
Site Address:	56A Bracklesham Road, Hayling Island, PO11 9SJ		
Proposal:	1No. 2 bed detached dwelling with garage and off street parking.		
Application No:	APP/17/01179	Expiry Date:	01/01/2018
Applicant:	Mr Steul		
Agent:	Mr Arthurs	Case Officer:	Lewis Oliver
	Arthurs Planning and Development		
Ward:	Hayling East		
Site Visit Date:			

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

56A Bracklesham Road, Hayling Island is located within the defined urban area. The site is located within a designated flood zone 3. The site is defined by a mixture of residential dwellings, the existing properties to the east of the west and east are three storey large dwellings, with balconies at first floor level, which allows mutual overlooking of each others properties.

The site itself was formally part of 56 Bracklesham Road, which has now been sub-divided, the wider boundaries to the site are defined by close boarded fencing. The application site is long and relatively narrow at 10.5 m wide by 48 m deep, the site area is 504 sqm. This is typical of the more urban site layouts in the adjoining streets. The building form of the adjoining sites responds to this with narrow, taller properties more typical of town settings with car parking forecourts and relatively large rear gardens.

2 Planning History

APP/15/01315 - Proposed second floor corner balcony, additions and alterations to fenestration and replacement of balusters with glazed privacy screen., PERM,03/02/2016
APP/16/00122 - Demolition of existing entrance and construction of 3 storey side extension to house new staircase. Installation of bi-fold doors to replace existing windows to first and second floor., PERM,21/04/2016

3 Proposal

The proposal is for the provision of a three floor, two bedroom detached house with off street parking, landscaped garden with balconies on first and second floor. The house has been specifically designed to minimise flood risk and has no habitable rooms on the ground floor. The design of the property is modern and reflects the form and building materials used in more recently constructed properties in the immediate vicinity. This comprises wood cladding on the upper floor, with white render on the lower levels.

The building footprint is approximately 7.1m street frontage and 11.5m deep. The proposed building height is 9.4m above the existing measured ground level. This compares with the foot print of the adjoining properties: No. 56 approximately 9.5m street frontage by 12.5m depth, and 9m in height; No.56b has a 10m street frontage and 10.5m deep, 9.6m in height.

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)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS9	(Housing)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

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

The unprotected area on the west elevation would exceed the permitted limits. Both the windows would need to be reduced in size and the cladding would need to be a material that is 30 minutes fire resistant.

The cladding on the east elevation would also need to be 30 minute fire resistant as the current proposal would also exceed permitted limits for unprotected areas.

Coastal Engineering

I can confirm that the Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership (ESCP) have no objection to the proposed development, subject to the LPA being satisfied that the sequential and exception tests have been passed.

The site is located within the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 3, and is therefore considered to be at risk of experiencing a 1:200 year (0.5% annual probability) extreme tidal flood event. For information, the present day 1:200 year extreme tidal flood level for Chichester Harbour is 3.4mAOD, increasing to a predicted 4.5mAOD by the year 2115, due to the effects of climate change.

The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) compiled by Ambiantal and dated September 2017, which sufficiently outlines how flood risk at the site will be mitigated. As outlined in the FRA, the external ground levels of the site range from approximately 2.29mAOD to 2.57mAOD. The ground floor of the proposed development is to be used exclusively for a garage and storage space, whilst habitable accommodation will be located on the upper floors of the property, with the finished floor levels of the upper floors being set above all modelled flood levels and approximately 3.0m above the existing ground levels. The upper floors of the proposed development could therefore provide occupants with safe internal refuge during an extreme tidal flood event.

The site currently benefits from flood defences at Eastoke Corner. The South Hayling

Island Beach Management Plan identifies a strategy for delivering the beach management approach along the open coast for the next five years (2017-2022), including bi-annual beach recycling at Eastoke Corner to deliver a 1:200 year standard of protection (SoP).

Furthermore, a range of flood resilient construction techniques are proposed to be used, as well as additional flood resistance measures. Finally, the FRA recommends that all occupants of the building sign up to the Government's Flood Warning Service and prepare a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan in accordance with advice from the Environment Agency, to ensure that adequate warning is received prior to an extreme tidal flood event.

