refused by HBC with one of the refusal reasons relating to highways/parking and reads as follows:

“Development of the site in the manner proposed would not provide adequate provision of car parking in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's adopted standards and would therefore encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway, leading to indiscriminate parking, detrimental to highway amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the adopted Parking SPD 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework”

In order to overcome the previous refusal reason, the current scheme has rearranged the layout to provide 5 new parking spaces at the front of the property to be used by staff and customers.

There is, however, it appears no site layout plan submitted and as such a full and proper assessment of the proposal cannot be made.

The applicant should submit a site layout plan demonstrating the layout changes for review.

HBC will need to determine in their capacity as local parking authority that the level of parking provision proposed falls in line with adopted standards.

Comments following submission of parking plan :

Further to the Highway Authority's response dated 12th May 2020, the applicant has now submitted parking plan A106 which details the location of 5 new parking bays in the north western corner of the site.

The applicant should confirm that these parking bays measure 2.4m x 4.8m (complying with Havant's parking SPD), especially given that the width of the eastern parking bay looks to be restricted by the reception area of the building. To prevent overflow parking onto the highway (as detailed in the previous refusal), this matter must be addressed. In their capacity as parking authority, Havant Borough Council should decide whether the quantum of parking proposed sufficiently meets their standards.

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: 7

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Comment	Officer Comment
Object - The proposed new parking spaces for employees and customers would take the place of part of the current sales parking areas which is already full (incidentally as at 14 May 2020 the area is still being used to display cars for sale). The loss of this area would surely be counterproductive on the sales business; where will the cars currently being	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of this report.

displayed for sale be relocated? Also using this area on a regular daily basis does not appear practical as it would require some very tight manoeuvring to park. It would also create further traffic issues with vehicles trying to enter and exit the premises on to the busy Church Road and crossing the pedestrian pavement.

The proposal would also not remove the various Company cars and trucks which are permanently parked in Tournerbury Lane when not in use and adversely impact the traffic flow and visibility. For example the company recovery truck permanently resides in Tournerbury Lane making access in and out of the residential properties difficult as there is no clear view of ongoing traffic from either direction and on occasions preventative action is needed by passing traffic to avoid accidents. Therefore the indiscriminate parking would continue to be detrimental to the highway amenity.

The side extension even with its lowered height only by 0.5 metres, will still be overly bulky and harmful to the character of the mainly residential area. The proposed white cladding will make the building even more impactful making it stand out more than is currently the case thereby harming the streetscene further and be detrimental to the amenities in the area. It would also need regular cleaning.

The accompanying plans do not reflect the reality of the street view, with many more cars being on the forecourt for sale than shown in the pictorial plans accompanying the application.

Before the extension was created the outdoor area was used to park vehicles NOT for work to be completed on cars. Whilst indoor space is obviously an advantage the fact remains that regrettably the curtilage of the premises is clearly not sufficient to accommodate the level of work now being attempted. With respect the size of the site cannot be expanded to safely make room for the number of employees and cars and customers now trying use the facilities, whilst ensuring the safety of the pedestrians and vehicles passing by on both Church Road and Tournerbury Lane. With today's strict social distancing rules, and such likely to continue for some time, the number of employees required and customers visiting would seem to make it extremely difficult to ensure compliance.

Perhaps alternative premises could be found for the workshop so that the existing site can be used safely just for car sales? Historically the garage was

profitable with work levels maintained and accommodated within the premises and were not impactful on the local area.

The area within the structure is used for both welding and grinding and also noxious substances will be used as is of course fuel. Exhausts have been fitted for over 2 years. There remains a real health and safety risk both to passing pedestrians and school children giving that the raised level of ground means exhaust fumes and sparks could be emitted at or close to face level. The reverse camber at the entrance to the building is also of a health and safety concern.

