
Site Address:	The Railway Inn, 95 North Street, Emsworth, PO10 7PQ		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing rear outbuildings, erection of 2No. 2 bed dwellings (Revised submission).		
Application No:	APP/17/00567	Expiry Date:	08/09/2017
Applicant:	Mr D Lucas		
Agent:	Mr M Singleton	Case Officer:	Lewis Oliver
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **GRANT 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/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 201, 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

3.1 The proposal is for the demolition of existing rear outbuildings, and erection of 2No. 2 bed dwellings (Revised submission). This application has been amended during the course of the application, following concerns raised by the Local Planning Authority and subsequent to the Appeal Decision. These amendments are:

- Reduction in the height of the proposed dwellings and amendments to the design through the removal of the proposed front dormer windows
- Removal of front balconies and a rear courtyard provided for each unit.
- Removal of the proposed undercroft car parking spaces, this has resulted in the proposal not including any allocated parking
- As a result on the removal of the parking, the internal layout has been reconfigured, which now proposes a kitchen and lounge on the ground floors. The proposed first floor has been reconfigured so that no primary bedroom windows are now located on the rear (south) elevation. The windows on the rear elevation would serve an en-suite, seperate bathroom and a landing/stairwell, and are proposed to be obscure glazed.
- The application will now be joined to the recently completed adjacent residential development on Sultans Road.

3.2 As a result the development would have a width of 11.65m, depth of the 6.6m, eaves height of 5.1m, with a ridge height of 7m. The layout of the proposal, which includes a rear courtyard amenity area, would result in the development being set back from the boundary with the immediate neighbouring property by 2.95m. The proposal includes the retention of a retained boundary wall from the existing property, which would be kept at a height of 3m. The proposal now also includes a rear courtyard for each property, which would be 2.95m in depth and 5.5m in width.

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)
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

Internal first floor bathroom is windowless Therefore Mechanical ventilation required and now shown re location

Public sewers within middle of Sultan Road might be within 3m

Ground floor WC compartment looks tight regarding access due to door layout and size of room re basin location

Disabled access into building not shown re level entrance

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

Fire Authority access OK

No sewer within 3m OK

Solid waste storage OK

The Railway Inn office roof light looks like it will be an issue under Approved Document B spread of flame regarding adjacent boundary and landing window

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

No response

Economic Development - Commercial and Housing

No response

Highways Engineer, Development Engineer

The ground floor plan does show the same as the north front elevation. The ground floor plan does not show a wall between the two undercroft parking spaces but the elevation does show a length of wall.

The undercroft space for two cars should be a total of 6m X 6 m and not 5.6m x 5m as shown.

If these dimension could be obtained the Highway Authority would have no adverse comment on this application providing a dropped vehicular kerb access is provided and the undercroft does not have garage doors installed.

In order to maintain access to the undercroft parking a TRO should be promoted in front of the buildings and for an additional distance of 1m in an east and west distance beyond the undercroft walls.

Highways Engineer, Development Engineer

It appears that this application has no parking space which does not meet the HBC Planning Advice criteria but this is matter for the Planning Authority to address.

The Highway Authority would not recommend a highway safety refusal because of the lack of parking.

However I would point out that the original planning application form is now wrong with regard to the information on parking numbers

Waste Services Manager

No response

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: 38

Number of site notices: 1.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 16

The application has been amended during the life of the application, as such this element of the report is split up to reflect the comments that were received during the publicity period. Summary of planning issues raised (with officer comments where issues are not addressed in Section 7 below). The following representations were received during the first publicity period undertaken in June and July:

19 Objections to the original plans, raising the following points:

1. Loss of privacy to No. 93A and B North Street from the use of the terrace
2. Loss of amenity resulting from noise, smells and light pollution from the rear facing windows in the new dwellings
3. Unsustainable loss of parking within the nearby locality when parking is already an issue adversely affecting local residents.
4. Sultan Road is non-permit so results in people parking all day, resulting in less available parking for residents.
5. Raising of the ridge height of the main public house would be overbearing and dominant in the streetscene.
6. Overlooking from rear facing windows in the new house
7. The height of the new dwellings will be overbearing on the gardens of No's 93-85 North Street.
8. Building works would cause a huge disruption.
9. Dormer windows are not in keeping with the streetscene
10. Overdevelopment of the site - no space for outside amenity space, bin storage etc for future residents or the pub itself.
11. The raising of the ridge height would result in a loss of light to No. 93a and B North Street.
12. With the shortfall of parking provided, there would be a net loss of 8 spaces in the immediate locality.
13. This application has not addressed the previous reasons for refusal