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

No response

Environment Agency

We have no objection to the proposed development as submitted, subject to the inclusion of the following condition, in any permission granted.

We consider that planning permission could be granted to the proposed development, as submitted, if the following planning condition is included as set out below. Without this condition, the proposed development on this site poses an unacceptable risk to the environment and we would object to the application.

Condition V Implementation of Flood Risk Assessment

The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA.

All habitable living accommodation shall be located at first floor level or above. The first floor level should be set no lower than 3 metres above existing ground levels (paragraph 1.7 and 7.4 of FRA.)

Internal access is to be provided throughout the dwelling to provide an area of safe refuge on the upper floors of the property (paragraph 1.7 of FRA.)

The provision of flood resilient construction measures has been submitted with the FRA and a site specific flood warning and evacuation plan is in place and to be implemented (section 7 of FRA.)

Reasons: To ensure the safety of the development and future occupants in line with section 9 of the Planning Practice Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for Flood Risk and Coastal Change.

Advice to Local Planning Authority/Applicant

The proposed development is located within tidal flood zone 3 and is considered to have a high probability of flooding (>0.5%, 1 in 200) from the sea in any year. The current 1 in 200 year tide level is given as 3.3mAOD, rising to 4.5mAOD by 2115, when considering the effects of climate change and sea level rise. We note that the site could be subject to significant depths of flooding over its lifetime with worst case flood depths of 4.5mAOD which makes ground floor of the building is subject to inundation.

The road levels are identified as 2.92 mAOD. Therefore, safe access to and from the building will not be possible in case of flooding. As a result, emergency services may not be able to operate and the safety occupants will be reliant on safe refuge within the building or prior evacuation.

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) needs to be satisfied that safe refuge within the

building is adequate and that the building will remain structurally sound given the potential depth of flooding possible at the site.

The LPA may decide that in the absence of safe access and egress, the risk to the users of the development can be mitigated by alternative means. In coming to a decision on the proposed development, the LPA should therefore give careful consideration, in consultation with relevant specialists, to the mitigation measures proposed. Specifically, consideration should be given to whether or not the availability of safe refuge, the submitted flood response plan contained within the FRA and recommended resilience measures would enable users of the development to avoid the flood hazards identified.

If the LPA is not satisfied, taking into account all relevant considerations, that the proposed development can be considered safe without the provision of safe access and exit then planning permission should be refused.

The Environment Agency will support the decision of the LPA on flood risk matters and should the LPA be minded to refuse the application on the grounds that the mitigation proposed is not considered satisfactory the Environment Agency would provide our full support at appeal.

In reviewing the site flood response plan, we recommend that the LPA consult their emergency planners, the emergency services and the Local Resilience Forum. It is essential that this consultation takes place prior to the granting of planning permission, as the agreement and securing of a suitable flood response plan will be crucial for the safety of the development.

Highways Engineer, Development Engineer

The Highway Authority have no adverse comment to this application subject to the provision of a dropped kerb

Planning Policy

Scope of these comments:

These comments are limited to the flood risk Sequential Test only, rather than any wider policy considerations.

Flood Risk:

The site is located within Flood Zone 3. The NPPF states that a sequential approach should be taken, and that development should not be permitted in areas at risk of flooding if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding.

The applicant has submitted a Sequential Test Document, which concludes that there are no sequentially preferable sites. I agree with the applicant's assessment that what is a reasonable search area for 'reasonably available' alternative sites, is not particularly detailed in national guidance. Neither has local guidance been produced. The applicant has referenced Bristol City Council's practice note.

While that guide of course does not apply in Havant, I nevertheless find that it provides a sensible framework for applying the sequential test.

Further, I agree with the applicant (and the guidance of Bristol City Council) that to be considered 'reasonably available' all the following criteria should apply:

- The site is within the agreed area of search.
- The site is of comparable size and can accommodate the requirements of the proposed development.
- The site is either:
 - o owned by the applicant;
 - o for sale at a fair market value; or

o is publicly owned land that has been formally declared to be surplus and is available for purchase.

