
Site Address:	The Railway Inn, 95 North Street, Emsworth, PO10 7PQ		
Proposal:	Demolish existing outbuildings to ground/first floor at rear of site and construct 2No. new two bedroom houses with off road parking.		
Application No:	APP/18/00665	Expiry Date:	22/08/2018
Applicant:	Mr D Lucas		
Agent:	Mr M Singleton	Case Officer:	Lewis Oliver
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site is located on the corner of North Street and Sultan Road in Emsworth. The entrance to the Emsworth railway station is located opposite to the site. The area is characterised by mainly Victorian style terrace housing along Sultan Road and North Street. A number of the properties on North Street, including the adjacent neighbour at No. 93 have been subdivided into two flats. Parking is predominantly on street. A recent development has occurred at the adjacent site on Sultan Road which involved a conversion of a former industrial/office building into three dwellings with a further new dwelling located in the rear garden facing onto Seagull Lane.

The application site comprises a two-storey building, with a traditional pitched roof. It has a white painted render finish to the external facade with some mock Tudor detailing. The building is currently used as a public house with B & B accommodation at first floor level. The main entrance fronts onto North Street and includes a front external seating area enclosed by iron railings. There is a flat roof area at first floor level at the rear of the building which includes a single storey unit of accommodation which is ancillary to the public house and used as managers accommodation. There are other flat sections of the building which are not enclosed and used for servicing.

2 Planning History

The most relevant planning history to this proposal, with regard to the provision of further dwellings on the site are:

APP/17/00567 - Demolition of existing rear outbuildings, erection of 2No. 2 bed dwellings (Revised submission). Permission 6/11/17 - Not implemented

APP/18/00535 - Application to remove Condition 5 of Planning Permission APP/16/01311 and variation of Condition 6 of Planning Permission APP/16/01311 relating to alterations on the south elevation comprising removal of access door onto flat roof area and insertion of 2No. AOV obscurely glazed windows. , Refused,24/07/2018

APP/16/01311 - Raise roof height and form 1No. self contained manager's flat to second floor roof area with new internal stairwell from first floor, Permission,14/03/2017

APP/16/00821 - Demolition of existing rear outbuildings, erection of 4No. three storey townhouses with parking and raise height of existing pub roof to form 1No. self contained flat to second floor roof area., Refused on 18/10/2016 for the following

reasons:

1. Development of the site in the manner proposed would amount to over-development, in that it would give rise to unsatisfactory plot sizes for two-bedroomed dwellings with minimal external amenity space. Furthermore, in providing this level of accommodation the proposed design features on the front elevations of the terraced units including balconies and undercroft parking would be out of keeping with the character of the streetscene and harmful to the visual amenity of Sultan Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

2. The proposed development would result in an excessive building bulk adjacent to No. 93 North Street, visible from the adjoining wider terrace row, detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of these properties. The proposed balcony to serve the access to the second floor accommodation would give rise to the potential for overlooking of the private amenity space of No. 93 North Street. The presence of windows in the rear elevation of the proposed residential units would result in a loss of privacy in terms of the potential for noise disturbance and light pollution. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

3. Development of the site in the manner proposed would not provide adequate provision of car parking in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's adopted standards and would therefore encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway which would be harmful to the amenity of the immediate locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Parking Supplementary Planning Document 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

4 The proposal, without completion of the appropriate binding arrangements to secure a contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership, is contrary to the Council's Policy on contributions towards measures of mitigation adopted by the Local Planning Authority which seeks to ensure that the provision is made from new development towards mitigating against increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. It is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and Policy DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

An appeal was subsequently dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 6th September 2017, for the following reasons (summarised):

Although I have found no harm to result in terms of parking provision, significant harm would result upon the character and appearance of the area, neighbouring living conditions and the SPA. This harm is the overriding consideration and leads me to conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan when considered as a whole. Consequently, having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Other planning history, relating to the existing pub:

01/63424/000 - Installation of two windows to ground floor, side (north) elevation., Permission, 19/06/2001

06/63424/001 - Replace pan tiles to roof., Permission, 04/12/2006

07/63424/002 - Retention of refrigeration unit. Resited to east elevation and enclosed with insulation board. , Permission,15/08/2007

09/63424/003 - Enclosure of the front forecourt including the erection of 0.9m high railings positioned above the existing 0.4m high boundary wall, erection of 0.4m high conifer planters above the existing brick piers and the erection of 1.3m high railings and iron gate in between the existing brick piers and boundary wall and the erection of 1No. retractable awning to the north side of the front entrance, Permission,02/02/2010

