
Site Address:	Rear of 70 Havant Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0LH		
Proposal:	Erection of 1No. three bed and 3No. four bed two storey detached houses with associated garages.		
Application No:	APP/16/01271	Expiry Date:	03/02/2017
Applicant:	Mr Mould		
Agent:	Mr Murray	Case Officer:	Daphney Haywood
	I J Murray Associates		
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

70 Havant Road is Grade II listed and dates from the 18th century. It formed part of a farmstead that was planned as a regular 'U-shaped' courtyard. This includes a Grade II listed Granary and converted barns. The farm house fronts Havant Road which is the main road onto Hayling Island that runs north south. The application site comprises part of the side and rear garden to the farmhouse and is located on the south side of the road in the Stoke area of Hayling Island which is mainly residential in character. There are a number of trees on the site, however, these are relatively small and of limited public amenity.

2 Planning History

91/52097/016 - Single storey side extension, PERM,31/10/1991
91/52097/017 - Listed
Building consent for single storey extension, PERM,31/10/1991
91/52097/019 - Erection of detached double garage., PERM,
91/52097/020 - Listed
Building Consent for detached double garage., ZHIS,19/12/1991
05/52097/023 - Listed Building application to demolish and rebuild rear lobby.,
PERM,27/05/2005
05/52097/024 - Listed Building Application for the installation of conservation roof light
in south facing roof., PERM,29/04/2005

3 Proposal

Erection of 1No. three bed and 3No. four bed two storey detached houses with associated garages. No physical changes are proposed to the farmhouse.

The proposed development will be to the side (north of the property) comprising a 3 bed dwelling fronting Havant Road and 3 further 4 bed dwellings to the rear. The proposed building that faces Havant Road and is to the side (north) of Cotterell farmhouse is designed in the style of the farm house using decorated brick and a gable to gable tiled roof as per the property opposite.

The Listed Granary which lies to the rear of Cotterell farmhouse (no 70 Havant Road) and is presently in the garden of no 72 Havant Road would be relocated close to its

original position. In the process of this relocation the Granary would be restored to its original condition including restoring the structure reinstating the correct roof materials and restoring the mushroom saddles. The aim would be to make the Granary the centrepiece of the new development.

No trees will be effected by this application and also a minimal amount of hedging will be removed with most being retained as the boundaries to the new properties.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20	(Historic Assets)
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)

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD 2016

Listed Building Grade: Adjacent Cotterell Farmhouse is Grade II listed

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer

Further Comments (Granary)

Principal Conservation Officer – Objection (additional comments)

The Granary comprises an interesting farm building, which is listed Grade II in its own right. On the historical mapping available to me (editions 1843-1893, 1891-1912 & 1904 -1939) the granary appears to have been located in its current position and has not been moved as has been suggested in the application. I would therefore suggest the principal of moving the Granary has not been established. Nonetheless, granaries of this type were not habitually moved.

It should also be noted that the granary as sited relates closely to the other agricultural buildings on the site (farmhouse and the barn). The proposed position of the granary will divorce the structure from this former agricultural setting to its detriment.. To conclude I would be resistant to any potential movement of this listed structure.

Original Comments:

Cotterell Farmhouse is Grade II listed and dates from the 18th century. It formed part of a farmstead that was planned as a regular 'U-shaped' courtyard. This includes a Grade II listed Granary and converted barns.

The plan (including the barns and granary) adds to the historic significance of the Listed Building and its setting. Historically therefore Cotterell Farmhouse was a remote cluster of buildings. It is important that the sense of isolation from the surrounding urban expansion is retained. It should not be consumed by the expanding back land development and needs to retain its agricultural setting and changes and respect the key aspects of the unaltered plan form. The significance of Cotterell Farmhouse not only lies in its architectural value but also in its evidential value as a physical document of past agricultural practices and rural settlement. This allows the observer to properly appreciate the functional origins of the complex and its relationship with the surrounding agricultural land.

A traditional farmstead or farm building will have significance if it makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, whether it is designated as a heritage asset or not. It is clear in this case the Farmhouse, granary and barn make a positive contribution in their current form to the character of the area.

Policy Context

Before proceeding to consider the policy context of the NPPF, it is of primary importance that the correct weight should be attributed to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building from the outset, in accordance with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990:

"In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses"

The need for the decision taker to attach considerable or special weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings has been reinforced through two recent high court decisions of: *Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Limited vs. East Northamptonshire District Council et al* (2014); and *North Norfolk District Council vs. DCLG and Mack* (2014).