There is further issue in that the reduced free outdoor space raises another unnecessary risk for the residents of the flats above the garage premises. The only entrance and exit to the flats is via a spiral staircase which is directly in front of, and in very close proximity to, the entrance extension. The residents have to walk through and across the area (previously only used to display cars) to exit and their properties. With vehicles also parked in front of the opening doors to the extension it creates further hazards for those residents. The use of noxious and potentially explosive products, which are well associated with workshop environments, must surely be of concern. If a resident was half way up or down the spiral staircase they would be in the direct line of any hazards emitted from the extension entrance.

There is an inadequate view of pedestrians and cars approaching from the western side as the extension has impacted on the clear visibility of Tournerbury Lane.

It is hoped that the Planning department will find these comments helpful when assessing the application (which has been made for a third time) and is believed to be an overdevelopment of the site. There is often much inconvenience to passing traffic, in view of the parked vehicles using or visiting the garage, some of which are regularly seen transcending the double yellow lines at the entrance to Tournerbury Lane.

If approved, it is assumed that the health and safety issues will be formally considered as part of the retrospective application to ensure compliance with building regulations.

In addition to the comments made dated 15th May 2020, which remain valid, the following relate solely to the plan submitted by IJ Murray and logged on the Planning portal dated

22/5/20.

The areas adjacent to the extension together with the rear access are far from flat. The access slope to the rear is steep and there is a severe reverse camber to the left on entering the rear of the premises.

The 20 external parking spaces are not parking spaces per se but display places and do not provide sufficient space to allow doors to open to provide easy access to vehicles. The area to the front of the premises is full with cars on display for sale.

The area shown as the designated parking area is so tight that a driver would be unable to get out of the car without much difficulty due to the closeness of the adjacent vehicles. Manoeuvring into and out of the space, adjacent to the front row of cars for sale would not be conducive to use on a regular daily basis. Interestingly no dimensions or measurements are included with the plan or evidence of turning circles which would clearly indicate that the site is too small to accommodate what is being proposed.

The entrance and exit to the spiral staircase is directly in front of the extension and not as shown on the plan.

Regrettably it remains that the site is too small to accommodate the level of work now being attempted and the overflow parking in Tournerville Lane continues as per all the points made in the communication dated 15th May 2020

I hope the above is helpful to HB Planning in their assessment of this third application.

Object -

I object to the planning proposal

1 -the original planning application was for a valeting bay/work shelter now it has a 2 poster ramp fixed to the floor

2- this shed is actually another fully fitted workshop unit

And has been refused before.

3- the noise generated from the shed is very loud as it is not insulated .

4-parking for hayling garage is all down Tournerville road as the Hayling garage vehicles are there day and night .

Customers cars too are parked down tournerville road which should not be acceptable.

As per Alister McMurrey letter from highways

He stated

No site layout for these 5 spaces which puts the parking back on to the highways .

5 - on leaving the coop when cars are parked on the

Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of this report.

yellow lines or backing out of the hayling garage The oncoming cars from church Rd have to go round in to the oncoming traffic from the coop and Tournurbury Rd which is putting the public at risk of an accident . I do not support this planning application If the premises had enough parking they should park their own vehicles on their site . I think you should send out a letter to all the people in Tournurbury and roads leading off to ask them as since the new estate has opened traffic has been heavy .	
Object- have several photos of the vehicles belonging to this garage Parked day and night on side of the Road but never on the garage Site Why is it now they can provide 5 spaces for parking but don't have room for their own vehicles ?	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of this report.
Support - FULL SUPPORT FOR THIS APPLICATION I see the first application has been declined i don't understand why?. I still support the application,in regards to the parking if they have to mark out new spaces on the premises then so be it but the cars parked down tournurbury, That road has been just as busy since the new houses was built and cars have been parked all the way up and down the road way before the new shelter even was built. in regards to the visual of the building not fitting with the area and being overly bulky, can somebody at the council please explain to me how their new building is not fitting and overly bulky when it is surrounded buy a Power sub station across the road , a fairly large metal fabrication shop also across the road and the co-op building opposite which is the largest of them all. Please could you respond to me by email thank you. Just to add, before that building went up they were repairing cars on the side anyway so if anything the noise level will go up if they have to remove it surely? FULL SUPPORT FOR THIS APPLICATION	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of this report.