3 Proposal

The proposal is for the demolition of existing rear outbuildings, and erection of 2No. 2 bed dwellings with off road parking (Revised submission). The proposal seeks to amend the planning permission granted under application APP/17/00567 in the following ways:

- The proposal includes undercroft car parking, which would provide 1 car parking space per unit
- The size of the dwellings has been amended in the following ways, the ridge height of the dwellings will be 7.2m in height compared to 7.1m under the previous approval
- The depth of the dwellings has been increased, resulting in a reduced courtyard area of 2.55m, compared to the approved depth of 2.95m
- The fenestration of at first floor on the rear elevation has reduced the number of windows from 3 to 2 for each dwelling.

4 Policy Considerations

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

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS21 (Developer Requirements)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable 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

Public Sewer within 3m in Sultan Road unlikely to be issue as existing building in same location

First floor windows to be capable of means of escape under Approved Document B requirements

Building Regulation application required for this work

Highways Engineer, Development Engineer

The plans show two car parking spaces of 2.4m by 4.8m but they are both adjacent to a wall and it would not be possible for passengers or drivers to get out of a car. These could not be considered to be car parking space. A standard garage is 3m by 6 so the undercroft parking area should be 6m by 6m to count as two spaces.

Natural England Government Team

No Objection subject to contribution in accordance with SRMS

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: 44

Number of site notices: 1.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 5

Comment	Officer Comment
I object to Planning Application APP/18/00665 (HBC letter dated 6th July 2018) on the same grounds for which I have previously objected to the other Planning Applications for this site (PAP/16/00821; APP/X1735/w/3174481; AP/16/01311; APP/17/00567 and all its many revisions; APP/18/00535). I am the neighbour who has the most to lose in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy if these Planning Applications be granted without modification. I would like all my previous online Representations and communications with the Planning Officers for these applications to be taken into consideration when the Planning Decision is being reached for this Planning Application APP/18/00665. Grant of Planning Permission for APP/17/00567 (dated 6th November 2017) has already been granted for two 2-bedroomed houses WITH NO PROVISION FOR CAR-PARKING. The Planning Officers saw fit to place Conditions upon this Grant of Planning	See section 7

Permission in order to protect the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties. The main relevant conditions for the occupants to the south are Conditions 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10. I quote from the Grant of Planning Permission, 'Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to CS16 of the Havant Borough Council Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.' This statement recurs in several Conditions or in modified form in others. In Condition 8 my address is actually mentioned by name. I repeat my statement from the first paragraph: I am the neighbour who has the most to lose in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy if Planning Application APP/18/00665 be granted without modification.

I hope and trust that these Conditions for APP/17/00567 will be repeated for APP/18/00665 because the proposed design of the buildings on the south elevation is somewhat similar. There is even more reason to be strict with the current Planning Application because the new dwellings on APP/18/00665 propose to be:

- Taller to the ridge 7200mm whereas APP/17/00567 is proposed to be 7100mm

- Nearer to my property because the courtyards are only 2550mm in depth whereas the courtyards for APP/17/00567 are proposed to be 2950mm deep.

- The first floor windows on the south elevation are proposed to be of obscured glass. Opening windows will definitely let the sound out. Conditions 5 and 6 in the of the Grant of Planning Permission for APP/17/00567 are specific and grant the occupants of 93 and 93a some protection. I am hoping that these Conditions will be written into Planning Permission for APP/18/0665 if this Application be granted. Bathrooms do not need to

have windows. The landing has other ventilation on the north side of the building and there is a door and two windows on the ground floor for each house. There will be the noise from the courtyards, sound systems, barbecues and people talking. Sound travels far in this 93/95 area. The proposal is an intrusion too far.

-Likewise for Condition 8. I hope the wall will be required to be built securely and strongly to the stated height and remain in place at all times thereafter (Condition 8).

-I notice in the Maps and Drawings No.12/18 (01): Date:20-06-18 that a short length of balustrade is shown in the south elevation. This balustrade appears to be unnecessary as the roof is simply a flat roof.

-I note that on account of the courtyards in APP/18/0665 being only 2550mm deep, would this proposed new development too close to the first floor rooms at the rear of my property? The proposed undercroft space for two vehicles appears to be too small. The loss of three or four car-parking spaces would have a detrimental effect for local on-road parking.