Following the receipt of amended plans the application was re-advertised to all contributors, including a new site notice

8 Objections were received to the amended plans, raising the following points:

1. The revised plans do not overcome the concerns regarding the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area
2. The application no proposes Zero parking, which would have a significant adverse impact in terms of lack of parking and impact on the safety and free flow of the highway network
3. The development would result in significant overlooking and overbearing impact on the immediate neighbouring properties

4. The development would result in light, noise and smell pollution
5. The submitted revised plans are inaccurate in that the scaled plans, and marked dimensions do not correlate. This therefore leads to concerns that the development cannot be accommodated in the manner proposed. **Officer Comment:** The Local Planning Authority have discussed this matter with the agent for this application. Following the assessment of the submitted plans, it was highlighted that the marked measurements on the plan did not match the scaled plans. As such amended plans have been submitted to address this point, these plans have been re-advertised to all contributors.
6. Planning APP/17/00567 shows a railing at first floor level along the edge of roof that is close to the boundary of my property, number 93. I fear that the presence of a railing may encourage residents and visitors to come out onto the flat roof and use it as a balcony or a terrace. This is expressly forbidden in the Grant of Planning Permission to APP/16/01311, 14th March 2017. I have been given to understand that Health and Safety have decreed that there must be a railing to guide people across the roof to an area of safety in case of fire. I request from Havant Borough Council that any railings are set back from the edge of the boundary with my property, because my kitchen and a bedroom are already dark and railings would make the area feel even more confined. I hope that Havant Borough Council will continue to protect me by reiterating Condition 5 in the Grant of Planning Permission for APP/16/01311. **Officer Comment:** Addressed in section 7 (vii)
7. Loss of property value. **Officer Comment:** This is not a material planning consideration.
8. Loss of a private view. **Officer Comment:** This is not a material planning consideration.

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.

(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. At present, the rear of the public house comprises a flat roof section including a single storey unit of accommodation, ancillary to the use of the main building. To facilitate a degree of privacy, a fence and trellis has been erected along the edge of the section of flat roof. Further to this is a covered smoking shelter and store room. Overall this section of the building does not positively contribute to the context of the streetscene in design terms and the proposal to replace this area with a more permanent and cohesive building form is encouraged. The principle of the continuation of a terrace row is acceptable given that Sultan Road is already characterised by flat fronted terraced properties with no front fore court. However, key to the success of a terrace is the concept of uniformity.

As has been highlighted in paragraph 3.1, this application has been amended following concerns raised by the LPA, and the subsequent dismissed appeal on the previous planning application for residential development on this site. These amendments have reduced the size and scale of the proposal, and simplified the design through the removal of the proposed dormer windows and undercroft parking. As a result of these changes the proposed development would be approximately 0.5m lower than the adjacent development and as such allows a gradual stepping down of built form along Sultan Lane, before it reaches the main Railway Inn Public House, which is a landmark corner building in the immediate and surrounding area. As such the development is considered to be consistent with the existing streetscene and as a result would not have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore this proposal is considered to have addressed the previous reasons for refusal, particularly those matters which were outlined by the Inspector in the dismissed appeal. As such this proposed revised scheme is considered to comply with the advice laid out in Policy CS16 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

(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. There is a 4.5m gap between the main building and managers accommodation which provides a gap in the built form and views of the sky at first floor level. The previous application was refused and upheld at appeal regarding the overbearing impact of the development on the amenities of 93 North Street. As has been highlighted this application has been amended in order to address this issue. The proposal would retain an element of the existing southern elevation of the existing building at a height of approximately 3m. The proposed dwellings would then be located approx. 3.3metres from the existing wall, and have an eaves height of 5.1m with a ridge height of 7m. Therefore the proposed development would result in a reduction in the size and bulk of built form facing the neighbour, with regard to the existing gable end, which is the closest element to the rear elevation of 93 North Street. Overall it is considered that given the proposed layout, size, scale and massing of the development that it would not have a significant adverse overbearing or in relation to loss of sunlight/daylight impact on the amenities of 93 North Street, and has also addressed the concerns that were raised by the Inspector in dismissing the appeal.