The above statute and its subsequent and consistent interpretation in recent high court decision emphasises the need for the policies of the NPPF to be implemented whilst always having regard to the need to give special or greater weight to the preservation of the setting of a listed building.

Where the impact on the setting of a listed building has been assessed in accordance with paragraphs 128 to 132 of the Framework, and has been found to fall within the category of 'less than substantial harm' (i.e. paragraph 134), then it is still important that when considering the balance exercise, and therefore the public benefits of any such proposal, that from the outset this is consciously weighed in favour of the need to preserve the setting of the listed building.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and sets down the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications. This supersedes PPS 5, however, English Heritage (web-site 23 April 2012) advises that the Practice Guide (HEPPG) remains a valid and Government endorsed document pending Government's review of guidance

supporting national planning policy as set out in its response to the select Committee”.

The NPPF sets out, in paragraph 17, the 12 core planning principles that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions. One of these core principles relates directly to conserving heritage assets, as follows

“Planning should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations;”

Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. It also goes on to state that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

Paragraph 133 provides guidance in relation to development proposals that cause 'substantial harm'. While, paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy states that where a development will lead to 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Paragraph 64 (Section 7 – Requiring Good Design) is also particularly relevant to this case in that development should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

At local level Policy CS11 of the adopted local plan applies. These policies are supplemented at national and local level by supplementary guidance. Most pertinent to the current application are:-

- The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England) 2011.
- Seeing the History in the View (Historic England) 2011

Assessment

The setting of a heritage asset is defined in the glossary to the Framework as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. In simple terms, setting embraces all of the surroundings from which the heritage asset can be experienced, or that can be experienced from, or with, the asset. The development proposed would be clearly visible from the listed buildings and there would be areas within, and outside, the site where the listed buildings and the proposed development would be seen in juxtaposition. On that basis, it is clear that the proposal would have an impact on the setting of the listed building concerned.

The setting of Cotterell Farmhouse contributes to its significance by placing it in a rural context similar to that in which it was constructed and operated. Changing the hinterland of the listed buildings from undeveloped garden land with trees and hedgerows, to four new dwellings, would reduce the ability of the observer to appreciate the origins of the complex, and its relationship with the land. This would have a harmful impact on the setting of the listed buildings.

On the basis of the information submitted, any development along these lines would impact negatively on the strong visual and spatial relationship between Cotterell Farmhouse and the surrounding land. Introducing a development, particularly one of this scale and in such proximity to a Grade II listed building is fundamentally at odds

with its rural environment. For these reasons, the proposal in its current form will be harmful to the significance of these designated and locally prominent Grade II listed building through the impact on their setting

Under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, decision makers are required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. In exercising this duty in this case for the reason set out above I considered the proposal would fail to preserve the listed buildings setting and the features of historic interest associated with that setting.

In accordance with the NPPF I believe the degree of harm to this listed building would be significant, but on balance, less than substantial. In this context, the NPPF requires such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Historic England No comments received

Landscape Team

I confirm a landscape objection to the application because the proposals are deemed contrary to Havant Borough Core Strategy Policies CS11 and CS16.

Stoke is a distinctly linear settlement, with dwellings of traditional construction and perpendicular orientation to the Havant Road. The application site proposes residential development infill to the garden curtilage associated with a Grade II Listed building, which lies within Landscape Character Type I: Enclosed Lower Harbour Plain and Landscape Character Area 30: Stoke and north-west Hayling (Havant Borough Townscape, Landscape, and Seascape Character Assessment).

The built form and development guidelines for these character areas that are relevant to this application comprise:

- Redevelopment of vernacular buildings should be sensitive to their size, scale and location and avoid loss of character.
- The setting of historic buildings, whether listed or not, should be protected when considering applications for new development.

The proposals demonstrate some sensitivity in terms of the three bed dwelling with a parity of scale, orientation and architectural style to the Grade II Listed Cottrell Farmhouse.

Conversely, the three proposed plots within the rear curtilage of the Listed Farmhouse comprise larger dwellings of suburban architectural style and orientation, which will erode the identified linear settlement pattern and adversely impact the attractive landscape setting currently associated with the Listed Farmhouse.

I am concerned the discord of the proposals by comparison with the existing local character is only further exacerbated by the numerous detached garages and closeboard fencing lengths that contributes a somewhat cramped, cluttered appearance.

The proposed vehicular access, associated visibility splay requirement and parking provision for fourteen cars (to comply with the current parking SPD) will require substantial vegetation removal with only limited scope for remedial soft landscape planting to mitigate views into the site from the Havant Road.

The application lacks sufficient historic mapping detail or documentary evidence to support the Listed Granary relocation proposal.