Planning Application APP/18/00665 should be refused.

I draw attention of the Planning Department to the following:
I have noticed a discrepancy on the Planning Application form Section 5 for this Planning Application that I do not understand.

The Agent states in Section 5 as follows:
'Previous scheme with off road parking approved
Ref: APP/17/00567
Approval Date 6/11/2017'

However, in the Grant of Planning Permission for Planning APP/17/00567 dated 6th November 2017 Condition 2 states the following:

' The development here by permitted shall be carried out in accordance with

See section 7

the following approved plans: Proposed elevations and floor plans-Drawing Number: 04/17 (02) Revision A - Received on 3rd October 2017 Block plan 04/17-received on 3rd October 2017 Revised Design and Access Statement received on 7th September 2017 Reason:-to ensure provision of a satisfactory development.' The above-mentioned Drawings and Block Plan clearly show that approval is granted for two houses with absolutely no provision for on-site car-parking at all. The two houses front directly on to the pavement in Sultan Road. Therefore the statement In Section 5 of the Planning Application form for Planning Application APP/18/00665 dated 27th June 2018 is incorrect. Off road car-parking has never been approved for any Planning Application involving 95 North Street, PO10 7PQ since these Planning Applications started with APP/16/00821 in 2016. Hence I am drawing attention to the discrepancy.	
This design has been tried before in a previous application and is a regurgitation of that. The undercroft parking would effectively remove public on-street parking spaces from Sultan Rd ensuring that the new inhabitants would always have reserved on-street parking in addition to off road parking. As previously stated these dwellings have already been earmarked. This design is unneighbourly and highly unfair for current residents who already struggle. In addition the windows on the south elevation should remain non-opening and obscured as previous permitted design. I do not wish to hear toilets flushing and other noises/smells emanating from bathrooms and kitchens. This proposal should be denied.	See section 7

HBC Highways department says it all what is proposed is not a car parking space. Here we go again losing more car parking space from Sultan road, when the car parking space proposed isn't a car parking space. It is against HBC policy about new build, as I have stated before poor quality design for Emsworth for future generations, and who ever believes that people are going to live without a car for the next 25 years, and use a bike or train always "beggars belief" No this is purely losing 12 meters of parking in Sultan road. Is a condition of the application possibly going to be that future B&B customers are going to park in Bridge street car park? I doubt it, Come on HBC stick to your policy	See section 7
I am appealing re this proposal as I live in Sultan Road. This road is so congested all day and evening as people use it to dump their cars and commute from the station. I know that this objection has already been dismissed but I would like to ask the relevant powers that be to come down here during the day but particularly around early evening time when you cannot park your car in the street where you live. We already suffer with fall out from the Railway Inn particularly on the weekend when there are numerous drunk people staggering around disturbing all and sundry but my main objection is this. More development will mean a possible 4 more cars to park in this street. Where exactly are they going to go and what about the rest of us who actually don't dare go out of an evening as they know they won't be able to park when they get back? What about those of us who are either with children or elderly who need to be able to park to unload shopping or just be able to walk to their own front door? Nobody in Sultan Road wants this development to go ahead, it will be disruptive while it is being built (its hard enough to drive in and out of this road at the best of times) and when it is	See section 7

built there will be even more congestion in this road than there is already and believe me its hard enough now. Come down from your ivory towers and see what its really like living here. I object in the strongest possible terms to this development.	

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 amenity of future occupants
 - (v) Impact on highways and parking
- (vi) Developer contributions

(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. Furthermore the principle of two further dwellings on this site was established through the granting of permission under application APP/17/0056.

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

Sultan Road is predominantly characterised by modest two storey terraced properties which are generally uniform in their appearance. New development has recently taken place immediately to the east of the application site. In terms of the proposed dwellings which would replace this section of the building, they could in principle, have potential to improve the streetscene, as was identified in the previous permission APP/17/00567, which had simple forms of design which integrated into the existing character of the area. However this depends on the quality of the design, particularly as the key to the success of a terrace is a degree of uniformity. Other than the Railway Inn itself, the height of the existing terrace along Sultan Road is two-storey, within none of the properties having on site parking provision in the form of undercroft car parking. The recent development at Tealwood, Sultan Road has resulted in properties with a slightly different front elevation in terms of window apertures, however this still draws inspiration from the existing terrace row.