- The site is not safeguarded in the Local Plan for another use.

What I do not agree with, however, is that additional very specific criteria set by the applicant on p.11-12 of his Sequential Test document. I consider that to meet the requirements of the sequential test, the applicant should demonstrate that he is being as flexible as possible, and therefore to include a long list of criteria by which sites may be discounted does not seem appropriate. Nevertheless, in this case I do not consider that removing these criteria would have led to a conclusion that alternative sites were available.

The applicant initially stated that the area of search should be restricted to South Hayling, but when questioned has confirmed that sites across the whole of Hayling Island have been considered, and has provided a list of these sites. I have also done my own review of property for sale on the open market and am satisfied that there are no suitable sites available at present. In saying this, I am mindful of the fact that there are always likely to be existing residential properties on the market which given unlimited funds could be purchased with the intention of demolishing and redeveloping for a single dwelling such as the one proposed. I would not expect the applicant to consider all such sites currently available on the market, where they contain quality dwellings not in need of redevelopment.

Overall, I am content that the applicant has discharged the requirements of the sequential test.

Waste Services Manager

No concerns

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 5

Number of site notices: 1_

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Comment	Officer Comment
I wish to object to this application. The house will be situated on an increasingly busy junction both residential and recreational (sailing club) use. The house is out of character with the rest of the houses in this road. It will directly overlook our house (2A Wittering Road) particularly the bedrooms which are situated on the ground floor. This junction is a gateway to the sailing club, creek and coast and is used by many people both local and from far afield.	Impact on the character and appearance of the area, highways and on amenities of neighbouring properties are considered under section 7
The character of this end of	Loss of property value is not a material

Bracklesham rd, and Wittering rd will be devalued by jamming in yet another infill property, one having been recently built in the same garden of the original old house which has itself just been redeveloped.	planning consideration
Concerns raised about contractor parking during construction	Impact on highways is considered under section 7
The subdivision of plot 56 into 3 was a subdivision too far which has left 56 itself unable to store boats and park 2 vehicles without projecting onto the nature strip. Hayling does not need more designer second homes; it needs affordable homes for local young families.	

1 letter of support, outlining the following points: We are the eastern neighbours to the proposed development (at 56B Bracklesham Road), and have lived at this property for a number of years. We very much welcome the proposed new house at 56A.

The derelict site was very overgrown and housed rats and other vermin, as well as being used for fly tipping. It was a blight on the area and a nuisance to us. The watercourse (vital to be kept clear) was blocked by undergrowth and detritus - the development will maintain this section of drain as each other house does along the street.

The proposed design seems to be the right scale and fits very well between the existing houses. We feel the quality of the design will enhance the appearance of the street and the use of wood cladding will blend the house very nicely into the surrounding area.

We very much hope that this application will be given permission to go ahead, and we would support it strongly.

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) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Highway matters
- (v) Flooding issues

(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.

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

7.3 The proposal is for the provision of a three floor, two bedroom detached house with off street parking, landscaped garden with balconies on first and second floor. The architecture of the property is modern and reflects the form and building materials used in more recently constructed properties in the immediate vicinity. The wood cladding on

the upper floor adds a softer more naturalistic pallet that blends with its coastal context and adds to the townscape quality. It is considered that the design and layout of the proposed development is a contemporary solution, which would respect its location through its simplicity and use of materials.

This is balanced against the need to take into account the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area. It is considered that whilst the development would change the immediate character along Bracklesham Road, and also when approaching from Wittering Road, it would not result in a proposal that adversely affects the character of the area or street scene, sufficiently to warrant the refusal of this application on this issue. The proposal is considered an innovative high quality design in a sustainable location, meeting the requirements of Policy 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.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.4 The proposed new property will be visible from the neighbouring properties, the property is 2 meters from the boundary wall of 56 Bracklesham Road and 3 meters from the boundary of 56b. There are secondary windows in the side elevation of 56B on ground and the top floor, the windows are to the garage and utility on the ground floor and a en-suite bathroom on the upper floor.

