
Site Address:	85A London Road, Cowplain, Waterlooville, PO8 8XB		
Proposal:	Rear two storey extension to provide 2 No. 1 bedroom flats.		
Application No:	APP/18/00607	Expiry Date:	15/08/2018
Applicant:	Mr Passingham		
Agent:	Mrs Grinstead	Case Officer:	Bee Crawford
	Your Home Plans Ltd		
Ward:	Cowplain		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is a two storey semi-detached property with a florist at ground floor and a 1 bedroom flat above, situated in Cowplain District Centre. It has a grey slate hipped and pitched roof and elevations of red multibrick and pebbledash render at first floor. The site is level with gated vehicular access leading to a tarmac drive. The area to the rear has a depth of approximately 22 metres and is currently unused and overgrown with vegetation. The adjoining building abuts the southern boundary together with a 2 metre high metal fence, there is a 2 metre high fence to the western boundary and a 2 metre high fence and the wall of the adjacent building is to the north.
- 1.2 The adjoining two storey property is to the north (currently used as a Chartered Accountants), a two storey building is to the south (currently used as a Co-op retail store), the side aspect and rear garden of a property in Summerhill Road is to the rear and An Age Concern Centre is opposite. The area is of medium density with two storey detached and semi-detached properties and commercial units of similar and different age, style and design in Cowplain District Centre.

2 Planning History

None relevant to this application.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal is for the construction of a rear two storey extension to provide 2 No. 1 bedroom flats, together with a new first floor window to serve the existing flat and a canopy extension on the southern elevation of the existing property .

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

CS14	(Efficient Use of Resources)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)

CS21 (Developer Requirements)
CS4 (
CS9 (Housing)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

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

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

No adverse comments. No public sewer shown near building and fire brigade access appears satisfactory

Community Infrastructure, Planning Policy & Urban Design

This application is CIL Liable. See pages 10 and 11 Developer Contributions Guide <http://www.havant.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/planning-policy/community-infrastructure-levy/developer-contributions-guide>

Additionally, instructions should be passed by the Case Officer to the CI Team to issue the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy Unilateral Undertaking, now based on the number of dwellings and their respective number of bedrooms. See <http://www.havant.gov.uk/unilateral-undertaking-solent-recreation-mitigation-strategy>

Officer comments: Noted and actioned.

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

No comments received.

Engineering/Drainage

No comments received.

Highways Engineer, Development Engineer

The application shows three parking spaces on site accessed by a 3m drive. There appears to be limited reversing space available for each vehicle to turn on site and enter the highway in a forward gear. I would suggested that overlays showing these movements should be provide to check the actual number of car parking spaces that can be provided within the site.

The revised plans show that three vehicles can park and turn on site and enter the highway in a forward gear. The three parking spaces can only be located in the position shown on the newly submitted plan. Any other location would not allow cars to park, reverse and turn on site.

Planning Policy, PPUD

The Planning Policy Team originally responded to the application on 23rd July 2018. Since then, further information has been submitted for this application and the team have continued to move forward with the emerging Local Plan 2036. As such, please

find below our updated comments.

Policy Status:

The Adopted Local Plan

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

In addition, the [Local Plan Housing Statement \(LPHS\)](#) and its guiding principles, adopted in

December 2016, is also a material consideration.

The following policies are of relevance:

- CS4 Town, District and Local Centres
- CS16 High Quality Design
- CS14 Efficient Use of Resources
- CS17 Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas
- CS21 Developer Requirements
- DM13 Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development
- DM24 Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development
- AL2 Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements
- AL3 Town, District and Local Centres
- Guiding Principle 3 of the LPHS
- [Havant Borough Parking SPD \(July 2016\)](#)

Havant Borough Local Plan 2036

The Council is preparing a new Local Plan and consulted on a Draft (Regulation 18) version of the [Havant Borough Local Plan 2036](#) (HBLP 2036) between 8 January to 16 February 2018. Whilst the Plan has limited weight in decision-making at this stage in the plan preparation, the Draft Local Plan, and particularly emerging policy C4 (Cowplain District Centre), is of relevance in setting out the Council's direction of travel.

