

APP/15/00732-Variation of Condition B6 of Planning Permission APP/12/00338 to change the maximum B8 floorspace from 12,356 square metres (20%) to 18,534 square metres (30%) (Approved 01/10/2015). Request to partially Discharge Condition No.B9 (03/08/2017). Request to partially discharge condition B9 (03.04.18). Request to Discharge Conditions A3, A5, A10, A11, A12, A13, A14, A17, A18 and B10. 1/10/15. Permission 01/10/2015

APP/15/01156 - , Approval of Reserved Matters in respect to Plot 2 Phase 1 of outline application APP/15/00732 (new employment uses, hotel and access road) comprising construction of B8 warehouse and distribution building(18,037 sq m) to be constructed in 2 phases, with a maximum height not exceeding the 42m AOD contour (the design for plot 2 incorporating revision to previously approved parameter plan forming part of the Environmental Statement dated March 2012)., PERM,23/12/2015

APP/17/00228 Variation of Condition No. A16 of Planning Permission APP/12/00338 to split A16 into 2 parts - 1) Plots 1,3,4,4a,5,5a to have a topsoil strip under supervision and watching brief; and 2) Plot 6 to remain as per original wording with full WSI required.. PERM

APP/17/00866 - Approval of Reserved Matters for Phase 1 of Planning Permission APP/15/00732 (Development for employment uses and a hotel with conference facilities; together with landscaping, infrastructure and associated works) relating to Condition B3 (i), and (ii) for plots access and layout ; and Condition B5 (c) for levels of proposed plots and building heights with a maximum height not exceeding 50m AOD contour on Plots 5 and 5a, and 45m AOD contour on Plot 4a (incorporating revisions to previously approved Parameter Plan forming part of the Environmental Statement dated March 2012)., PERM,29/11/2017

APP/17/01324 - Variation of Condition B6 of Planning Permission APP/15/00732 to remove restriction on proportion of B8 floorspace allowed within the Dunsbury Park development, and thus provide for a maximum mixed use floor space of 61,779sqm within Classes B1, B2 and/or B8 of the Use Classes Order 1987 as amended. Not yet determined.

APP/18/00357 Approval of Reserved Matters in respect to Phase 1 Plot 3b of APP/15/00732 (new employment uses, hotel and access road) comprising construction of 3,528 sqm B1(c)/B2/B8 commercial premises for plot access, layout, scale, appearance & landscaping and Condition B5 Other Matters criteria A to G inclusive. . Not yet determined

3 Proposal

Approval of Reserved Matters in respect to Phase 1 Plot 3a of APP/15/00732 (new employment uses, hotel and access road) comprising construction of B2 commercial vehicle repair and maintenance facility with ancillary sales area (total 1,190 sqm) for plot access, layout, scale & appearance and Condition B5 Other Matters criteria A to H inclusive.

This Reserved Matters application seeks approval for a number of aspects under Conditions B3 & B5 of APP/15/00732, both of which are reproduced below in full:

B3 Reserved Matters

*Approval of the details of the following aspects of the development, **hereinafter called "Reserved Matters"** shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before*

each individual phase of development is commenced:

- (i) access, (with the exception of the access road corridor for which full permission is granted by this permission)*
- (ii) the layout of the development*
- (iii) the scale of the development;*
- (iv) the appearance of the development*
- (v) the detailed landscaping scheme for the site, including provisions for open space, including publicly accessible open space, and ecology.*

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Reserved Matters.

B5 Submission of 'Other Matters'

Application for approval of each reserved matters for new buildings, structures or uses of land pursuant to this permission shall be accompanied by information and plans concerning the following other matters, unless otherwise agreed in writing by Local Planning Authority,

- a. Details of parking including provision for non-car modes*
- b. Details of delivery and vehicle turning space*
- c. Levels of existing and proposed ground and buildings*
- d. A sustainability statement detailing measures to ensure that development attains the BREAM 'excellent' standard*
- e. Provision for waste storage and recycling*
- f. Measures for the reduction of crime risk*
- g. Details of lighting, (including access roads if subject of a particular reserved matters application)*
- h A noise assessment for any development for General Industrial purposes (Class B2) or Storage and Distribution purposes (Class B8).*

In parallel to this reserved matters submission is a discharge of conditions package covering the pre commencement information required by the 'A' conditions on planning permission APP/15/00732. These include tree protection, site compound & contractor parking, ecology and contaminated land.