As has been highlighted in paragraph 3.1, this application has been amended from the previous permission, with main visual impact being the inclusion of the undercroft parking, and the slight increase in height of the development. Policy CS16 of the Local Plan advises that all development should demonstrate in its design that it responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and in section 1.c. advises that it uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing building lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of openings including windows, doors and openings for parking.

In contrast to the existing terrace in Sultan Road, the proposed dwellings would include open, undercroft parking bays at ground floor level. The use of this design features would result in the extension to the terrace forming a highly incongruous pocket of development, with a contrived and unwelcoming appearance from the undercroft parking, resulting in a significant harmful impact to the visual amenity of the streetscene and contrary to Policy CS16 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy).

In terms of the remainder of the scheme, these largely follow the previous approved application and in this respect the development is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The proposal would be visible from the rear gardens of No's 93-85 North Street and beyond. However, the most immediate impact would be on No. 93. The existing south elevation of the ground floor of the public house and the managers accommodation unit at first floor, forms the shared boundary between the two plots. The first floor building comprises a gable end and then a pitched roof with two roof light windows. A previous application APP/16/00821, was refused and upheld at appeal regarding the overbearing impact of the development on the amenities of 93 North Street. The previous approved application, APP/17/00567, would have retained an element of the existing southern elevation of the existing building at a height of approximately 3m. The proposed dwellings would then have been located approx. 3.3metres from the existing wall, in comparison this application has reduced the previous approved distances to the following, 2.8m from the existing wall, with an increase in ridge height of the dwellings by 0.1m to a height of 7m. Whilst the proposed development would result in a closer proximity of development to the neighbour than the approved development, overall it is considered that given the proposed layout, size, scale and massing of the development being largely similar to that previously approved, that it would not have a significantly adverse overbearing impact or in relation to loss of sunlight/daylight impact on the amenities of 93 North Street.

In relation to privacy this application now proposes 2 windows each per dwelling on the rear elevation at first floor, compared to 3 windows under the previous application. These windows would serve a bathroom and landing and are proposed to be obscure glazed, in order to prevent direct overlooking into the private amenity area of 93 North Street. Having regard to the approved scheme, were this proposal to be recommended for approval it is considered that it would be appropriate for additional conditions to be imposed controlling the extent of opening of these windows, and this would satisfactorily protect the amenity of adjoining properties. Concerns have been raised that these windows would also result in light pollution on the neighbouring property. Whilst light would be visible at night through these windows, it is not considered that this would be so significant to cause a harmful impact on neighbouring living conditions, which was also a conclusion reached by the Inspector on the previous appeal, under application APP/16/00821.

Concerns have also been raised that the proposed amenity areas, would result in significant noise pollution and have an adverse impact on the amenities of 93 North Street. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed location of the amenity areas would result in some noise disturbance, from usual day to day activities associated with residential dwellings, it is not however considered that this would have a significant adverse impact on 93 North Street to justify a reason for refusal on this

issue.

Taking all these factors together, and subject to suitable conditions, to include removing permitted development rights and limitations on the opening of windows, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties with regard to loss of sunlight/daylight, overlooking or overbearing impact. As such whilst this revised scheme has a different impact on neighbours, compared to the approved scheme, this development is still considered to have overcome the previous reasons for refusal and the matters raised by the Inspector in the previous appeal, APP/16/00821. The development would therefore comply with policy CS16 of the Core Strategy, the Design SPD and the NPPF.

(iv) Impact on amenity of future occupants

The proposal now includes a reduced rear courtyard for each property from the previous approved application (APP/17/00567), which would now be 2.55m in depth and 5.5m in width. It is noted that the guidelines set out in the Design Guide SPD normally require a garden depth of 10m. However it is considered that as the dwellings are 2 bed unit, located within the urban area, that this level of amenity space would be sufficient to provide for the day to day needs of the future occupants, in terms of both amenity space for enjoying an outside area, and for matters such as drying clothes amongst other day to day activities. Overall it is considered that the impact on the development is acceptable in terms of the amenities of future residents of a dwelling this size.