Please note, the Council's Local Plan Panel considered a report setting out a summary of the responses to the consultation on the Local Plan and the proposed changes to the policies moving forward. This [Consultation Summary Report](#) was published on the Council's website on Friday 22nd June 2018. A summary of the comments received for C4, along with the Council's proposed actions and amendments, can be found on page 211 of the report.

Principle of Development:

The site lies within the urban area as defined by Policies CS17 and AL2 of the Local Plan which seek to concentrate new development within the five-urban area of the Borough.

The site is in Cowplain District Centre as shown in Policies CS4 and AL3 (Town, District and Local Centres). Although these policies, along with emerging Policy C4, resist residential development at ground floor within town, district and local centres, this proposal is for the rear extension of a property and would, therefore, not impact on the vitality and viability of the retail frontage. As such, no objection to residential development would arise in principle in this instance.

The redevelopment of the rear of the site is supported by Policy CS17.4 and Guiding Principle 3 of the Local Plan Housing Statement (LPHS). These cite the Council's promotion of development of previously developed (brownfield) land by looking at higher densities around town centres and transport hubs.

Parking:

Policy DM13 and the [Havant Borough Parking SPD \(July 2016\)](#) set out the vehicle and

cycle parking standards for new development in the Borough. As set out in paragraph 1.11 of the Parking SPD, the parking standards apply to all development for the provision of one or more residential units (gross).

Vehicle Parking

The provisions for allocated and unallocated residential parking can be found on Tables 4A and 4B respectively (pages 9 and 10) of the SPD (link above). The allocated and unallocated vehicle parking requirements are 1 space and 0.9 spaces per one bed dwelling respectively. As such, the development will need to provide a minimum of 2 vehicle parking spaces regardless of whether parking spaces are allocated or unallocated.

The applicant has proposed three vehicle parking spaces for the 2 one-bed apartments. Whether the applicant provides allocated or unallocated vehicle parking, the development will meet and exceed the minimum parking requirement.

Cycle Parking/Storage Provision

The cycle parking/storage requirements can be found in Table 4D (page 13) of the Parking SPD (link above). The long-stay cycle requirement for a one-bed unit is 1 cycle space. As such, the proposal will need to provide at least 2 cycle spaces/storage to adhere to the requirements of Policy DM13 and the Parking SPD.

Please note, short-stay cycle parking/storage will not be required as the proposal is for less than 10 dwellings.

High Quality Design:

The design and layout of the proposal will need to meet the requirements of Policy CS16 (High Quality Design). In particular, due to the proximity of surrounding development (most notably, 1 Summerhill Road), criterion 1c) and 1e) of Policy CS16 will need to be adhered to. These criteria require new development to respond to the characteristics of the locality¹ and to ensure that development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.

¹ E.g. height, massing, existing building lines, plot widths and depths, materials and location/proportion of windows and doors.

Efficient Use of Resources/Low Carbon Design:

There is an opportunity to provide PV panels on the south-sloping roof. This would meet criterion b) of Policy CS14 (Efficient Use of Resources) by contributing to the delivery of the PUSH target of 100MW of renewable energy by 2020.

In addition, following the provisions of emerging Policy E8 (Low Carbon Design) of the emerging Havant Borough Local Plan 2036, consideration and inclusion of natural ventilation and fabric performance, in addition to PV panels as mentioned above, would address climate change and improve the energy efficiency of the proposal.

In conjunction with above, it is also encouraged that the applicant seeks independent certification against the Home Quality Mark (HQM) One. This certification offers a holistic and flexible means through which individual dwellings can be measured, improved and showcased. Moreover, the HQM provides a five-star rating with key indicators which communicate the performance of a new home's design, construction, and use potential. The framework assesses water and energy use (embodied and when occupied), internal comfort and health (air quality, daylighting, noise and access to green space and amenity), resilience and safety (flood risk, fast and secure internet, adaptability) in addition to the home occupier experience (aftercare, handover procedures and the provision of home information). It enables applicants to

demonstrate the quality of their homes to a range of stakeholder;
building confidence in the quality of the completed new homes and helps highlight the benefits of new housing to prospective home buyers and tenants.

