

2 Planning History

APP/13/00149 - Crown reduce 1No. Oak (T2) by 2.5m overall, remove dead crossing and epicormic growth subject to TPO 1115., PERM,26/03/2013

APP/13/00379 - Reduce 1No. Fig by 2.5m overall, reduce two lowest limbs in north sector back to retaining wall and remove any branches rubbing on the wall. Remove dead epicormic or crossing branches. Tree within Conservation Area of Langstone., RNO,04/06/2013

APP/18/00062 - Fell 1No. Magnolia; fell 1No. Fig; fell 1No. Macrocarpa, all trees within Conservation Area of Langstone., RNO,26/02/2018

APP/19/00075 - Listed Building application for: Demolition of garden store, corrugated sheet roof store area and attached garage. Demolition of single storey rear extension and erection of two storey rear extension. Single storey extension with slate roof over and flat roofed link following partial demolition of single storey kitchen. Part demolition of two storey flat roofed bathroom, erection of two storey tiled cat slide roof extension and alterations to fenestration. Extend stone garden east facing wall. Erection of Flood Gates. Alterations and replacement of doors and windows. Internal alterations.

Officer Comment: Current LBC application to alongside this planning application.

3. Proposal

Demolition of single storey rear extension and erection of two storey rear extension. Single storey extension with slate roof over and flat roofed link following partial demolition of single storey kitchen. Part demolition of two storey flat roofed bathroom, erection of two storey tiled cat slide roof extension and alterations to fenestration. Extend stone garden east facing wall. Erection of Flood Gates. Alterations and replacement of doors and windows. Internal alterations.

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)
CS12	(Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB))
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20	(Historic Assets)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Langstone

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC)

No objection subject to:

- (a) the local planning authority first being satisfied there are no bats roosting in any part of the dwelling being demolished,
- (b) negotiating the deletion of two rooflights facing the harbour in the new central ridged roof,
- (c) negotiating a more harmonious south elevation to the remodelling of the two storey side extension in terms of an discordant larger dormer window over a much smaller ground floor window; and,
- (d) subject to planning conditions to ensure –
 - ☐ Any retained tree to be protected by fencing during construction;
 - ☐ Any biodiversity enhancements be agreed and to be delivered to a set timescale;
 - ☐ Agreement of external facing and roofing materials;

Additional CHC comments:

The deletion of two rooflights which might have faced the Harbour is welcomed. Whereas the upper fenestration is still taller than that beneath it in the existing two storey element, the width now at least matches the remodelled opening beneath it. I also note the council's Conservation Officer is content with that adjustment.

Subject to the previously recommended conditions and the council first being satisfied on the absence of bats, the Conservancy's earlier concerns about building detail are removed.

Coastal Engineering

The Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership have no objection in principle to the proposed development.

County Archaeologist

The location is archaeologically interesting, with late prehistoric activity associated with either end of the Wadeway which is just close by. However in view of the small scale, and in view of the degree of impact of past development, I would not raise any archaeological issues.

County Ecologist

The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Survey (Arbtech, February 2019). The dwelling has been shown to support roosting bats and therefore further assessment is required prior to determination. The proposals are very likely to be acceptable provided that suitable mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are secured.

The site is situated within very close proximity to parts of Chichester & Langstone Harbours SPA, Solent Maritime SAC and Chichester Harbour SSSI. There is some potential for construction-related impacts to the SPA, specifically noise disturbance and pollution. These matters could be addressed through a suitably-worded Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP).

Additional County Ecologist comments:

The CEMP can be secured by condition and that would be satisfactory.

The applicants have subsequently submitted Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys and a Construction Environmental Management Plan in order to seek to address matters of detail in relation to ecological impacts. The County Ecologist has been consulted in respect of these submissions and raises no objection. The following conditions have been recommended:

Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed within the Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys report (Arbtech, July 2019) and those in Table 1 of the Construction Environment Management Plan (Arbtech, July 2019) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All ecological compensation and enhancement features shall be installed as per ecologists' instructions and retained permanently in a condition and location suited to their intended function.