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

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS13	(Green Infrastructure)
CS14	(Efficient Use of Resources)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS18	(Strategic Site Delivery)
CS19	(Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
CS2	(Employment)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS3	(Skills and Employability)
CS5	(Tourism)
CS6	(Regeneration of the Borough)

DM1	(Recreation and Open Space)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM11	(Planning for More Sustainable Travel)
DM12	(Mitigating the Impacts of Travel)
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)
AL3	(Town, District and Local Centres)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

County Ecologist

The application is accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment (Atkins, February 2018), a 2017 Dormouse Survey Results report (Atkins, February 2018) and a Bat Survey and Report (Sylvatica Ecology, December 2017).

Habitats

The bulk of the application plot comprises former arable land which has been disturbed and partly recolonised by vegetation. No detailed description of the vegetation has been provided – the LPA should expect full details of any survey information. For example, the presence of ‘arable weeds’ may indicate that species of conservation importance may occur. I appreciate that there may have been constraints to access but it is important that attempts are made to describe in detail the vegetation present. This should be noted for future applications.

The plot is bordered to the west by Cherry Tree Row SINC, an area of semi-natural woodland. The EIA report states that a buffer will be established between the woodland and the application site. The site sections show a 2.4m wooden acoustic fence on the eastern site boundary. It is not immediately clear what the distance is between this fence and the woodland (but my estimate is no more than 3m to the tree canopy?), or whether there will be any incursion into the woodland edge. The building is 7m high so it is not clear how the 2.4m fence would assist with mitigating any light spillage (which would be most relevant at canopy level). Some clarification on this matter would be welcome. An arboricultural impact assessment report would be useful.

I note that many of the residual ecological mitigation/compensation measures rely on the use of the proposed Habitat Creation Area to the north. This area has, I understand, not yet been created. There is a risk of this area not being ready within a suitable timeframe for it to adequately mitigate the impacts associated with plots as they come forward. I would appreciate some clarification as to when exactly the area will be in suitable condition (it is currently described as containing construction spoil) to be of use in mitigating ongoing impacts. It would be useful to have a ‘running tally’ of which impacts on each plot are being mitigated using the Habitat Creation Area. Are we currently running a mitigation deficit?

Bats

The very rare Bechstein’s bat has been recorded within very close proximity to this site (breeding age female trapped just south of the site in 2015) and is known to be present in large numbers (of at least national significance) in the surrounding landscape. It is imperative that bat surveys in this landscape use methods which are best placed to

detect this species. Current best practice survey guidance recommends that the only reliable method for detecting Bechstein's bat is to use trapping methods. The species echolocates extremely quietly and is highly likely to be missed by standard bat detector surveys. The use of walked transects and automated detector surveys here (and only carried out from mid-summer to early-autumn, with some survey limitations) would be very unlikely to detect Bechstein's bats and, in any case, the surveys did record a small number of calls from mouse-eared (*Myotis* species) bats which have not been identified to species level. There are at least six mouse-eared bat species present in Hampshire and the calls recorded here could be any of those. The LPA should expect at least some attempt to identify mouse-eared bats to species level, especially where Bechstein's is present. I am not sure I agree with the statement that 'data obtained is considered to provide sufficient information as to the species present and how there [sic] are continuing to use the Application Site'.

The uncommon but widespread western barbastelle has also been recorded on site, highlighting the suitability of this area for a diverse assemblage of bat species.

In future, the LPA should expect a more nuanced approach to surveys intended to detect Bechstein's bats. I would suggest that trapping locations along potential flying routes (hedgerows, woodland rides) would be a more efficient method of detecting this species and would also assist in detecting other quiet species such as long-eared bats which are routinely under recorded. The presence of features used by flying Bechstein's bats would substantially increase the value of those features and have implications for the mitigation measures required across the wider site (remembering that since the outline permission was granted our understanding of this species in south-east Hampshire has developed substantially). For this individual proposal the impacts to boundary features are relatively limited (but see comments on lighting below) and I am content to state that I do not expect additional surveys to be carried out. Rather, I am again reiterating that where Bechstein's bat is known to occur, standard survey methodologies are not likely to provide the information required to robustly understand the potential constraints. Future applications must be informed by appropriate survey design and results interpretation.

No detail is provided on lighting, beyond some broad recommendations. Given the potential for lighting at this site (and other plots) to result in demonstrable impacts to the bat assemblage present, the LPA should expect firm details of lighting specifications in order that the potential impact can be explicitly understood. Lighting units attached to the building or on tall columns would presumably have the potential to result in spillage onto boundary vegetation. The 2.4m high fence would be unlikely to mitigate any lights on the upper sections of the building, even if luminaries are full cut-off. Clarification is required.

