
Site Address:	45A Portsdown Hill Road, Havant, PO9 3JU		
Proposal:	Demolition of dwelling and construction of replacement dwelling and garages.		
Application No:	APP/19/00080	Expiry Date:	01/04/2019
Applicant:	Mr Deng		
Agent:	Mrs Jezeph	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Bryan Jezeph Consultancy		
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The site is located on the southern side of Portsdown Hill Road, overlooking the hill and the harbour beyond. It is the penultimate dwelling before the open fields at the western edge of the Borough's boundary. The streetscene is characterised by large detached family dwellings set within generous grounds and spacious plots with clear separations. Due to the slope of the land the properties are set at a lower level than that of Portsdown Hill Road and have views over the sea from their rear. This setting, along with strong frontage planting, results in a 'low key' appearance of dwellings along this section of the road.

The application site comprises a detached bungalow set back from the highway. There is a tarmaced sloping driveway to the front of the property and attached garage which allows for on site parking. As with other dwellings along this section of Portsdown Hill Road, the property is set down to reflect the level change at the rear of the site. The loft space of the bungalow has been converted into living accommodation and there is a flat roof dormer located at the rear. The rear elevation wall is built up to form a parapet wall and there is also a rear conservatory leading to a terraced and stepped patio area across the rear. The garden is of a generous size and extends downwards towards the recent development of detached dwellings off Bedhampton Hill which now abut the rear of the site. The eastern side boundary is enclosed by a fence and the western boundary has a very high evergreen hedge screen.

Unlike other properties on this section of Portsdown Hill Road, No. 45a is positioned very close to its neighbouring properties. These neighbours include No. 47 which is a Grade II listed building comprising an art deco style house built in the 1930's. It has an unusual design with curved north and south corners and full width, panoramic windows. Also No. 45 which is a large, two-storey dwelling of a more traditional design.

2 Planning History

90/52133/002 - Single storey side extension., PERM,
97/52133/007 - Dormer to rear (south side), PERM,02/04/1997
APP/15/00598 - Demolition of existing house and construction of 1No. two-storey 4 bed detached dwelling and attached garage., REF,06/08/2015
APP/16/00495 - Demolition of existing house and construction of 1No. two-storey and lower ground level 4 bed detached dwelling and attached garage. (Resubmission.), REF,11/08/2016

3 Proposal

Demolition of dwelling and construction of replacement dwelling and garages.

This is a revised scheme following the 2 refusals of traditional designed dwellings - and now proposes a modern style flat roofed 5 bedroom dwelling over 3 floors - stepped into the slope of the site. The siting would be broadly on the same footprint as the existing but slightly narrower. Materials would largely be render with the lower floor being brick; with dark aluminium window and door units. A full width balcony across the first floor rear elevation is proposed with a Juliette balcony at second floor.

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

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20	(Historic Assets)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM24	(Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control

The proposed building appears to be within 3m of a foul water public sewer. Consultation with Southern Water should be carried out.

Community Infrastructure

CIL liable.

As this is a replacement dwelling the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy does not apply.

Conservation Officer

No Objection

This dwelling was built in 1936 to a design by one of the foremost architects and designers of the Modern Movement in Britain, Wells Coates, and was listed in 1994 as of special architectural and historic interest by Historic England at Grade II. Such buildings have been accorded greater significance in recent years. This building is a

particularly complete example. It is currently accorded grade II status but may be worthy of upgrade.

Legislative and Policy Background

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The need for the decision taker to attach considerable or special weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings has been reinforced through two recent high court decisions of: *Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Limited vs. East Northamptonshire District Council et al* (2014); and *North Norfolk District Council vs. DCLG and Mack* (2014).

The above statute and its subsequent and consistent interpretation in recent high court decision emphasises the need for the policies of the NPPF to be implemented whilst always having regard to the need to give special or greater weight to the preservation of the setting of a listed building.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications. The 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2?', states at paragraph 4:

'The significance of a heritage asset is the sum of its archaeological, architectural, historic, and artistic interest? and provides at paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 that in order for the Local Planning Authority to make decisions in line with legal requirements, the objectives of the development plan; and, the policy requirements of the NPPF, great importance is placed on understanding the nature, extent and level of the significance of the heritage asset.

The revised NPPF sets out in Chapter 16, the core principles relating to development affecting Heritage Assets that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions in the following paragraphs:

'184. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

189. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets? importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

190. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development

affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

191. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Considering potential impacts

193. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional

Proposed development

In this particular instance it is considered that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the architectural significance of the listed building or its setting. Although it is acknowledged that the setting of the building contributes to its significance, the new scheme allows for this setting to be substantially maintained.