Developer Contributions:

In addition to the requirements of Policy CS21, Havant Borough Council has an adopted CIL Charging Schedule which is applied to all new residential development in the Borough.

The [Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy](#) was approved, along with its implementation from 1st April 2018 onwards, by Havant Borough's Cabinet on 7th February 2018. As such, the applicant will need to pay the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP) contribution in line with the strategy and Policy DM24.

Recommendation:

No objection in principle providing that the following are met:

- The provision of two cycle parking/storage spaces (1 for each dwelling); and
- Adherence to Policy CS16 (High Quality Design).

It is also recommended that the opportunity to provide PV Panels on the south-sloping roof is explored and conditioned if appropriate.

Public Spaces

No comment received.

Natural England

No objection

Natural England notes that your authority, as competent authority under the provisions of the Habitats Regulations, has undertaken an Appropriate Assessment of the proposal, in accordance with Regulation 63 of the Regulations. Natural England is a statutory consultee on the Appropriate Assessment stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Your appropriate assessment concludes that your authority is able to ascertain that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the sites in question. Having considered the assessment, and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal, Natural England advises that we concur with the assessment conclusions, providing that all mitigation measures are appropriately secured in any permission given.

Traffic Management, East Hampshire District Council

I would expect to see 2 parking spaces per dwelling to be provided.

Officer comment: Following the submission of amended plans to reduce the scheme to two 1 bedroom flats, there is a requirement for 1 parking space per dwelling to be provided which is reflected on the amended plan.

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
I have received a letter from you with regard to the above application and as the adjoining owner of 85 and 85A London Road, Cowplain, wish to make the following comments to the application. We, in principle have no objections to the application but would like to state that we have taken advice and it would appear that as the extension is abutting our property, it is likely that foundation will need to be installed in part on land that we control and we have not been served a "Notice 1" in accordance with the planning application process, which should have been served a minimum of 21 days before the application was lodged. Secondly we have concerns to the "weathering" of the proposed extension where it abuts our property. It appears from the roof plan supplied that there is to be a valley gutter installed to the "Party Wall" and there is no details of the discharge and weathering treatment, which is a concern which we would like clarification on. If the new extension wall is to be abutted against our property it will mean that in future we will have no access to our wall to maintain and hence our concerns regarding potential water ingress. Please could these issues be addressed and a response sent to us before you determine the application.	Further clarification was provided by the agent regarding the issues raised which were subsequently forwarded to the occupier of the adjoining property.
We have observed the proposed plans to 85A London Road, and wish to lodge objections to the plans regarding the following points: 1: The proposed 1st floor balcony will overlook our garden, and main recreation area. Whilst the two floor extension is not an issue as such, the addition of a balcony will be used for prolonged periods of time causing a	Following the submission of amended plans , the 1st floor balcony was removed from the proposal.

negative impact on our privacy, and that of our neighbours at no. 3 Summerhill Road. Currently we have offices & shops along the left hand border of our back garden that has minimal impact on our privacy during evenings and weekends. Any previous tenant of 85A would have been further removed from our fence and not able to overlook the boundary line.	
2: The 3 proposed car parking spaces positioned next to our boundary fence. We oppose to these due to noise and pollution. They have be positioned below two bedrooms and next to our dining room and living room. There is a precedence for parking, as there is a car park for the offices next door to 85A, however these are only used during working hours and not 24 hours a day. Similarly there is a public car park at the end of our garden for the Co-op and motorcycle shop, again this is only in use during opening hours and rarely past 9pm. We request that the spaces are either moved to the front of the property - or removed from the plans.	See section 7 below.
3: Positioning of bins next to our boundary. We object to their position on the grounds of smell and the attraction of pests. Our BBQ and patio is on the opposite side of the fence and it will be unhygienic in the event of the bins smelling or attracting fly's. These bins will also have to be moved to the front of the property for the regular Monday collections. This position is at the greatest distance from the point of collection and will create the most noise - Mr Colin Tuck works alternative weekly shifts, so any movement on a Monday morning will wake him. We request that the bins are positioned somewhere closer to London Road for ease of access to the tenant and the collection lorry.	Following the submission of amended plans , the bins have been relocated away from this boundary.
4: Drainage. We have had issues in the past with flooding to our back garden; the builders have dug a trench which flows into the back garden of 85A - will any extension have an effect on the runaway water causing it to stand in our garden?	This issue will be addressed by Building Control.