In relation to privacy this application now proposes 3 windows each per dwelling on the rear elevation at first floor. These windows would serve a bathroom, en-suite and landing and are proposed to be obscure glazed, in order to prevent direct overlooking into the private amenity area of 93 North Street. Furthermore it is considered appropriate in this context to control the level of opening of these windows in order to

ensure that this matter is controlled. 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.

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 not have a significant adverse impact on 93 North Street to justify a reason for refusal on this issue.

Taking all these factors together subject to suitable conditions, to include removing permitted development rights and 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 this revised scheme has overcome the previous reasons for refusal and the matters raised by the Inspector in the previous appeal. 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 also includes a rear courtyard for each property, which would be 2.95m 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

The previous application 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 a the 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.

A number of objections have been received that the development proposes no car parking for the scheme. The Havant Borough Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD identifies areas around Emsworth Railway Station to be a highly accessible location where reduced or even zero standards of vehicle parking provision can be considered in order to maximise the use of land and discourage use of the private motor vehicle. Furthermore, paragraph 3.06 of the Standards recognises that on brownfield sites outside of town centres, it may be possible to reduce the number of car parking spaces where the development is within a reasonable distance of good public transport links. It is therefore considered that given the highly sustainable location of the development that this proposal, with zero parking, is considered to be consistent with the aims of the SPD.

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 has been reduced, 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, that in this situation the provision of zero car parking is considered acceptable and 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 applicant has been advised of this accordingly.

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 Disturbance Mitigation Project. The applicants have made the necessary planning obligation and returned the associated paperwork. As such the appropriate financial contribution has been secured, and address one of the reasons for refusal in the previous application and the subsequent appeal.

(vii) Other matters

It is noted that the revised plans indicate a balustrade to be located on the remaining flat roofed area. Whilst this does not form part of this application, it does require appropriate consideration of the previous planning applications APP/16/01311, restricted the use of this area, with the following condition:

The flat roof area at first floor level adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 93 and 93a North Street shall not be used for the purposes of a terrace or balcony at any time whatsoever, but shall only be used for infrequent and occasional maintenance purposes only.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring property and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is therefore considered that given this situation that a condition is placed on any consent that this permission does not include the provision of a balustrade, to protect the amenities of 93 North Street.

8 **Conclusion**

It is considered that this revised scheme has addressed the previous reasons for refusal and matters that were raised by the Inspector. The development is therefore not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area or on the amenities of neighbouring properties. In addition given the sustainable location of the application site, in combination with the existing deficit of car parking provision, that in this instance it is appropriate to have a residential development with zero car parking, which complies with the aims and objectives of the Parking SPD. Furthermore the development makes adequate provision in the form a financial contribution toward impact on the SPA.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/17/00567

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:

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.

- 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 Classes A, B, C, D and E, of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 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 windows at first or second (roof) floor, other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall, at any time, be constructed in the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the building the windows on the rear elevation at first floor shall be fitted with textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent), and shall be non-opening and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 7 No development shall take place until plans and particulars specifying the following matters have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(i) The provision to be made within the site for contractors' vehicle parking

during site clearance and construction of the development;

(ii) The provision to be made within the site for a material storage compound during site clearance and construction of the development.

Thereafter, throughout such site clearance and implementation of the development, the approved parking provision and storage compound shall be kept available and used only as such.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and/or in the interests of traffic safety and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8 Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the rear boundary wall between the application site and neighbouring property of 93 North Street has been completed. The wall shall remain in place at all times thereafter.

Reason: This screening is required in order to prevent overlooking into the private amenity areas of 93 North Street, given the positioning of the development, having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

- 9 No development shall take place until details of existing and finished floor and site levels relative to previously agreed off-site datum point(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

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.

- 10 Notwithstanding the details shown on plan 04/17(02) Revision A, this permission does not relate to the installation of a balustrade to be located on the remaining flat roofed area of the existing pub.

Reason: For the purposes of clarity as the installation of the balustrade is subject to a condition under application APP/16/01311, which was applied to safeguard the amenities of the locality and ensure that all such drainage provision is constructed to an appropriate standard and quality and having due regard to policies and proposals CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.