

## Planning Application Response of Planning Policy

|                          |                                                                                                                  |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application No:</b>   | APP/18/01226                                                                                                     |
| <b>Address:</b>          | Land off Larchwood Avenue (Former Stantons Yard, Larchwood Avenue, Havant                                        |
| <b>Development:</b>      | Construction of an 81 bed, four storey hotel (Class C1), associated car-parking, landscaping and ancillary works |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>     | David Eaves                                                                                                      |
| <b>Comments by:</b>      | Jade Ellis                                                                                                       |
| <b>Date of Comments:</b> | 19 March 2019                                                                                                    |

### Policy Status:

The [Local Plan \(Core Strategy\)](#) and the [Local Plan \(Allocations\)](#), together with the [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan](#), provide the development plan for the borough.

### Comment:

Following our earlier comments, the applicant's agent has responded to various points previously raised, revised plans and submitted further information. I have set out a response to the various issues under the relevant headings below.

#### Sequential test:

It is contended the BAE System Technology Park is unavailable because planning permission has not been granted, and there are no other sequentially preferable sites available accordingly. However, the same could be said to be true of the application site. The BAE Systems site is also allocated for mixed use including a hotel and already benefits from extant planning permission for a hotel use under planning permission ref. APP/12/00652.

The applicant's agent has also highlighted case law which suggests the sequential assessment should be informed by the developer's assessment of the market with reference to the Council's advice that both Havant and Waterlooville Town Centres should be scoped into the assessment (the proposed hotel is intended to serve the Havant market). Whilst this is noted, paragraph 86 of the NPPF is clear that main town centre uses should be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations; and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered.

#### Impact assessment:

Whilst our earlier policy comments advised that the submitted impact assessment was unlikely to be sufficient, it is accepted this is only required for retail and leisure development outside town centres (hotels are categorised as arts, culture and tourism development in Annex 2 of the NPPF).

#### Sustainable Construction and High-Quality Design:

Within the package of revised information, the applicant has submitted a BREEAM New Construction Pre-Assessment estimate which indicates that the proposal would score 62% and therefore meet and exceed the "very good" standard of BREEAM required by Policy CS14.

#### Parking Provision:

A revised ground floor plan has been submitted which indicates that 9 short stay cycle parking spaces would be required, and 10 long stay spaces. Whilst the scheme would conform with the required parking standard for short stay cycle spaces, the long stay cycle provision would fall short of the required standard (1 space per 40 sq. m GEA). There may however be material considerations which justify a deviation from this requirement.

#### **Summary:**

Whilst we do not agree with the applicant's assertion that the BAE Systems site is not available, it is acknowledged the hotel use is part of a much larger mixed-use scheme at the BAE Systems site which is likely to have a long lead-in timescale to delivery. On this basis it may be possible to reach a conclusion that there are no other sequentially preferable sites.