The design approach is also considered to be sympathetic to the setting. The size, form, location and design of the dwelling and the proposed materials will minimise any visual impact. Important views east, south and west have been retained and not harmed by the development. It is considered these design parameters pay special attention to the desirability of preserving the setting of the nearby listed building as the development has responded to the significant elements of the designated heritage asset.

In accordance with Section 66 and 72 of the Act considerable importance and weight has been given to the desirability of preserving the setting of the heritage asset. It is therefore considered that the significance of the listed building and its setting are sustained.

The following conditions should be submitted if permission is granted:

Conditions:

1. PD rights removed
2. Material samples to be submitted

County Ecologist

The dwelling may exhibit features suitable for use by legally-protected species such as roosting bats and nesting birds.

I would recommend that the applicant commissions a Phase 1 ecological survey of the site: this should include an assessment of the potential for the site to support protected species (to be provided by a qualified ecologist)

County Ecologist - following submission of Phase I Survey & subsequent Bat Survey Report

The application is accompanied by a Bat Survey report (Cherry Tree Ecology, June 2019). Three bat surveys were carried out in suitable conditions in May and June 2019 and no bats were observed roosting within the dwelling. No bats will be impacted by the proposed works and therefore no further works are necessary.

Some sensible ecological mitigation recommendations are provided with respect to artificial lighting and the clearance of vegetation.

If you are minded to grant permission, can I suggest that these mitigation measures are secured by condition.

Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological mitigation measures detailed within the Bat Survey report (Cherry Tree Ecology, June 2019) unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such measures shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details and secured in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: to provide ecological protection and enhancement in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, NPPF, NERC Act 2006 and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

Crime Prevention

None received

Southern Water

Exact position of the public foul sewers must be determined on site before the development is finalised.

Application should not be determined until layout respects standoff distances of - no development within 3m; no new soakaways within 5m; all existing infrastructure should be protected during construction works;

request condition re protection of equipment;

should any additional sewer be found then further investigations will be required;

formal application for connection to a public foul sewer - request Informative

Officer Note

The sewer runs parallel to the road and has been surveyed. It was found to be 225mm diameter and less than 3m deep. The foundations will not be within 500mm of the sewer and the proposed foundations are at least 150mm deeper than the sewer invert. The distance between the corners of the garage and the centre of the sewer is between 1,786mm and 1,857mm. Amended plans provided.

SW also advised of constraints of site and adjacent Listed Building

Southern Water comment on amended plans following sewer survey:

Given additional information and sewer being confirmed as classified as minor (in size and depth) then SW would allow and approve the proposed site layout. The construction within the standoff distance of the public sewer will be permitted subject to strict compliance with details of approval under Build Over/Close to Public Sewer. The applicant is still required to obtain SW's approval as above.

Highways Engineer

The Highway Authority has no adverse comment on the applicant subject to a condition that the area shown for turning on the layout plan (in order for a vehicle to enter the highway in forward gear) must be provided and retained.

Portsmouth Water Company

From a groundwater quality protection issue we have no further comments as the site is outside a source Protection Zone.

Public Spaces

None received

Waste Services Manager

No concerns

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: 4

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
Agree with Heritage Statement and importance of outlook from Sunspan must be respected; however consider proposed house would intrude into long outlook east to Chichester; 45 degree viewing zone on Dwg 2 uses point where curved window straightens as origin and consider this should use northeast end of lounge window instead. View can only be appreciated from within lounge and applicants advisors have not visited and have failed to accord due weight to this design parameter. Suggest depth of proposed house be reduced by 2m to respect	Noted - but existing parapet of Sunspan within this field of vision and proposed siting does not encroach beyond that - see section 7 Officer visited neighbour to appreciate impact

easterly outlook.

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) Impact on the setting of the Listed Building
- (v) Parking and highways
- (vi) Ecology
- (vii) Drainage
- (viii) Contributions/CIL

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. In this case the site lies adjacent to the Grade II Listed Building at No.47, and therefore the local planning authority has a statutory duty under s.66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to "*...have special regard to the desirability of preserving the .. setting .. of a listed building.*"

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

The locality is residential in character and includes dwellings of varying designs and ages. The existing dwelling is a bungalow which contrasts with the majority of other properties which are mainly two-storey on the road side and three-storey at the rear (reflecting the change in levels). The neighbouring properties to the site include a three-storey, art deco building at No. 47 (which is Grade II listed) and a more traditional style two-storey dwelling at No. 45. The houses are arranged in a linear pattern along the southern side of Portsdown Hill.