Further to our meeting last week with the representative from Havant Council, we wish to formally complain against the revised plans to this application, as mentioned before we are against the balcony on the grounds that it will overlook our back garden due to its proximity to our fence and patio. Having looked at the revised plans we are dismayed to see the car parking spaces have been moved so that they now run along the boundary to our property, this we now strongly object to on the following grounds: 1. These parking spaces abut our back entrance; barbecue & patio area - fumes from the cars - particularly (but not exclusively) space 3 that needs 5 manoeuvres to turn in what is a very confined space. 2. There are also two bedrooms at the back of our house and next to the spaces - which will be affected by noise; fumes and light pollution from these spaces. Whilst these spaces are not setting a precedent along this part of London Road, no other spaces are residential and are therefore only in use during office hours - or are situated at the other end of our garden. As mentioned before, Mr Tuck works shifts, the future residents will have the freedom to come and go - 24 hours a day, increasing the probability of disturbing his sleep. 3. The position of the spaces are close to the corner of our property - and due to the lack of space, increase the risk of damage to our property. We have had one fence panel damaged already - if a driver was to hit a panel whilst we were sitting in the garden we could be seriously injured. If our house was hit, bedroom wall could come down. I am sorry, but neither scenarios is acceptable. The plans are proposing too much in too small a space. 4. Looking at the number of manoeuvres required to turn a vehicle in that plot makes the design questionable, most modern vehicles (SUV's; estates; 4x4's) are too large to pass along the proposed driveway, let	Following the submission of amended plans , the 1st floor balcony was removed from the proposal. See section 7 below. See section 7 below. This is not a planning issue. See section 7 below. See section 7 below.

alone turn safely in the space provided. Any damage to our fence (or any property our side of the boundary) is not be acceptable - we have two dogs and need the boundaries in place to provide their safe keeping. 5. There has been a question over the boundary line within the last year. It seems that when our property was built, the builder put the fence in the wrong place to avoid a tree - on the condition that the back garden was cleared (and maintained) we let the mother of Mr Passingham change the boundary and keep the land IN GOOD FAITH. One year on, this piece of land is wanted for parking spaces, is currently over run once again; and appears to be harbouring rodents. Thus far we we have kept to our side of the deal - but the Passingham family have not.	This is not a planning issue and would need to be resolved by the applicant and their neighbour.
Following the latest set of proposed plans we would firstly like to say that we happy with the changes to the flats themselves as they are now in line with the existing property next door and are further from our boundary. Unfortunately we are still not happy with the proposed parking spaces and wish to have them either moved 90 degrees so that they run alongside the border fence with the Accountants - or are removed altogether. Whilst there has been an attempt to move them further away from our boundary fence (and our patio and house the other side) we don't think that a few plants will protect our border - we feel that there is inadequate provision in the event of an accident as mentioned before. We think there is the need for either concrete or metal bollards their side of the fence to prevent damage to our property. Whilst there is now more land for the cars to manoeuvre in and out of the parking spaces it is still a small area, and the cars are closer to us than the flats they are there to support. Mr Tuck has measured that there is approximately 3m between the corner of our house and where the cars will be, we are not happy that the fumes	See section 7 below. See section 7 below.