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.

Development shall proceed in accordance with the avoidance and mitigation measures detailed within the Construction Environment Management Plan (Arbtech, July 2019) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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.

The above conditions with minor appropriate amendments to policy references have been added to the decision notice.

Environmental Health Manager

No objection though the use of informatives are recommended.

Conservation Officer

Subject to the following conditions the proposals appear to be appropriate.

Conditions:

- 1) Material samples to be submitted
- 2) Window and door details 1:20 & 1:50 to be submitted
- 3) Guttering and downpipe details

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: 6

Number of site notices: 2

Statutory advertisement: 08/03/2019

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
The Green Cottage is a listed waterfront property in Langstone Conservation Area and Chichester AONB. The proposed plans will reduce the amenity of the sea view enjoyed by several residents who live to the rear of the property. A pitched roof extension with skylights is shown on the plan. This is suitably subservient to the original part of the listed property and would not have an adverse effect on the AONB. It is important that the roofline is not raised above the height shown in the plans, as this would cause a severe loss of amenity for the several neighbouring properties who currently have a view of the sea over the existing single storey building. I note on the plans that there is a rehabilitation and physiotherapy room shown on the ground floor. Please could a condition be included in the planning decision that should the owners wish to use the property for business purposes planning permission for change of use would be required.	See section 7. The current proposal is not for the change of use of the property for commercial purposes. If the owners wished to change the use of the residential property then this would be likely to require a planning application to the Local Planning Authority and therefore the suggested planning condition is not required.
The proposed replacement single storey extension is well below the level of the public, shoreside footpath, therefore the bottom of the proposed pitched roof would only be just above eye level. This, together with the impact of slate tiles and two skylights, not features of the rest of the listed property, would mean that the design and materials would have a negative impact on the Conservation Area. It would also conflict with NPPF advice on Conserving the Historic Environment regarding: (c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and	See section 7

(d) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place. Also, the space above the current single storey extension, between the original building and the annexe, would be lost by the addition of a pitched roof, and spaces between buildings are a plus in planning terms and a feature of the Langstone waterfront. The present single storey is partly hidden by vegetation and the fact that it is well below the level of the public coastal footpath means that in this particular case a single flat-roofed construction would work far better than a pitched roof. As there would be no loss of accommodation if the pitched roof were removed from the plan please could consideration be given to replacing the shabby and outdated single storey building with another one of high quality design.	
I have looked extensively at this planning proposal and still feel strongly opposed to it. The nature and charm of the Green cottage is going to be erased from this old listed building by adding such a mass of black slate on such a high pitch in a conservation area. If it is at all possible for the pitch to be reduced in height it would be a better solution for the open aspect of the conservation walker. Although slate is used in the area none is used directly on the waterside or indeed on this building. If at all possible another material could be considered perhaps cedar tiles as on the top of the Mill, it would be a prettier finish and more in keeping with the area and the old charming building itself. If the chimney could be moved to a more southerly place it would also blend in better with the building.	See section 7. With regards to the way in which contractors would access the site, in the event of any permission, these matters would normally be addressed, if necessary, under the relevant Environmental Protection legislation and it would not be within the remit of a planning permission for an application of this scale

This building is at the central focal point to the quaint village and to lose this charm is a great loss to society. I would also like you to consider that the building contractors use the Langstone High St as their route to the building as it is less invasive on fewer residents. May I also bring to your attention the magnolia tree which I feel has grown way too big for the garden site and it would be beneficial to reduce it by a third in height. I strongly appeal to you to oppose this planning application for the future of our picturesque beauty spot.	to have these matters formally conditioned. The Environmental Health team have recommended informatives relating to dust, bonfires and the use of the wood burning stove that forms part of the proposal. These informatives have been attached to end of this report. Works to trees within the curtilage are not proposed as part of this application. Any future works to trees within the curtilage would require an application to the Local Authority
---	---

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) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Assessment of design of proposals and impact on the Grade II Listed Building and the Langstone Conservation Area
- (iv) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area and the Chichester Harbour AONB
- (v) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (vi) Parking and Highway Safety
- (vii) Flood Risk
- (viii) Ecology

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria. In this case the site is also within Langstone Conservation Area and Chichester Harbour AONB, these designations are considered below.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.3 Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 states that 'In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall 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.'