Dormice

Updating surveys were carried out in 2017. No dormice were recorded but it is assumed that any dense woody vegetation supports this species. Given what we know about the distribution of this species in Hampshire I consider this to be a sensible approach.

Reptiles

No updating surveys were carried out in 2017 due to access issues. The proposals will entail impacts to reptile habitat. It is unclear what is to happen to any reptiles encountered during site clearance works. Supervised clearance methods are recommended, but what happens if substantial reptile numbers are encountered? Will these animals be captured and moved? Where to? How will retained habitat be protected? Clarification is required.

Landscaping

Whilst the inclusion of some areas of wildflower grassland is welcomed, the use of beds of daffodils seems a little uninspiring. There are a range of native or more interesting bulb species which could be used to provide a more relevant landscaping scheme.

In summary, there are a number of areas where some clarification is required. This is mostly due to lack of clarity on precise impacts and subsequent mitigation details. Each new plot application needs to be explicitly linked to the wider mitigation strategy for the entire site.

Comments on the further information submitted addressing the points raised:-
Now adequate.

Development Engineer - Highways

No adverse comments

Economic Development

No comments received.

Engineering/Drainage

No comments received

Environment Agency

We have no objections to the proposed development.

Advice to Applicant/LPA

Based on the information provided, we consider the risk to groundwater at this site to be limited. Therefore we will not be providing detailed site-specific advice in this instance. The site is located in the groundwater Source Protection Zone 1c (SPZ1c) for the Bedhampton and Havant springs.

The information provided with the application does not indicate that the proposed development will include any deep activities (such as piled foundations or deep surface water drainage structures) which could penetrate the clay/ chalk interface and cause pollution of groundwater in the chalk aquifer. If this is not the case we request that we are re-consulted by the LPA.

We would like to refer the applicant to the pollution prevention advice given on the GOV.UK website at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pollution-prevention-for-businesses>.

We would also like to refer the applicant to our updated groundwater protection position End 2 statements at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protectionposition-statements>. This sets out our position for a wide range of activities and developments, including waste management, discharge of liquid effluents, land contamination and drainage.

Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

Discrepancy between noise impact assessment and fencing plan in that the noise impact assessment refers to a proposed 3 metre high acoustic barrier along the eastern boundary of Plot 3a, whilst the fencing plan refers to a 2.4 metre solid timber acoustic fence along the same boundary.

officers note:- Amended plan received providing 3m fence.

Highways England

No objection

Hampshire Highways

The Highways Authority's comments should be made by the District Council's engineers.

Hampshire Wildlife Trust

No comments received

Highways England

Has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

In the case of this development proposal, our interest is in the A3(M), specific to this application A3(M) J3.

Having examined the above application and its supporting evidence we do not offer any objections to this proposal as the proposal is unlikely to have significant impact on safe and efficient operation of the A3(M)

Landscape Team

From a landscape perspective we have the following comments:

- The proposed car parking layout needs to be broken up with planting, as a whole HBC would need to see vegetation every 5 – 6 parking bays.

It is noted that the proposed development lacks a comprehensive landscape scheme. The submitted landscape masterplan illustrates on an area of wildflower meadow, however this alone is not deemed acceptable. We require a robust planting plan to help soften the development into the existing landscape.

The development sits within close proximity to the existing line of trees to the east of the site, we have concerns of construction within the PRA.

The proposed motorcycle and cycle storage location does not afford sufficient space to manoeuvre in/out of the allocated bay without any potential tension with the adjacent parking bay, as such we would require additional room for the cycle storage area. Furthermore the number of cycle parking bays (4) is not sufficient and to support sustainable transportation we would want to see more allocation for cycle storage.

—

comments on the amended plans

We would prefer to see 3 no. trees on the western boundary with an additional 5 no. to the north to help soft the development. I appreciate that the gas main does create a design issue, however root barriers could be implemented to remove the possibility of root damage. I have marked up on the landscape masterplan the location I was suggesting.

I am happy with the details that you have provided for the boundary treatments.

Officer note:- The plans have further been amended to provide the required tree planting and are now acceptable.