from running engines or emitted during the 5 manoeuvres to turn in the confined space will enter our property through bedroom windows - or our back door into our living room. In particular my daughters bedroom overlooks the area and is closest. If at any time in the future there are medical concerns that are directly related fumes issued from these parking spaces we will be looking at Havant Borough Council planning process first.	This is not a planning issue.
May we remind you that Mr Tuck works shifts, noise from cars making the proposes manoeuvres - and/or motorcycles will not be accepted during anti-social hours.	This is not a planning issue
Who will be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed planting against our border?. Any planting MUST be kept tidy and free of pest - WHICH IS NOT HAPPENING NOW.	See section 7 below.
Once again we want assurance that motor vehicles and bins will not cause undue pollution to our property - be it noise or smell, what you are proposing is in the immediate vicinity of our living/sleeping/recreation.	This is not a planning matter and would be managed by the freeholder/occupiers of the property.
Further to our conversation, our concerns are listed below. We object to a balcony overlooking our property as we would suffer a gross loss of privacy. There is already a large car which is used until quite late in the evening and to have another car park even closer could mean 24 hour disturbance and pollution.(there is a car park at the back to the adjacent property but is only used in business hours) We are concerned that vehicles from residential premises will be crossing the public footpath to enter the road at a busy junction.	Following the submission of amended plans , the 1st floor balcony was removed from the proposal. See section 7 below. There is already vehicular access serving the premises.

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 upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highways and parking
- (v) Developer contributions

(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. The provision of two new dwellings would assist the Council's requirement for providing new homes across the Borough under Core Strategy Policy CS9.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact upon the character of and appearance of the area

7.3 The proposal is for the construction of a two storey rear extension to form 2 no. 1 bedroom flats with associated parking. The original submission was for the construction of a two storey rear extension to form 2 no. 2 bedroom flats which extended 4 metres beyond the rear elevation of the adjoining property, and incorporated a rear first floor balcony, . Following officer concerns and a subsequent site visit to the neighbouring property at 1 Summerhill Road, the agent was advised that the scheme would not be supported due to the proximity to the neighbouring property and potential overlooking and loss of privacy.

7.4 Subsequent extensive negotiations resulted in an amended scheme for the construction of a two storey rear extension to form 2 no. 1 bedroom flats. The revisions included a 4 metre reduction in the depth of the extension, to be in line with the rear elevation of the adjoining property, together with the removal of the first floor balcony to the western elevation. The proposal would not be visible from the public realm.

7.5 The extension would be a continuation of the existing building and would be 4.8 metres in width, 9.8 metres deep with a shallow pitched roof 7.25 metres high which is approximately 1.8 metres below the ridge height of the current building. It is considered that this would be an appropriate addition, in character with the design of the existing building and matching materials are proposed.

7.6 The revised design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context and is therefore judged to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). It is considered that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

7.7 The proposed extension is to the western elevation of the existing building and the revised scheme would not project beyond the rear elevation of the adjoining property. Following the removal of the first floor balcony, two small high level windows are proposed in the western elevation of the first floor flat which would limit any perception of overlooking and loss of privacy to the rear garden of the property at 1 Summerhill Road. Furthermore, there would be a distance of approximately 16 metres from the rear elevation of the extension to the western boundary of the site. Although there is a first floor window in the eastern elevation of 1 Summerhill Road, this serves a landing.

7.8 Whilst it is acknowledged the extension would have a bearing on this property, it is considered the amendments to the original proposal are appropriate and the resulting impact would not be so great as to constitute a defensible reason for refusal.