I am concerned the application proposes a substantial increase of built-form and hard surfacing to an area known to have a high water table that comprises clay soil. The implications for surface water drainage will require appropriate investigation and provision for mitigation.

National Amenity Society - Ancient Monuments Society No comments received

County Minerals No comments received

Building Control

Surface of driveway should be suitable for Fire Authority access (Requirement B5).
Bin storage to be provided for each plot.

Natural England Government Team

Provided that the applicant is complying with the SPD or policy, Natural England are satisfied that the applicant has mitigated against the potential adverse effects of the development on the integrity of the European site(s), and has no objection to this aspect of the application.

Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

It is likely to be appropriate to seek prior approval of a detailed scheme of surface drainage, subject to the advice of the LLFA as the appropriate authority to advise on flood risk.

The residential use proposed is considered to be contamination sensitive, comprising family homes with private garden areas. The degree of sensitivity would apply irrespective of development density. I have no objection to the development on grounds of contamination potential subject to conditions: no adverse comments on air quality grounds.

Development Engineer - Highways

My concerns with this application is that service vehicles must be able to enter the site and then emerge in a forward gear. Any parking or stopping on Havant Road will cause traffic problems. It is important to see details of the swept paths into and out of the site and the turning circles overlay for vehicles to determine what vehicles (including fire appliances and emergency vehicles) are capable of servicing the proposed site.

Further to my previous comments made in late December 2016 I have now had an opportunity to visit the site and I have concerns with the accuracy of the visibility splay drawing.

In order to evaluate the sight line proposal I require a surveyed drawing showing 100m to the north and south of the site. This plan needs to show Havant Road with kerb lines, road markings, road signs and also the boundaries of all the adjacent properties with details of the hedging trees etc. On this drawing I would like sight lines of 2.5 by 56m to be shown.

Waste Services Manager

Waste bins to be brought to the boundary / highway of the new development for ease of collection

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps No comments received

Lead Local Flood Authority

As this application relates to a site which is less than 1 hectare in size and under 1000 Sq.m floor space, there is no need for us to comment on it at this time. However, please direct the applicant to our website

<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/flooding/hampshireflooding/drainagesystems.htm> for further information on recommended surface water drainage techniques.

Also, please note that if the proposals include works to an ordinary watercourse, under the Land drainage Act 1991, as amended by the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, prior consent of the Lead Local Flood Authority is required for this work. This consent is required as a separate permission to planning. Details can be found <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/flooding/hampshireflooding/watercourses.htm>

Traffic Management Team

The traffic team has no adverse comment to make regarding this application.

Engineering/Drainage

Historically the area subject to the application has been subject to flooding due to isolation of the adjacent ditch along the northern boundary from the wider surface water drainage system. This demonstrates that soakaways (application section 12) will not work at this site. However, following representations over a number of years from local residents HBC has recently used its land drainage powers to install, at public expense, a by-pass pipe to allow the ditch to drain into the rest of the surface water system and resolve the flooding.

In addition, section 12 of the application is wrong in that the proposed development is within 20m of a watercourse (the ditch, in fact it abuts it), and explicit drainage consent will be required from Hampshire County Council as the LLFA. The fact that soakaways will not work is no longer material since there is now a positive connection to a surface water pipe available, viz. the pipe installed recently by HBC.

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: 8

Number of site notices: one

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Summary:

- contrary to the Local Plan. Detrimental to rural setting and degrades soft edge
- out of character with existing pattern of development
- unsustainable location
- overbearing suburban form and has a significant detrimental effect on the listed building and its neighbours.
- need for improved infrastructure particularly relating to the already congested primary access of Havant Rd, I feel this proposal needs careful consideration in this respect.

- Closeness of the new entrance driveway to the existing driveway serving 78a&b. Havant Rd is very busy particularly during peak times, which can sometimes take up to 10mins to safely negotiate joining the traffic queue. Additional vehicles attempting to join Havant Rd from a new driveway just 5m distant is at best going to exasperate the existing situation, if not lead to a more serious outcome. In this respect has consideration been given to locating the new driveway further south which is also on a straighter portion of the road?
- building contractors do mis-use the driveway (78a&b) for turning or parking purposes. Should planning permission be granted, to allay any fears In this respect, it would be appreciated if Contractors Method/Work Statements could be shared with local residents prior to any commencement of work.
- The access road cannot fulfil the traffic design criteria for safe access
- The proposals risk the loss of a significant number of trees
- The proposal to move the Granary is unsubstantiated folly to facilitate development
- The proposals do not quantify the potential harm to the local biodiversity or the potential for nesting sites
- If an approval is forthcoming, we suggest that CIL contributions should directly fund continuation of the footpath to the west of Havant Road, south of the site and a suitable crossing to promote safe pedestrian movement near the Yew Tree Inn / Daw Lane

Comment:
see section 7

7 Planning Considerations

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 on the setting of the Listed Building and Granary re-location
- (iv) Impact upon residential amenity
- (v) Highway Implications
- (vi) CIL and SRMP considerations

(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. Policies CS9, and CS17 of the Core Strategy together with Policies AL1 and AL2 support residential development within the built up area and the need to provide small units to meet housing demand, which is also identified in the Annual Monitoring report.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development however this should not be to the detriment of the local area.