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) Parking
- (v) Impact on local businesses/ economic development

(i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

History of the site

- 7.3 A planning application was made at this site in 2010 for a side extension to the south elevation under reference 10/51526/003 . This proposal was for a side extension in the same position , with a shallow sloped roof with a height of 3.2 metres to the highest level, a depth of 7.9 metres and a width of 5 metres. This included a large roller shutter door to the Western elevation and the Eastern elevation. Materials proposed included upvc cladding to match the existing frontage with the side wall covered with white render with metal sheet roofing to be coloured in mid grey. This scheme was very similar to the current application, which differs in materials and dimension, with a depth reduction of one metre yet a height increase by approximately 0.7 metres.
- 7.4 A side extension was subsequently constructed without the required permission and a retrospective proposal was submitted under application reference APP/20/00032 for a side extension on the South elevation of the main garage building which is used as an additional work space. The extension has dimensions of approximately 3.9 metres height with 5 metres width and 6.9 metres depth. It has one large, black metal roller shutter door to the front which is visible from Church Road , and one to the rear, which is where the car repair works take place and which is visible from Tournerbury Lane . The structure has a flat roof and is constructed of dark green metal cladding with a flat roof constructed of a clear plastic roofing sheet on a metal frame . Access to the site is maintained off Tournerbury Lane. This application was refused permission for reasons which shall be discussed under the 'Impact on the character and appearance of the area' section.
- 7.5 This current application is the third made for a similar proposal, a side extension to the south elevation in the same position as previously proposed. This would have proportions of approximately 3.4 metres in height, 5 metres in width and 6.9 metres in depth. It would have white roller shutter doors to the east and west elevations, with a flat roof comprising of a clear plastic roofing sheet on a metal frame and would have white pvc cladding to the elevations. Access to the site is maintained off Tournerbury Lane, with 5 additional car parking spaces proposed.

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

- 7.6 The context of the surrounding area comprises mainly of residential properties. Tournerbury Road is characterised by bungalows with low set front boundaries. On the opposite side of the road, to the South of the site is a co- op retail unit with a brick wall stretching alongside the entrance to Tournerbury Lane. The Hayling Garage building itself is a two storey, brick building with a pitched roof. The side extension is a large cube shaped structure which comes right up against the low boundary wall which borders the site.

Previous reasons for refusal

- 7.7 The scheme proposed in 2010 (**10/51526/003**) was refused for the following reasons :

"The proposed development by reason of its design, siting, prominent

location and roofing materials would be an incongruous feature within the streetscene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area and would therefore be contrary to saved Policy D1 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011."

"On the basis of the limited information available to the Local Planning Authority it has not been demonstrated that the use of the proposed development would not be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent residential dwellings and as such the development would therefore be contrary to saved Policies D1 and PC1 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011."

- 7.8 The previous application proposed in 2020 (**APP/20/00032**) was refused for the following reasons :

1 Development of the site in the manner proposed would not provide adequate provision of car parking in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's adopted standards and would therefore encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway, leading to indiscriminate parking, detrimental to highway amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the adopted Parking SPD 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The proposed side extension, by virtue of its position, design and visibility from both Church Road and Tournurbury Avenue , is considered overly bulky and harmful to the character of this mainly residential area. The proposal is therefore considered to harm the visual appearance of the streetscene and the proposed development would, therefore, be detrimental to the amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Officers delegated report highlighted the relevant design policies and guidance and how the scheme being considered did not meet these requirements emphasising the position, height and materials of the proposal and the inappropriate impact on the character and appearance of the area.

- 7.9 This proposal for a side extension to be used as a car mechanics workshop would have the following differences from the proposal refused under application reference APP/20/00032 :

- A height reduced by 0.5 metres to a total of 3.4 metres.
- Materials altered from dark green metal cladding to white pvc cladding.