- 7.4 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 states “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area...special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area”.
- 7.5 It is one of the core principles of the NPPF that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 190 sets out that the local planning authority should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- 7.6 Paragraphs 193-197 sets out the framework for decision making in planning applications relating to heritage assets and this application takes account of the relevant considerations in these paragraphs.

Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will be granted for development that:

- 7.7 *Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough’s statutory and non statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest.*
- 7.8 Policy CS16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states: *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 identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site.*
- 7.9 Policy DM20 of the Allocations Plan states that development proposals must conserve and enhance the historic assets of Havant.

(iii) Assessment of design of the proposals and impact on the Grade II Listed Building and the Langstone Conservation Area

- 7.10 This listed building application has been submitted with a Heritage Statement which analyses the significance of 23 Langstone High Street and the impact of the proposed works on the listed building and the Langstone Conservation Area; this has been reviewed by the Conservation Officer. The works proposed fall into a number of components:
- (a) Replacement of existing single storey flat roofed side extension with single storey hipped roof addition;
 - (b) Extension of the existing two storey rear addition & alteration works to the late 19th century side extension;
 - (c) Demolition of garden store, corrugated sheet roof store area and attached garage. Extend stone garden east facing wall.
 - (d) Other minor alterations: Fenestration alterations; extension of stone garden to east facing wall; erection of flood gates.

With regard to (a),

- 7.11 The existing 1960's flat roof side extension is of a poor construction and represents an incongruous addition which holds no aesthetic value. Whilst it is acknowledged that its low height in relation to the historic dwelling ensures that the 19th century addition does not overwhelm the historic character of the main building and does appear not unduly prominent within the wider Conservation Area, this feature merely partially mitigates what is a clearly harmful 20th century addition.
- 7.12 The single storey hipped roof addition would have a greater height by approximately 1.6m, however it should be noted that there is historic photographic evidence that a former pitched roof outbuilding of a similar height once occupied the position before being replaced by the flat roof extension. Moreover, the design takes a more traditional form that is still subservient to the structures either side. The use of slate which is a traditional material is also not unusual in the context of the conservation area. During the course of the application, and following comments of the Conservation Officer, the applicant agreed to remove 2 rooflights which were to originally be set into the harbour facing roofslope. Following this minor amendment, the Conservation Officer expressed no objection to this element of the proposal.

With regard to (b),

- 7.13 The two storey rear extension would have a hipped roof which would be set down from the ridge of both the original dwelling and the 20th century extension to which it would be attached. There would be no impact on the appearance of the front elevation of the original dwelling when viewed from the harbour and the use of matching materials would ensure the extension would be sympathetic to the listed building.
- 7.14 The remodelling of the 19th century two storey side extension would be deemed a enhancement to the listed building and the wider Conservation Area. The current arrangement consists of a hipped roof which steps down to a flat roof to the rear and which is incongruous in relation to the character of the historic home. The flat roof aspect in particular jars with the hipped roof of the south of the 16th century building. The proposal would see the ridge of the hipped roof of the 19th century extension elongated before dropping to the rear as a catslide roof resulting in a more traditional and in-keeping appearance that would integrate more effectively with the built form of the dwelling. The Conservation Officer expressed no objection to this element of the proposal though recommended the alteration of the proposed fenestration detail to the eastern elevation so that window openings of the first floor were not larger than those of the ground floor in order to avoid a disjointed appearance. This amendment was duly made during the course of the application and it is deemed that overall the extensions would be of a design, scale and form of that would be appropriate to the character of this historic dwelling and wider Conservation area.