No. 56 Bracklesham Road has a number of windows on the east elevation facing the application site. These include a window on the ground floor that is a bedroom, a living-room window at first floor and small window to the stair-tower on the upper floor. the primary windows are on the north and south elevations that will not be impacted. The application proposes a number of windows on the western elevation, these windows serve a combination of the stair well and store rooms, a condition to obscure glaze these windows is considered an appropriate form of mitigation to avoid significant overlooking. As such due to the orientation of the new property and the location of the windows at No.56 no unacceptable loss of daylight or loss of privacy would result from the proposed development.

The proposal does include a balcony at second floor level, which would be accessed off the proposed kitchen and dining room. The immediate and surrounding properties in the area, are defined by balconies at either first or second floor level, which subsequently provides a degree of mutual overlooking into each others properties. This is the case with both immediate neighbouring properties. The design and layout of the building would screen direct views into the private amenity areas of no.56. In terms of the relationship with 56B, the development is set slightly back from the rear elevation of this property, and as such the private amenity area of this property would be partially screened by this neighbouring property. It is however acknowledged that this balcony would provide overlooking into elements of the neighbouring garden, however given that mutual overlooking exists from balconies from neighbouring properties, it is considered that this development would not result in a development that would create significant overlooking to an extent to justify a reason for refusal on this matter. It is also noted the occupier of 56B Bracklesham Road supports this application.

Concerns have been raised from 2A Wittering Road about the development creating overlooking this property. The application site and 2A Wittering Road, are separated by Bracklesham Road itself. In terms of distances the front elevation of the proposal is located 10.5metres from the boundary with 2A Wittering Road, and approximately 14.5 metres from the property itself. The layout of 2A Wittering Road has the driveway running along the southern boundary of the site, with the private amenity area located to the north of the driveway, which has a row of trees and shrubs between the driveway and amenity area. As such whilst the proposed distances do not comply with the 20

metre separation distances outlined in the Design SPD, given the combination of the intervening road, and that the private amenity areas of 2A Wittering Road, is screened by internal landscaping, which is in the control of this neighbouring property. As such it is not considered that the development would result in significant overlooking onto this property to justify a reason for refusal on this issue.

In terms of overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties, the proposal would be set behind no.56B. In terms of the relationship with No.56 the development would be set at an angled nature to this property. The private amenity area of this neighbouring property is located adjacent to the south western corner of this property. As such taking into account the proposed layout and distance to this area, it is not considered that the development would have a significant adverse overbearing impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties to justify a reason for refusal on this matter.

- 7.5 As such drawing all these matters together, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to appear overbearing or lead to overlooking and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

7.6 (iv) Highway matters

The development would result in a new access onto Bracklesham Road. The layout includes on site parking and turning for the new dwelling. Cycle parking can be provided for the new dwelling. Concerns have been raised that the development would have an adverse impact on the highway network. As such in terms of the overall impact, the Highways Authority has advised that the local highway network is not at capacity and the highway can therefore accommodate the potential increase in traffic from the development. Having regard to paragraph 32 of the NPPF, which refers to the cumulative impacts of development, it is not considered that the development would result in 'severe impacts' on the safety and free flow of the highway network, to justify a reason for refusal on this matter.

7.7 (v) Flooding issues

The site is located within a Flood zone 3 as identified on the Environment Agency flood zone map and the proposed development of an additional dwelling house is classified as a More Vulnerable Use by the EA. Paragraph 101 of the NPPF requires that Local Planning Authorities steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding and that development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. A sequential approach should be undertaken by the LPA in this regard to decision making. The advice contained within the EA's Demonstrating the flood risk Sequential Test for Planning applications, has been followed to this regard to test the planning application subject of this report.