- 7.10 In 2010 the proposal for an extension with a height of 3.2 metres was refused for the reasons outlined above , including the extension forming an 'incongruous feature' on the streetscene. Although the reduction in height by 0.5 metres from the existing 3.9 metres is judged to be an improvement, this is still of a height which exceeds that which was refused previously due to impact on the character of the area. Although it is noted that the extension requires minimum dimensions in order to be used as a car

mechanics workshop, this is still judged to have considerable mass and bulk. The combination of height, width, materials and location within the context of the surrounding locale mean that the reduction in height does not mitigate against the harmful impact this is judged to have as the structure still remains a dominant feature on this corner plot.

- 7.11 Alterations to materials are proposed from the existing dark green metal cladding to white pvc cladding to the side extension elevations. The green metal cladding was judged to have an industrial feel, creating the appearance of a temporary structure; out of keeping with the surrounding area, which has some mixed use, however is fairly residential in nature. The context of the surrounding area has not changed and the proposal of white pvc cladding is not considered to make the structure any more in keeping with the surrounding area. It is considered that in white pvc, this would make the extension appear more dominant, especially when viewed from Tournurbury Lane which comprises mainly bungalow properties, set back from the highway with mainly traditional materials, brick tiles and elements of render.
- 7.12 The alterations do not mitigate against previous reasons for refusal. The current application has been assessed again on its own individual merits and it is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and to be contrary to Policies CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) and Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.13 The closest residential property to the site is no 1 Tournurbury Lane which is located approximately 10 metres from the extension site. Although there is not deemed to be any issues as a result of the structure in terms of overshadowing or overlooking, the extension would bring activity in the extension into proximity to the residential area. The nature of a vehicle repair business does mean a reasonable amount of vehicles entering and leaving the site and it is judged that as a vehicle repair centre that parts would need to be delivered via the rear access as this is the only vehicular access, alongside the comings and goings of customers. This is a fairly limited site in terms of plot size as the front forecourt is used for car sales and the additional business created by the side extension in this fairly compact rear area could present additional problems. There have been no overriding objections from local residents in terms of pollution, although concerns have been raised in regards to the possible use of noxious substances at the site. Policy DM10 of the HBLP addresses pollution:

7.14 Policy DM10 - Pollution

Some forms of development which can result in pollutants are necessary to the economic and social needs of the borough. This would include some industrial uses which, although necessary, may be detrimental to amenity. Only in instances where the risk is appropriately managed will development be permitted.

- 7.15 Environmental health have previously been consulted on this and had no further comments to add in terms of pollution as the class use would not be changing from existing for the use of the extension. They have stated that if the use class were to change an objection would be upheld pending further information. The previous application in 2010 which was refused stated how "*it has not been demonstrated that the use of the proposed development would not be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent residential dwellings.*" There has been no evidence

presented that the use of the extension has resulted in any detriment to neighbour amenity in terms of pollution, noise or otherwise, although it may have the potential to do so. Under APP/20/00032 Environmental Health commented that they had no objections if use was still classed under B2, which it is. Although no further comment has been received from Environmental Health under this application, the use and general context of the site remains the same. It is not considered that a reason for refusal has on the impact on residential amenity could be substantiated under the current application.

(iv) Parking _

7.16 The current proposal shows allocation for an additional 5 parking spaces as shown on Parking Plan A106.

7.17 Comments made in regards to the previous proposal (**APP/20/00032**) were as follows :

Concerns have been raised in regards to an increase in vehicles parked along Tournerbury Lane as an outcome of the increased usage and activity at the garage. The site does meet the Havant Borough Council Parking SPD (2016) parking standards for B2 use, which requires one space for every 45 sqm , which also applies to the rear hard standing area where there is an approximate floor area of 200sqm where there is judged to be over the 4 spaces required.

Despite this, it does not meet SPD standards in relation to 'Car sales and garage forecourts Workshops' which requires 3 spaces per service bay for customers, 1 space per full time staff and 1 space per 10 cars on display- there were approximately 20 cars on display when noted at site visit.