Paragraph 6 makes it clear that regard must be had to the document as a whole in determining what the Government's view of sustainable development means in practice. It promotes the effective use of land through the re-use of previously developed land. With paragraph 49 stating that "*housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.*"

However, paragraph 56 makes it clear that *“Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.”* Paragraph 58, bullet 4 seeks to ensure that development responds to local character, with bullet 6 requiring good architecture.

Paragraph 59 seeks to ensure the sustainable construction of the dwellings, whilst paragraphs 60 and 61 seek to ensure the development is designed well accounting for local context. Paragraph 64 however, requires development of poor design to be refused.

Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy Local Development Framework 2011 seeks to reflect the requirements of the NPPF at a local level. It and the local plan policies encourages the principle of development within the settlement area, provided that any new development pays proper regard to the character and appearance of the area, design and neighbour amenity

(ii) Impact upon visual amenities and character of the area.

Stoke is a distinctly linear settlement, with dwellings of traditional construction and perpendicular orientation to the Havant Road. The application site proposes residential development infill to the side and rear garden curtilage associated with a Grade II Listed building. Whilst the proposals demonstrate some sensitivity in terms of the three bed dwelling with regard to siting, scale, orientation and architectural style to the existing linear development, the three proposed plots within the rear curtilage of the Listed Farmhouse comprise larger dwellings of suburban architectural style and orientation, which will erode the identified linear settlement pattern and adversely impact the attractive landscape setting currently associated with the Listed Farmhouse.

Policy CS11 Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough states that:-

Planning permission will be granted for development that ensures the key landscape and built form principles set out in the Havant Borough Townscape, Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment are protected and where possible enhanced by partnership working with developers, groups and the wider community.

The site lies within Landscape Character Type I: Enclosed Lower Harbour Plain and Landscape Character Area 30: Stoke and north-west Hayling (Havant Borough Townscape, Landscape, and Seascape Character Assessment). The guidelines for these areas advise that regard should be had to the character of the existing development and the setting of historic building should be protected. The proposed development would not respect the existing semi-rural character with extensive built form, hardsurfacing and harsh boundary treatment, resulting in a visually intrusive form of development to the detriment of the character and visual appearance of the area. Overall, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and contrary to Policy CS11 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) and the this supplementary guidance.

Additionally Policy CS16 High Quality Design seeks to encourage good design and amongst other things development should:-

1. Responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and:
 - a) Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local

character within or close to the proposed development site;

b) Integrates with existing local landscape features, promotes wildlife and biodiversity and/or applies characteristics of the local area into the design of a scheme wherever possible to create variety and interest;

c) Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors

The application proposes a substantial increase of built-form and hard surfacing in a form that does not respond to the local context, nor use the characteristics of the area or respect the landscape setting of Stoke, resulting in a visually intrusive form of development to the detriment of the character and visual amenities of the area.

Overall, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area contrary to the provisions of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iii) Impact on the setting of the Listed Building and Granary re-location

The setting of a heritage asset is defined in the glossary to the Framework as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. In simple terms, setting embraces all of the surroundings from which the heritage asset can be experienced, or that can be experienced from, or with, the asset. The development proposed would be clearly visible from the listed buildings and there would be areas within, and outside, the site where the listed buildings and the proposed development would be seen in juxtaposition. On that basis, it is clear that the proposal would have an impact on the settings of the listed buildings concerned.

The setting of Cotterell Farmhouse contributes to its significance by placing it in a rural context similar to that in which it was constructed and operated. Changing the hinterland of the listed buildings from undeveloped garden land with trees and hedgerows, to four new dwellings, would reduce the ability of the observer to appreciate the origins of the complex, and its relationship with the land. This would have a harmful impact on the setting of the listed buildings.