(v) Impact on highways and parking

Application APP/16/000821 was refused as the development would not have provided adequate provision of car parking in accordance with the Local Planning Authorities adopted standards and would therefore encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway which would be harmful to the amenity of the immediate locality. Whilst the subsequent appeal was dismissed, the Inspector concluded that on the matter of parking that *"Given the accessible location of the site with very realistic alternatives for travel by methods other than the private car, I consider that a reduction from the Council's usual parking standards is justifiable in this case. This is particularly the case given the limited size of the proposed houses containing only two bedrooms. The site is in a location where reduced car ownership could realistically be encouraged. I acknowledge the loss of a small amount of on street parking spaces and the high demand for parking spaces from train station users. Nevertheless, I do not consider that there is any persuasive evidence that the parking implications of the proposal, including the loss of a modest amount of on-street parking spaces, would result in any significant harm to the amenity of surrounding residents. There is also no compelling evidence to suggest that any highway safety implications would arise."*

As such subsequent to this appeal decision, an assessment of the existing parking provision and situation has been undertaken. This part of the existing building currently provides two bedroom used as a B&B, along with a bar area, offices with managers accommodation at first floor level and currently has no on site car parking spaces and therefore an existing deficit of four car parking space currently exists. Sultan Road is not covered by a residents parking permit system, unlike Seagull Lane or Palmers Road, nor does it have time restrictions like North Street and therefore has a higher demand for parking from residents and train station users. Therefore the previous approved application, APP/17/00567 was approved with zero parking,

given its sustainable location. This application proposes undercroft car parking again. The concerns of residents regarding such parking provision are noted, and it is acknowledged the proposed parking spaces would be difficult to use, as the Parking SPD outlines that a car parking space should be minimum size of 2.4m x 4.8m, which these spaces would be - however, this size fails to take into account the need for space to open car doors in order to easily access the space. However given the car parking space sizes are similar to the appeal (APP/16/00821), where the Inspector considered this to be an acceptable relationship, then it would be unreasonable for the Local Planning Authority to refuse this application for this reason.

Concerns have also been raised that the level of traffic generation would have a significant adverse impact on the safety and free flow of the highway network. As has been outlined given the existing uses on this site, in combination with the Inspector in the previous appeal for 4 dwellings, concluding that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on the highway network. As such given that the number of units and bedroom sizes remain the same as the previous approval, which would result in the provision of two dwellings, it is not considered that the development would have a significant adverse impact on the safety and free flow of the highway network.

Taking all these factors together with regard to impact on the highway and provision, it is considered that given the existing deficit of parking from the existing uses on the site, combined with the sustainable location of the site, and previous permission for 2 dwellings that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on the highway network.

vi) Developer contributions

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 20th 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 £100 (plus indexation) per square metre on new floorspace (measured as gross internal area) in Emsworth.

It is considered that there is a CIL liability for this site. A credit can be given for the existing floorspace of the dwelling within the site and therefore only the additional floorspace is CIL liable. The agent has completed the CIL planning form and confirmed that the net additional gross internal floor space would be less than the existing floor space, and therefore in this circumstance a contribution towards CIL would not be liable.

The Council has conducted a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the proposed development under Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, this includes an Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63. This is included in the case file. The screening under Regulation 63(1)(a) found that there was likely to be a significant effect on Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area due to the increase in recreation as a result of the development. The planning application was then subject to an Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63. This assessment included a package of measures based on the suggested scale of mitigation in the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy and the applicant has indicated a willingness to enter into a legal

agreement to secure the mitigation package. The Appropriate Assessment concluded that this is sufficient to remove the significant effect on the SPAs which would otherwise have been likely to occur. The HRA was subject to consultation with Natural England as the appropriate nature conservation body under Regulation 63(3) who have confirmed that they agree with the findings of the assessment. The applicant has indicated a willingness to enter into a legal agreement to secure the mitigation package, however on basis of a refusal, these factors must be included.

(vii) Other matters

It is noted that the revised plans indicate a balustrade to be located on the remaining flat roofed area. This does not form part of this application.

8 Conclusion

The design of the front elevation of the terrace row, through the provision of undercroft parking is considered to be out of character and visually harmful to the streetscene. Furthermore no contribution has been provided towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy. Overall it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policies CS16, DM13 and DM24 of the Local Plan and advice laid out at national planning policy level and results in a form of unsustainable development in respect of which the harm heavily outweighs any perceived benefits.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/18/00665 for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed design features on the front elevations of the development, in the form of the undercroft parking, would be out of keeping with the character of the streetscene and harmful to the visual amenity of Sultan Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 2 In the absence of a suitable agreement to secure appropriate mitigation measures, the development would be likely to have a significant effect on the Solent Special Protection Areas and so is contrary to Policy DM24 Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations Plan) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.