The proposed new dwelling would be of a contemporary flat roofed design, presenting as two stories to Portsdown Hill Road but being 3 stories to the rear (accounting for the change in levels). It would be built in approximately the same position within the site, but pulled away by 2m from the western boundary and the front elevation would be set forward (north) of the existing by between 2m and 3m. Overall this roof profile and increased separation to the west would sit comfortably in the street scene, being respectful to the adjacent Listed Building and other dwellings. As such, it is considered that the design of the proposed dwelling would not be out of keeping with the character of the immediate streetscene. With regard to the wider views from the harbour and motorway to the south, the proposed three-storey dwelling would be set into the slope and although visible on the hilltop, would be of an appropriate scale and form to blend with long distance views, and would not be visually harmful to the character of the area.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The existing dwelling has a closer spatial relationship to the neighbouring properties than other dwellings along this section of Portsdown Hill Road. The adjacent Listed Building, No. 47 stands diagonally in its plot and was built in a 'sunspan' style which

means that it has a panoramic curved window on both the first floor, serving the lounge and the second floor, serving a bedroom. The existing bungalow generally respects the views from within No 47 - it is only the conservatory that would impinge on the view - but this is currently screened by a high evergreen hedge that is planted within No 47 curtilage and would remain.

The siting of the proposed dwelling continues to respect this rear building line with a stepped approach and re-grading of the ground levels to create the lower ground level. The cross section plans submitted show the proposed change in profile of the proposed dwelling compared to the adjacent properties. It is apparent that the rear facade would not substantially alter the outlook from the adjacent properties in terms of mass of building. A ground floor balcony is proposed, across the full width of the dwelling, with side screening panels, which, by virtue of the levels would effectively be a first floor balcony - it would sit above the lower ground level. This would approximately align with the lounge level of No 47 which also has access onto the flat roof and external steps down, but with the high evergreen hedge as screening between. Additionally there is a high hedge on the eastern boundary with No 45. Provided screening panels are conditioned, then it is not considered that this rear balcony would have any harmful impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

There are no windows proposed in the western side elevation but 3 within the eastern elevation. These are at ground floor level and 2 would be obscure glazed. The existing dwelling also has 3 windows at this level on the east elevation. Number 45 has several side windows at both ground and first floor but there is a mature hedge on the boundary providing screening between ground floor windows. Overall it is considered that the existing levels of privacy between properties would not be further harmed.

It has been noted that the proposed rear facade includes large windows and Juliette balconies with a considerable amount of glazing resulting in an added perception of overlooking to neighbouring garden spaces. However within this urban area with established cross views from rear windows, and given the distance and level drops to neighbouring gardens, then it is considered that any additional overlooking would be minimal and acceptable. Juliette balconies are generally a permitted development feature in rear elevations and other properties in Portsdown Hill Road have large scale rear windows to take advantage of rear long distance views. The proposed level of glazing is not considered inappropriate to the site and its setting and would not result in any additional harm to the amenity of neighbours. The proposal is therefore considered compliant with policy CS16 in terms on impact on neighbouring amenity.

(iv) Impact on the setting of the Listed Building

As previously stated, No. 47 is a Grade II listed building. It is a notable modernist 'sunspan' building by Wells Coates built in 1936. One of the key design features is that the large living room spans two sides of a square plan, enabling it to receive the maximum amount of sunlight. For that reason No. 47 was named 'Sunspan House' and explains why it was built diagonally on this south facing plot on Portsdown Hill. It is considered to be an important heritage asset as an example of important modern architecture. As the application site lies adjacent to this Grade II Listed Building, the local planning authority has a statutory duty under s.66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to *"...have special regard to the desirability of preserving the .. setting .. of a listed building."*

The setting of this listed building encompasses the land on either side of the dwelling, its large rear garden and its frontage from Portsdown Hill Road. As viewed from the

road, there is a sense of spaciousness around No. 47 which serves to isolate and add to its significance. Looking upwards from the rear garden, No. 47 appears more distinctive as a result of the lack of buildings of competing scale.

The proposed contemporary design follows pre-application advice and is supported by a detailed Heritage Assessment. The proposed siting results in greater separation to Sunspan which would improve the relationship between the buildings and provide a benefit and enhancement to the setting of the Listed Building. However the objection letter notes that the proposed rear balcony would impinge on views from the lounge and a 45 degree line marked on the plan is incorrect. This matter was discussed at an internal inspection and it was noted that the line of vision is currently obscured by the parapet of the lower level of No 47. Infact an alternative line commencing where suggested would cut the balcony and side screens such that only the nearest triangle would be impinge on the internal view. To partially address this issue amended plans have been received showing the provision of a chamfered side screen ie sufficient to retain privacy but keeping as open an aspect as possible. Given that the balcony is an open feature (apart from these side screens) then infact the balcony is not considered to represent a mass and bulk that would block and be harmful to the vistas and concept of Sunspan. It is further noted that the existing conservatory also cuts this vista and overall the change would not be harmful to the setting of the Listed Building.