Local Lead Flood Authority HCC

No comments received

Natural England Government Team

In order for your authority to be assured that the proposal meets the requirements of the standing advice and the additional requirements for biodiversity enhancement as set out in National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 7, 109 and 118, Natural England recommends that the application is supported by a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP), or equivalent, that has been agreed by a Hampshire County Council (HCC) Ecologist. A BMEP draws together all the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures for the development in one report to allow these measures to be secured and implemented.

The scope of the BMEP should be agreed with a HCC Ecologist but should include the mitigation and enhancement measures outlined in the environmental impact report as well as further clarification of the boundary of the development proposals and the Cherry Tree Row SINC, mitigation and enhancement strategies for bats, dormice and reptiles, and a landscape plan that utilises appropriate native species. Consideration should also be given to the provision of additional bat roosting opportunities within the established woodland and the provision of a range of bird boxes.

It is noted that Planning Condition A1 of the outline planning permission refers to the approved Landscape, Open Space and Ecology Strategy which states that each phase of the development will adhere to the Habitat Maintenance and Management Plan and this plan will be updated for each new phase of the wider development site. The BMEP should include details of the wider strategy and outline how the mitigation measures for this application adhere to this strategic context. The site is important within a wider ecological network and corridor that supports a diverse assemblage of protected species and biodiversity. Natural England strongly recommends that the proposals support and enhance this ecological network.

The BMEP should outline whether net biodiversity gain is being achieved. It is noted that a Habitat Creation Area is proposed as mitigation and further details of this scheme in the BMEP are required. For example, the phases of development that this area relates to, the timing for the creation of this area, details of future management and associated costs. Any permission should secure appropriate funding provision for maintaining and managing the areas of biodiversity mitigation / enhancement measures, as well as areas of green infrastructure and strategic planting, for perpetuity.

As further phases of development come forward, consideration may need to be given to the provision of additional offsite replacement habitats or an agreed financial contribution for biodiversity enhancements elsewhere calculated using a Biodiversity Compensation Framework, Environment Bank, or similar mechanism.

Please note that provided the HCC Ecologists are satisfied with the submitted BMEP and the full implementation of the plan is secured by any permission then no further consultation with Natural England on this aspect of the proposal is required. In the event that a BMEP cannot be agreed with the applicant then Natural England should be re-consulted on the proposals so that we can reconsider our advice.

Planning Policy

Policy Status: The Local Plan (Core Strategy) and the Local Plan (Allocations) provide the development plan for the borough. The Local Plan Housing Statement (LPHS) is also a material consideration.

A Draft (Regulation 18) version of the Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 was also

subject to public consultation from 8 January to 16 February 2018.

Principle of development:

The proposed development would form the second plot of the Dunsbury Park to be delivered. The proposed development would deliver a further plot in the first phase of the key strategic employment built as defined by Policy CS18 in the Core Strategy. The site is reaffirmed as a business gateway of local and sub-regional importance in the Draft Local Plan with the potential to deliver substantial amount of new employment floorspace up to 2036. The scheme is also in line with the requirements of the original outline planning permission (APP/15/00732) as varied through APP/15/00732.

Efficient use of resources:

As the applicant has highlighted in the Design & Access Statement, condition B5 (d) of the outline planning permission for Dunsbury Park (APP/12/00338) requires a BREEAM level of Excellent to be achieved across the plots. A BREEAM pre-assessment estimator has been submitted targeting a 'very good' level. This would clearly not comply with the condition. It should also be noted that the targeted score is some way short of the threshold for excellent.

The energy strategy set out in the Design and Access Statement follows the energy hierarchy, which is sensible and welcomed. However it is unclear about the energy strategy with confusing wording in section 7.4 ("Whilst the 'lean' and 'clean' measures outlined above would provide the necessary improvements in energy efficiency to meet the relevant requirements of the Building Regulations (Part L2A), further energy savings would be achieved without the implementation of renewable or Low carbon technology. As such a number of technologies have been appraised"). On the basis that LZC energy is not proposed, it is unclear why an appraisal of technologies would have taken place. However, provision of LZC technologies may be needed in order to improve the overall BREEAM score.

A small justification is provided in section 7 of the Design & Access Statement as to why a higher rating has not been targeted. However, this does not appraise all issues where full credits have not been targeted. As such, it is not possible at this time to assess whether there is a justification to deviate from the standard required in condition B5 (d). I would expect a concise feasibility study to be submitted going through each issue where full credits are not being targeted justifying why it would not be feasible (rather than viable) to do so. This is in line with the approach that was taken forward with the previous reserved matters application at Dunsbury Park. This justification should also highlight the energy strategy

Once the justification has been provided it will be critically reviewed in order to assess whether a deviation from the condition is justified.