- 7.9 The new first floor window and the windows of the extension in the southern elevation would face the high blank brick wall of the neighbouring commercial property and it is deemed any impact would be negligible. Additionally the window closest to the rear elevation of the extension is set in 1.5 metres from the edge of this wall and would not give rise to any unacceptable impact on the occupiers of 1 Summerhill Road.
- 7.10 Concerns were raised by the occupiers of 1 Summerhill Road with respect to the proposed parking spaces for the development regarding the proximity to their boundary fence and rear elevation, safety issues and possible pollution from fumes. In order to lessen the impact, a 1.5 metre landscaping buffer will be formed between the new parking spaces and the western boundary of the application site. A condition is recommended for further details of this landscaping to be submitted with a requirement for it to be retained at all times.
- 7.11 Following consultation with the Council's Highways Engineer, it was confirmed that the three parking spaces can only be located in the position shown on the newly submitted plan. Any other location would not allow cars to park, reverse and turn on site. Furthermore, the proposed location of the parking spaces would not constitute a defensible reason for refusal of the application.
- 7.12 The amendment to the scheme for the provision of 2 no. 1 bedroom flats has resulted in a reduced requirement from four parking spaces to two. Moreover, whilst the rear of the application site is currently overgrown, the area could be used unreservedly for the parking of vehicles associated with the existing business and flat.

(iv) Highways and parking

- 7.13 There is one bedroom proposed in each property, subsequently there will be a requirement for two on site parking spaces as recommended in the HBC Parking SPD (July 2016). The proposed block plan submitted reflects this.

(v) Developer contributions

- 7.14 The CIL rates to be applied to development are set out in the Havant Borough Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, which was adopted by the council on the 20 February 2013. This followed two public consultation exercises and an Examination into the Charging Schedule by an independent Examiner. The Examiners Report concluded that the Havant Borough Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule provided an appropriate basis for the collection of the levy in the borough. The levy is charged at £80 per square metre (plus indexing) on new floorspace (measured as gross internal area) in Waterlooville.
- 7.15 The proposal would result in new residential development which is Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable and the appropriate forms have been submitted. The gross new internal floor space for the dwelling has been calculated by the agent as 82.128 sqm which generates a total CIL liability of approximately £8,858.31. The applicant is not claiming self build exemption.
- 7.16 This development would also increase the number of dwellings within the 5.6km zone identified as significant in potentially increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. Natural England's advice in regard all new housing development within this zone is that it is likely to have a significant effect on the SPA. Policy DM24 of the Allocations Plan, covers this issue and allows for a financial contribution to be made towards mitigation measures. This is currently set at £337 for a 1 no. bedroom dwelling, so the total fee due for 2 no. 1 bedroom flats plus the monitoring and administration fee is £727.70. The relevant paperwork has been returned and the contribution has been paid for the original

proposal of 2 no. 2 bedroom flats, consequently a refund for the difference in payment will be issued. The proposal therefore accords with Policies CS11, CS21 (Developer Contributions) and DM24.

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 It is considered that the revised scheme has made the necessary amendments to address issues relating to overlooking and having an overbearing impact on neighbouring property at 1 Summerhill Road, meeting the requirements of policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). The application is therefore considered to be acceptable and is recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/18/00607 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 external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3 No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a more detailed soft landscaping scheme for the planting buffer along the western boundary has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall specify the proposed finished ground levels in relation to the existing levels, the distribution and species of ground cover to be planted, the positions, species and planting sizes of the trees and/or shrubs to be planted, and timing provisions for completion of the implementation of all such landscaping works.
The implementation of all such approved landscaping shall be completed in full accordance with such approved timing provisions. Any tree or shrub planted as part of such approved landscaping scheme which dies or is otherwise removed shall be replaced with another of the same species and size in the same position during the first available planting season.
Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS16, of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 4 No development hereby permitted shall commence until a specification of the materials to be used for the surfacing of all open parts of the site proposed to be hardsurfaced has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought

into use until the implementation of all such hardsurfacing has been completed in full accordance with that specification.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality and having due regard to policies CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

- 5 The car parking, cycle store, 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.

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

Drg no. 01 Rev A Location plan and block plan
Drg no. A101 Existing elevations plan
Drg no. A102 Proposed elevations plan
Drg no. A103 Existing ground and first floor plan
Drg no. A104 Proposed ground and first floor plan
Drg no. A105 Existing and proposed roof plan
Drg no. A106 Perspective view plan
Drg no. A107 Site plan
Drg no. A108 Proposed parking plan
Planning statement
Flood map dated 07/06/2018

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.