The side extension as used as a workshop would be increasing the need for parking due to the increase in business at the site as well as the change in business to include a separate workshop area which also requires further parking. It is also deemed that the side extension incorporates space which could have been used as parking , therefore potentially increasing pressure on parking twofold which then could impact on street parking in the surrounding vicinity.

7.18 Concerns have again been raised by local residents with regards to on street parking issues in relation to the garage. Hampshire Highways have been consulted in regards to the scheme and have stated no objection, with parking standards to be assessed by the LPA.

7.19 The proposed side extension would add an additional 34.5 m2 of floorspace to the existing 165 m2 of floorspace of the existing building, creating a total floorspace of 201 m2 at ground floor level which has B2 use. B2 use parking standards require 1 parking space per 45 m2 of floorspace , creating a need for 4 spaces. In addition to this, the Havant Parking SPD under 'Car sales and garage forecourts and workshops ' requires 3 spaces per service bay, 1 space per full time staff and 1 space per 10 cars on display. Information provided states that there would be 1 full time member of staff , 1 service bay and less than 20 cars on display, therefore this would require an additional 5 parking spaces. The 5 additional spaces proposed are shown on the parking plan in the north west corner of the site. These spaces need to meet the 2.4 x 4.8 specifications as outlined in the Havant Parking SPD. After measurement, these

spaces fall below standard in their width , with the space closest to the building measuring below 2 metres and therefore it is judged this space would provide 4 parking spaces. This would result in the loss of space for sales vehicles which the spaces are currently in use for. There is a dropped kerb and access to these spaces off Church Road. It is judged the remaining 4 spaces could be accommodated to the rear of the site .

7.10 After evaluation it is judged that more information is required in order to demonstrate that the required parking allocations can be accommodated on site. As the spaces shown in the parking plan do meet the required standards it is judged that this need has not been met and therefore lack of parking as a reason for refusal still stands . It is noted that a more detailed parking plan was requested however this was not supplied due to the understanding that there are reasons for refusal on other grounds in addition to parking.

7.11 It is noted that objections refer to the parking of larger vehicles on the road associated with the business.

(v) Impact on local businesses/ economic development

7.12 It is noted that this is a local business, with local customers and employees. Whilst local businesses are to be supported, where planning permission is to be granted this should be on the grounds of good design and not at the detriment to other material planning considerations.

7.13 The Havant Borough Local Plan has various policies which support local employment :

7.14 Policy CS2 - 'Employment' of the HBLP states:

Prioritise the use of previously developed land for the provision of new employment floorspace

7.15 Policy CS3 - 'Skills and Employability' states that :

Planning permission will be granted for development proposals that raise skill levels and increase employability.

7.16 This proposal does result in an increase in employment space in a borough which has a "historically high unemployment rate and low job density" (Havant Borough Local Plan 2011) and whilst this is acknowledged, it is not deemed that the positives of this business outweigh the impact of the structure on the character of the area and potential issues in regards to parking and access. There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It seeks to drive and support sustainable economic development to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century, however it also seeks to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

8 Conclusion

8.1 This application has been considered and assessed above and the proposed side extension, by virtue of its position, design and visibility from both Church Road and

Tournerbury Avenue , is considered overly bulky and harmful to the character of this mainly residential area and not deemed to overcome the previous grounds for refusal. The potential issues brought by the proposal surrounding parking and overuse of the site is deemed to have an adverse impact on the immediate residential amenity of the area. The proposal is therefore considered to harm the visual appearance of the streetscene and be contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011. Accordingly, the proposal is recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00315

(B) for the following reasons

- 1 Development of the site in the manner proposed and on the basis of the information available would not provide adequate provision for car parking in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's adopted standards and would therefore encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway, leading to indiscriminate parking, detrimental to amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16 and DM14 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the adopted Havant Borough Council Parking SPD 2016 (partially updated September 2019) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed side extension by virtue of its position, design, materials and visibility from both Church Road and Tournerbury Avenue, is considered overly bulky and harmful to the character of this mainly residential area. The proposal is therefore considered to harm the visual appearance of the streetscene and the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.