With regard to (c),

- 7.15 These structures are small scale later additions which make no particular contribution to the significance of the listed building and in regard to the flat roof garage which projects forward of the historic dwelling and abuts the adjacent footpath thereby having an undue degree of visual prominence, there is a degree of harm to the significance of the listed building and Conservation Area. Consequently, their removal would lessen the existing harm to the value of the historic assets.

With regard to (d),

- 7.16 A number of modern crittall and aluminium windows and doors which have been inserted into the historic dwelling would be replaced as part of the proposal. These windows would be replaced with timber to match the style and detailing of the timber on the front elevation. These changes are deemed to be an improvement in preserving and enhancing the significance of the dwelling and the Langstone Conservation Area.
- 7.17 The southern wall of the garage would be replaced with a low level wall to match the existing east facing wall which sits ahead of the annexe. This addition would be a minor one and would represent a softening of the frontage of the site in comparison to the existing 2.5m high elevation of the blank south wall of the garage. The flood gates would be erected in close proximity to the wall infilling the space left by the removal of the garage. At 1.4m high, the gates would be 1.1m lower than the blank east wall which currently abuts the footpath.

Taking the proposals as a whole.

- 7.18 Taken together, the overall proposal would be considered to preserve and in some respects, enhance the listed building, its setting and the Conservation Area, and would accord with the statutory requirements in respect of listed buildings, the NPPF and Local Plan Policies CS11, CS16 and DM20.

(iv) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area and the Chichester Harbour AONB

- 7.19 As discussed at (a-d) above, the proposal has elements which would enhance the listed building and the character of the Conservation Area due to the removal of incongruous later additions to the original 16th century building. Furthermore, the design of the proposed extensions and other alterations are, as discussed above, sympathetic to the character and context of the existing listed building and of the wider area. Chichester Harbour Conservancy were consulted regarding the impact on the AONB and following the removal of the front facing rooflights and alteration to the proposed fenestration to the eastern elevation of the 19th two storey extension as requested by the Conservation Officer, it was concluded that subject to conditions relating to trees, ecology and materials, the proposal was acceptable.
- 7.20 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policies CS12 and CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy). It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(v) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.21 The proposed two storey rear extension would be separated from the nearest properties along Tower Gardens to the west by approximately 26m ensuring there would be no overbearing or overshadowing impacts. Though as a result of the extension, the distance between the nearest rear facing window to the boundary with these properties would be reduced, it is considered that at 26m and with large screening trees lining the boundary no undue overlooking of the rear of these properties would result.

- 7.22 Though it is acknowledged that concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupiers due to the loss of a view of the harbour due to the replacement of the existing flat roof link with a higher hipped roof extension, this is not a material planning consideration as there are no rights to a view protected under planning legislation. Therefore, this concern cannot inform the conclusions of this report.
- 7.23 The two storey rear extension would be separated from the rear of no. 26 Langstone High Street by approximately 17m. This degree of separation allied with the absence of any windows to the first floor of the elevation facing the neighbouring property would ensure no harmful impact to no. 26.
- 7.24 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(vi) Parking and Highway Safety

- 7.25 DM13 of the Core Strategy states that residential development must accord with the standards set out in the Residential Car Parking and Cycle Provision Supplementary Planning Document. The dwelling currently has 3 bedrooms and this total will increase to 4. Though the single bay garage will be lost, it is considered that the hardstanding area to the rear of the property is more than sufficient to provide the required parking provision for a dwelling of this size. The increase in the size of the dwelling by 1 bedroom is not deemed to risk the undue intensification of the access compared to existing.