Planning Policy comments re BREEAM

Initial comments

We've received the attached supplementary note and pre-assessment summary which indicate that a target score of 65.31% ('Very Good' score) would be achieved.

There is some assessment and commentary around different energy solutions in the supplementary note, but it's unclear why they have not used the shell and core assessment instead.

I'd suggest they've gone some way to address our concerns, but it would have been clearer to have had a shell assessment instead.

Further comments

Having discussed this further we're comfortable that the applicant has submitted sufficient information to justify a deviation from the condition in this case.

Whilst I'm conscious that the condition is 'excellent', under CS14, they would have only had to do 'very good'. They are well into the middle ground now between Very Good and Excellent.

Obviously there'll be a point where they need to discharge the relevant condition for this phase of DHF. If at that point they submit a post-construction assessment and BREEAM certificate showing that the scheme has achieved a minimum of 65.31% and a level of 'very good' I'd be happy for the condition to be discharged.

Southern Gas Networks

No comments received

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: 221

Number of site notices: one
Statutory advertisement: 23/03/2018

Number of representations received: 0

Comment	Officer Comment

Summary:

Comment:

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) Landscape, Design and Visual Impact
- (iii) Access and Traffic Management
- (iv) Drainage
- (v) Ecology

(vi) Impact on Amenities

(i) Principle of development

The principle of developing the site for employment purposes has been established by the Local Plan (Dunsbury Hill Farm is allocated as a strategic employment site under policy CS18 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy) and the extant planning permission.

The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. Recent reserved matters application (APP/17/00866) was granted permission for the cut & fill exercise across the Dunsbury Park site. This permission is currently being implemented and sees individual plots being levelled and serviced prior to the future construction of buildings. As a result, the proposed ground level of Plot 3a has already been approved.

(ii) Landscape, Design and Visual Impact

The site benefits from mature woodland boundaries which provide a clearly defined setting and as well as a dense visual screen to three sides

The ground levels approved under Criterion (c) of Condition B5 have been carried forward and form the basis of the design proposed in this Reserved Matters application. The plot level is set at +23m AOD, with the height to parapet of 9.02m and height to ridge of 10.2m meaning the highest part of the building is at +33.2m. This comfortably adheres to the parameter plan height restriction on this plot of +40m AOD.

Whilst the plot has three considerable constraints to the potential site layout – namely the high pressure gas main running directly down the middle of the site from north to south, an overhead electricity main supply to the west of the gas main on the same route together with overhead pylons running along the entire western edge of the plot, the layout and design respond to the Dunsbury Park ethos and design code parameters, and the building, which has been designed to reflect its function as a commercial vehicle showroom repair and maintenance facility, would be set within the landscape parameters of the plot. The car parking area to the front of the plot is buffered by wildflower seeding and significant bulb planting over the gas main area to replicate types of planting elsewhere within the Dunsbury Park site. This buffer will also provide a natural break between hard surfacing and the building behind.

The building which, would be rectangular in plan, 37.6m in length by 25.1m in width, would be clad in a metal micro-rib composite panel system running horizontally. This would have a white coated finish to the front elevation facing west. The remaining elevations would be in a silver / grey coated finish. The roofing would be in a profiled metal deck with a grey coated finish. There would be 3 level access doors in a dark grey finish providing access to the workshop space

(iii) Access and Traffic Management

Access to the plot would utilise the current spur of Fitzwygram Way.

In respect to parking, the current adopted parking standards for non-residential development within Havant Borough Council are set out in the Havant Borough Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which was adopted in July 2016. The SPD states that for B2 development such as that on Plot 3a the minimum standard is 1 space per 45 square metres, which for the proposed building of 1,190 sqm equates to a minimum of 27 spaces. The proposal provides for 32 spaces together with cycle parking,

waiting bays, and parking for commercial vehicles and therefore satisfies the minimum standards.

DHF lies directly adjacent to the strategic road network (A3M) with a new access link road connecting the site to Hulbert Road, and is in between the large residential areas of Waterlooville (west of the A3) and Leigh Park (east of the site). Bedhampton Railway Station is located within 2km and Havant is about 2.5km, additionally there is a bus stop approx 400m away, and as the DHF site develops it is envisaged that a bus service will run through the site with a stop directly outside the application site. In addition the outline scheme provided for foot path and cycle links along the access road.