The Sequential Test does not need to be applied for individual developments on sites which have been allocated in development plans through the Sequential Test, or for applications for minor development, (for example extension to existing dwellings), or change of use (except for a change of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site). However, the site subject of this report is categorised as a windfall site and the EA advise that, in the absence of a flood risk windfall policy it may be possible (where the data is sufficiently robust) for the LPA to apply the Sequential Test taking into account reasonably available sites, historic windfall rates and their distribution across the district relative to Flood Zones. Where historic and future trends evidence indicate that housing need in the district through windfall can be met largely/entirely by development outside high flood risk areas, this may provide grounds for factoring this into the consideration of 'reasonably available alternative sites at the

planning application stage.

The proposed development, a new dwellinghouse, is classified as a More Vulnerable Use by the Environment Agency. The aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to the areas with the lowest probability of flooding. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that, in applying the Sequential Test, the aim is to steer new development to Flood Zone 1, these being areas with a low probability of flooding. Only where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 1 and 2 should reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 3 be considered.

The information initially provided by the applicant regarding the reasonable availability of alternative sites for the proposed development was considered to be limited. The Planning Practice Guidance states that in the first place it is the Local Planning Authorities responsibility to consider if the sequential test has been satisfied, informed by evidence provided by the developer.

Further to the request from the LPA, the agent for this application provided further evidence with regard to a reasonable search area for 'reasonably available'. The applicant has submitted a Sequential Test Document, which concludes that there are no sequentially preferable sites. The applicant's assessment that what is a reasonable search area for 'reasonably available' alternative sites, is not particularly detailed in national guidance. Neither has local guidance been produced. The applicant has referenced Bristol City Council's practice note. While that guide of course does not apply in Havant, it nevertheless provides a sensible framework for applying the sequential test. Further, to this it is considered that the applicant (and the guidance of Bristol City Council) is a pragmatic approach, with regard to sites that are to be considered 'reasonably available' all the following criteria should apply:

- The site is within the agreed area of search.
- The site is of comparable size and can accommodate the requirements of the proposed development.
- The site is either:
 - o owned by the applicant;
 - o for sale at a fair market value; or
 - o is publicly owned land that has been formally declared to be surplus and is available for purchase.
- The site is not safeguarded in the Local Plan for another use.

However, the LPA do not agree with the additional very specific criteria set by the applicant on p.11-12 of his Sequential Test document. It is considered that to meet the requirements of the sequential test, the applicant should demonstrate that he is being as flexible as possible, and therefore to include a long list of criteria by which sites may be discounted does not seem appropriate. Nevertheless, in this case it is not considered that removing these criteria would have led to a conclusion that alternative sites were available

The applicant initially stated that the area of search should be restricted to South Hayling, but when questioned has confirmed that sites across the whole of Hayling Island have been considered, and has provided a list of these sites. The LPA have undertaken a review of property for sale on the open market and from this observation it is agreed that there are no suitable sites available at present. In saying this, the LPA is mindful of the fact that there are always likely to be existing residential properties on the market which given unlimited funds could be purchased with the intention of demolishing and redeveloping for a single dwelling such as the one proposed. It is not expected that the applicant should consider all such sites currently available on the market, where they contain quality dwellings not in need of redevelopment. Overall, the LPA are content that the applicant has discharged the requirements of the sequential test.

Moreover, as the site is within Flood Zone 3, the proposals must also demonstrate compliance with the "Exception Test". The NPPF states that for the Exception Test to be passed:

- o "it must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where one has been prepared; and

- o a site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall."

Both elements of the test have to be passed for development to be permitted.

The first requirement, to demonstrate "wider sustainability benefits", has been outlined by the applicant in the submitted Design and Access statement in that *"The applicant is a resident on Hayling island, is a keen sailor and an active member of the Hayling Island Sailing Club and his boat is moored at Sparkes Marina. For his practical and indeed more sustainable ongoing needs he has been looking at purchasing a suitable property or site on the island for some time. A site off the Island is simply not practicable for his needs as he wants to be within walking or cycling distance to Sparks Marina and the Sailing Club. No suitable sites for a single dwelling on the Island, particularly the eastern part of the Island, have been available or identified so the sequential tests have been met, in accordance with the guidance and intent set out in the NPPF and subsequent advice notes."* It is considered that the use of this under utilised site would provide a sustainability benefit for the Island, through extra housing, and therefore in this unique circumstances, this development is considered to comply with this element of the test.