The proposed development would impact negatively on the strong visual and spatial relationship between Cotterell Farmhouse and the surrounding land. Introducing a development, particularly one of this scale and in such proximity to Grade II listed buildings is fundamentally at odds with its rural environment. For these reasons, the proposal in its current form will be harmful to the significance of these designated and locally prominent Grade II listed buildings through the impact on their setting, contrary to the provisions of Policy CS11 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

The proposed works to the Granary would need to be considered under a listed building application, however, the scheme currently under consideration would necessitate the re-location of the Granary. The principle of moving the Granary has not been established and the building as currently sited relates closely to other agricultural buildings on the site (farmhouse and the barn). The proposed position of the granary will divorce the structure from this former agricultural setting to its detriment. The Conservation Officer concludes that he is resistant to the movement of the building.

(iv) Impact upon residential amenity

With regard to the impact on neighbouring residents, the neighbouring properties comprise 70, 72 and 78a Havant Road and 99-105 Havant Road on the opposite side

of Havant Road. In respect to nos. 99 to 105, the development would impact views from these properties but Havant Road provides separation and the impact would not be over dominant and is considered to be limited and acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

Regarding 70, and 78a the proposed development has been designed to satisfy the Borough Design Guide in respect to separation distances and amenity space, and the access would be sited adjacent the garage to 78a away from the dwelling and the amenity area. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to appear overbearing or lead to overlooking and would have limited and acceptable impact on these properties, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

No 72 has a large first floor window in the side elevation and the proposed dwelling facing this elevation has a number of first floor bedroom windows which would be approx 11m distance. This falls well below the guidance in the Borough Design Guide and there would be a loss of privacy to 72 contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(v) Highway Implications

The Development Engineer has advised that there are concerns regarding the accuracy of the visibility splay drawing and that a surveyed drawing showing 100m to the north and south of the site is required with sight lines of 2.5 by 56m. Additionally service vehicles must be able to enter the site and then emerge in a forward gear. Any parking or stopping on Havant Road will cause traffic problems. It is important to see details of the swept paths into and out of the site and the turning circles overlay for vehicles to determine what vehicles (including fire appliances and emergency vehicles) are capable of servicing the proposed site.

The agent has been advised of these comments, but in the absence of the information to address this point then highway safety has not been satisfactorily addressed, and the requirements of Policy 20 have not been satisfied.

(vi) Contributions and CIL

In relation to developer contributions, should permission have been recommended for approval it would be CIL liable. An informative will be added in relation to CIL in the Decision Notice.

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 at the end of June 2014 require a payment of £176 per dwelling to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Project together with £20 administration and £8.80 monitoring fee. As the proposal is recommended for refusal the SRMP has not been pursued at this stage.

8 Conclusion

In terms of the impact on the setting of the listed building the Conservation Officer advises that the degree of harm to this listed building would be significant, but on

balance, less than substantial. In this context, the NPPF requires such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In economic and social terms, the provision of additional dwellings within the urban area would accord with the objectives of the NPPF and make a contribution to the Council's housing requirements as set out in the development plan and therefore should be given weight. Whilst some form of residential development in this area may be acceptable in principle, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Listed Building. Additionally it has not been demonstrated that safe and satisfactory access can be provided. Furthermore it fails to secure adequate mitigation measures to offset the impact of additional recreational pressure on the coast. The recommendation is therefore to refuse planning permission.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/16/01271

for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed dwellings with associated garages and hardstanding would by reason of their number, siting, height, mass, bulk and design lead to a cramped and visually intrusive form of development at this prominent corner location. This would be harmful to the established pattern of development and the character and appearance of the area. The development is therefore considered contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 together with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 2 The proposed development by reason of its scale, height, siting and overall appearance would adversely affect the character of the area and in particular would be detrimental to the setting of the adjacent building which is listed as being of special architectural or historic interest. Furthermore the proposed layout would require the re-siting of a Listed Granary building. The principle of relocating the listed building is considered unacceptable based on the information available and would result in the building being isolated from its original farm complex thus undermining its historic interest and context. It is therefore contrary to policies C11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Publication Local Plan (Allocations) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 3 The proposed first floor windows on the south elevation of the plot backing onto 72 Havant Road are likely to give rise to direct overlooking of the adjacent property at 70 Havant Road to the detriment of the amenities of the occupants of that property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 4 On the basis of the limited information available to the Local Planning Authority it is not considered that the proposed development could be

undertaken in a satisfactory manner in respect to access and highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16 and CS20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 5 The proposal, without completion of the appropriate binding arrangements to secure a contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Project, is contrary to the Council's Policy on contributions towards measures of mitigation adopted by the Local Planning Authority. These seek to ensure that the provision is made from new development towards mitigating against increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. The development is therefore contrary to policies CS11 and 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.