Under the original hybrid permission the approved framework only fixed the link road alignment, which has now been constructed. The submitted master plan utilises all of the access points and the development plots are set out within the areas envisaged on the original indicative site plan and each plot will benefit from its own individual access, in accordance with the outline proposal. Highways have been consulted and have no objection.

(iv) Drainage

The site is covered by the flood risk assessment submitted with the hybrid application which advised that the site is not at risk from flooding and will not subject other properties to flooding provided that greenfield run off rates are adhered to. In accordance with this storm water run-off will be restricted to green field run off rates with the remainder of the water generated by rainfall onto hard surfaces to be attenuated on site until the storm has receded.

(v) Ecology

The site is important within a wider ecological network and corridor that supports a diverse assemblage of protected species and biodiversity. In accordance with the comments from The County Ecologist additional information has now been submitted to clarify the precise impacts and subsequent mitigation details and how these link to the wider mitigation strategy for the entire Dunsbury Park site. This has been assessed by the County Ecologist and has been confirmed as adequate. However, it should be noted for future plots that the initial submission should include a detailed approach to the Dunsbury site as a whole, showing for each plot how it fits into the wider scheme.

(vi) Impact on Amenities

An important consideration is the potential impacts on the amenities of the area, including residents living close to the site or along approach roads to it. Changes in the appearance of the site, traffic, increased activity and noise, lighting, air quality, and access are relevant considerations, as summarised in Local Plan policy CS16. These impacts were considered under the hybrid application and found to be acceptable, and visual, ecology and highways impacts are further considered above.

8 Conclusion

The proposed development accords with the outline permission and the details of the reserved matters are appropriate and acceptable for the site. Approval is recommended.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS** for application APP/18/00224

- (i) The conditions imposed on the Outline Planning Permission APP/15/00732 dated 01/10/15; and
- (ii) The following additional conditions:

1

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

Document/drawing	Reference/prepared by
Planning Statement	Savills
Parking statement	Savills
Noise Assessment	PBA
4330-DHF-BMD-MP-DR-A-10100-S4-P1	Plot 3a Location Plan / BAM
4330-DHF-BMD-Z3-DR-A-10003-S3-P03	3a Site Plan / BAM
4330-DHF-BMD-Z3-DR-A-11002-S4-P5	Ground Floor Plan GA / BAM
4330-DHF-BMD-Z3-DR-A-11003-S4-P4	First Floor Plan GA / BAM
4330-DHF-BMD-Z3-DR-A-11004-S4-P1	Roof Plan GA / BAM
4330-DHF-BMD-Z3-DR-A-12003-S4-P4	Elevations 1 of 2 / BAM
4330-DHF-BMD-Z3-DR-A-12004-S4-P4	Elevations 2 of 2 / BAM
4330-DHF-BMD-Z3-DR-A-12002-S4-P2	Elevations in context
4330-DHF-BMD-Z3-DR-A-13001-S4-P3	Typical sections Plot 3A / BAM
LP2123-FIRA-MP-ST-D-LA-001 Rev B	Illustrative sections / FIRA
LP2123 Materials palette	FIRA
LP2123-FIRA-MP-ST-P-LA-FL Rev B	Fencing Plan / FIRA
DHF-FIRA-Z3A-XX-DR-L-23001-S)-PO3	Landscape masterplan / FIRA
LP2123-FIRA-MP-P-LA-PP Rev C	Planting plan / FIRA
BREEAM Pre-assessment Summary May 2018 BREEAM supplementary note 18 June 2018	BAM
EXTERNAL LIGHTING PLAN PLOT 3	P115 2800 03
LIGHTING ASSESSMENT	P115 2800 03
ROOT PROTECTION ZONES & FENCING	DHF-FIRA-3B-XX-DR-L-23006 REV A
Document/drawing Landscape proposals summary Shrub schedule Tree schedule	
Drainage strategy	
Phasing plan update	
External finishes	

Tree Protection Plan	
ConstructionEnvironment Management Plan (CEMP)	
Contractor parking & site compound	
Contaminated land desk study and SI results	
Ecological Impact Assessment	

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 2 No works comprising deep activities (such as piled foundations or deep surface water drainage structures) which could penetrate the clay/ chalk interface and cause pollution of groundwater in the chalk aquifer, shall be carried out until details of such works have been submitted and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with any such approved details.

Reason:- To prevent pollution of groundwater in the chalk aquifer 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.