The conservation officer has carefully considered the design and potential impacts and supports the proposal as having paid sufficient attention to the desirability of preserving the setting of the adjacent listed building.

(v) Parking and highways

The existing vehicular access to the site would remain and be re-used. The plans indicate that some re-grading of the drive would result, which is currently quite steep - however this reflects all others along this road and is a consequence of the natural ground levels. The highway safety from the proposed one for one replacement dwelling would not be altered. With respect to parking the garages have been amended during the course of determining this application to achieve an internal size of 3m x 6m to meet the Parking SPD size requirement. With the double garage and hardsurfaced area, the site can easily accommodate the required 3 car parking spaces. Therefore there is no objection on highway grounds and the proposal is considered to comply with policy DM13 and the Parking SPD.

(vi) Ecology

The existing bungalow is noted to have some loose roof tiles and holes within the eaves etc providing potential bat roost opportunities. Accordingly a Phase 1 Habitat Survey was requested and undertaken. This demonstrated the high potential for roosting bats, commuting and foraging bats, aswell as the presence of breeding and nesting birds. As a result further bat emergence surveys were undertaken in May and June 2019. These surveys confirmed there are currently no bats roosting within the dwelling or garage. Mitigation measures have been recommended in both reports.

The County Ecologist has considered the reports and raises no objection subject to imposition of a condition securing the mitigation measures.

(vii) Drainage

Southern Water identified a public sewer crossing the front of the site (parallel to the road) which is closer to the proposed development and build than normally permitted. However given the constraints of needing to protect the setting of the adjacent Listed Building which would prevent re-siting the dwelling further south away from the sewer; and the fact that a sewer survey revealed that it was a 'minor' sewer (in terms of diameter and depth) then SW have since confirmed that they will allow this layout in this case. It will still be necessary for a Build Over/Close to sewer agreement with SW which is a matter for Building Regulations - an Informative can be added and the applicant is aware.

(viii) Contributions/CIL

As a replacement dwelling the development is CIL liable for the additional 284sqm floorspace. This triggers a CIL liability of £31,747.14. Although Form 1 indicates that the applicant wishes to claim self build exemption, the correct self-build form has not been received. This can however be claimed at a subsequent date, provided it is before commencement of development.

As a replacement dwelling the development does not result in increased pressure on the SPA and therefore no SRMS contribution is necessary; neither would it result in increased impact on water quality.

8 Conclusion

The proposed replacement dwelling, in size, form, location and design is considered appropriate to its site and setting. Important views east, south and west have been retained and not harmed by the development. It is considered these design parameters pay special attention to the desirability of preserving the setting of the nearby listed building as the development has responded to the significant elements of the designated heritage asset. Accordingly the proposal is recommended for conditional permission.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/19/00080 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Heritage Assessment by John Pike dated July 2017
Planning Statement by Bryan Jezeph Consultancy Ltd dated January 2019
1:1250 Site Location and 1:500 Block Plan Drawing No 7 Rev A
Site Survey & Existing Elevation Drawing No 1 Rev A
Proposed Site Layout Drawing No 2 Rev C
Proposed Floor & Roof Layouts Drawing No 3 Rev B

Proposed Elevations Drawing No 4 Rev C
Proposed Elevations Drawing No 5 Rev B
Proposed Site Section Drawing No 6 Rev C
Proposed Detailed West Elevation showing chamfered balcony screens
Drawing No 9 Rev A

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the building(s), including windows, doors and balcony balustrade/panels, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.
Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use 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.
- 5 Development shall proceed in strict accordance with the ecological mitigation measures detailed within the Bat Survey report (Cherry Tree Ecology, June 2019) and the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Ecosupport dated April 2019, unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such measures shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details and secured in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: to provide ecological protection and enhancement in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, NPPF, NERC Act 2006 and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.
- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order, no extension, roof alteration or porch permitted by Part 1, Classes A, B, C or D of the 2015 Order as amended, shall be constructed within the curtilage of the site without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To protect and preserve the historic significance of the setting of the adjacent Listed Building in accordance with section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and having due regard to policies CS11 and DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 7 The hereby approved dwelling shall not be occupied until details of the side panels to screen the rear terrace/balcony have been submitted to, approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and installed on site. Such details shall include height, materials and level of obscuration as necessary. Thereafter the approved screens shall be retained on site in perpetuity.

Reason: To protect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents, and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.