The second requirement to demonstrate that the development will be safe has been the subject of discussions between the applicant and Environment Agency (EA). The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) compiled by Ambiental and dated September 2017, which sufficiently outlines how flood risk at the site will be mitigated. As outlined in the FRA, the external ground levels of the site range from approximately 2.29mAOD to 2.57mAOD. The ground floor of the proposed development is to be used exclusively for a garage and storage space, whilst habitable accommodation will be located on the upper floors of the property, with the finished floor levels of the upper floors being set above all modelled flood levels and approximately 3.0m above the existing ground levels. The upper floors of the proposed development could therefore provide occupants with safe internal refuge during an extreme tidal flood event.

The site currently benefits from flood defences at Eastoke Corner. The South Hayling Island Beach Management Plan identifies a strategy for delivering the beach management approach along the open coast for the next five years (2017-2022), including bi-annual beach recycling at Eastoke Corner to deliver a 1:200 year standard of protection (SoP). Furthermore, a range of flood resilient construction techniques are proposed to be used, as well as additional flood resistance measures. Finally, the FRA recommends that all occupants of the building sign up to the Government's Flood Warning Service and prepare a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan in accordance with advice from the Environment Agency, to ensure that adequate warning is received prior to an extreme tidal flood event. Therefore, whilst the site is categorised as being within an area of potentially high flood risk, it can be concluded that this proposal meets the requirements of the necessary Sequential and Exception tests. In addition the EA raised no objection to this development, and are content with the measures in place to ensure that the development is free from the risk of flooding and is sustainably drained (subject to conditions).

7.8 (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 per square metre on new floorspace plus indexing. It is considered that there is a CIL liability for this site, and the developer has been advised of the appropriate figure.

This development would 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. The measures of mitigation adopted by the LPA in April 2016 requires a payment of £181 per dwelling (plus admin and monitoring fee) to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Project (SRMP). The relevant contribution has been paid and paperwork returned.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, impact on amenities of neighbouring properties or on highway safety. It is considered that the proposal has complied with the flooding Sequential and Exception Tests, in that whilst the site is categorised as being within an area of potentially high flood risk, there is no realistic alternative to cater for the development, which in other respects will provide wider sustainability benefits in terms of an additional housing. In addition the EA have raised no objection to this development.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/17/01179 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:
Site plan - 58ABR/P/001
Location plan - 58ABR/ P/ 002
Proposed elevations - 58/ABR/P/003
Proposed North Elevation - 58/ABR/P/003
Proposed roof plan - 58ABR/P/003
Proposed second floor plan - 58ABR/P/003
Proposed first floor plan - 58ABR/P/003
Proposed ground floor plan - 58ABR/P/003
Proposed street elevation
Addendum: FRA Sequential & Exception Test Assessment
Phase 1 Flood Risk Assessment 3383 Date: September 2017 Version: Final

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.
Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Class A, of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, B, C, D, E, F of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: Any extensions to the dwelling hereby approved need to be carefully controlled given the limited garden size remaining and proximity to the immediate neighbouring properties, and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.
- 5 The development permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:
 - All habitable living accommodation shall be located at first floor level or above. The first floor level should be set no lower than 3 metres above existing ground levels (paragraph 1.7 and 7.4 of FRA.)
 - Internal access is to be provided throughout the dwelling to provide an area of safe refuge on the upper floors of the property (paragraph 1.7 of FRA.)
 - The provision of flood resilient construction measures has been submitted with the FRA and a site specific flood warning and evacuation plan is in place and to be implemented (section 7 of FRA.)**Reason:** To ensure the safety of the development and future occupants in line with section 9 of the Planning Practice Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for Flood Risk and Coastal Change and policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011.
- 6 No floodlighting or other form of external lighting scheme shall be installed unless it has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination. Any lighting scheme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall thereafter not be altered without prior consent other than for routine maintenance, which does not change its details
Reason: To protect the occupiers of nearby residential properties from light disturbance/pollution and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.