(vii) Flood Risk

- 7.26 The application would be classed as a 'minor development' and according to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) unlikely to cause flood risk unless they would have an adverse effect on a watercourse, floodplain or its flood defences; they would impede access to flood defence and management facilities, or; where the cumulative impact of such developments would have a significant effect on local flood storage capacity or flood flows.
- 7.27 The dwelling is within Flood Zone 3 and a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been provided. The FRA has been assessed by the Eastern Solent Partnership who raised no objection. Finished floor levels (FFLs) of the development would be no lower than the existing floor levels with the floor levels of the single storey hipped roof side extension in fact 0.4m higher than the level of the existing single storey flat roofed link. A number of flood resistance and resilience measures have also been proposed to be incorporated into the development; including raised electrical sockets and wiring, improvements and repairs to the existing storm drainage and the installation of flood gates. In bringing the above together, it is considered that subject to conditioning the FRA, the proposal would comply with CS 15 of the Core Strategy.

(viii) Ecology

- 7.28 The site is situated within very close proximity to parts of Chichester & Langstone Harbours SPA, Solent Maritime SAC and Chichester Harbour SSSI. The applicant has submitted Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys and also a Construction Environmental Management Plan. The County Ecologist has raised no objections to these and has recommended conditions to ensure impact mitigation measures are adhered to and these conditions have been imposed. There would therefore be no harmful impacts on ecology resulting from the proposals.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 Following minor amendments secured to the scheme, it has been concluded that the proposed works to the original and extended building would not harm the historic integrity of the listed building and would respect the character and context of the building and its setting, the Langstone Conservation Area and the Chichester AONB. Taken together, the development would be considered to preserve and in some respects enhance the listed building and its setting, and would accord with the statutory requirements in respect of listed buildings, the NPPF and Local Plan Policies CS11, CS16 and DM20. The scale, siting and design of the proposal would also have no undue impact in regard to neighbouring amenity, parking, flood risk and ecology and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/19/00074 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:

Revised Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drwg No.4f

Revised Proposed First Floor Plan Drwg No.5f

Revised Proposed East and West Elevations Drwg No. 6a

Revised Proposed North and South Elevations Drwg No. 7

Proposed Site Plan Drwg No. 8

Revised Proposed Roof Plan and Location Plan Drwg No. 9A

Heritage Statement by T.R Hayes and J. Atherton, January 2019
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment
Survey by Arbtech, Final v2 19/02/19
Flood Risk Assessment by Mr M. Bone
Statement of Significance Historic Building by T.R. Hayes, February 2019
Design and Access Statement by Mr M. Bone
Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys Report and Recommendations dated
09.07.2019 by Arbtech
Construction Environmental Management Plan dated 10.07.2019 by Arbtech

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 No above ground construction shall commence until samples and details of all external facing and roofing materials have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter only such approved materials and finishes shall be used in carrying out the development

Reason: To safeguard features of special architectural and historical interest, preserve the character and appearance of the building and the appearance of the development having due regard to policies CS11, CS12, CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) received by the Local Planning Authority on 18/03/2019.

Reason: In the interests of preventing flooding in accordance with CS15 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed within the Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys report (Arbtech, July 2019) and those in Table 1 of the Construction Environment Management Plan (Arbtech, July 2019) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All ecological compensation and enhancement features shall be installed as per ecologists' instructions and retained permanently in a condition and location suited to their intended function.

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 Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

- 6 Development shall take place in accordance with the avoidance and mitigation measures detailed within the Construction Environment Management Plan (Arbtech, July 2019) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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 Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011.

- 7 No development shall take place until all trees that are to be retained within or adjacent to the site have been enclosed with temporary protective fencing in accordance with BS:5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations'. The fencing shall be retained throughout the period of construction and no activity prohibited by BS:5837:2012 shall take place within such protective fencing during the construction period.

Reason: To safeguard the continued health and presence of such existing vegetation and protect the amenities of the locality 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.