
Site Address: 48 Sinah Lane, Hayling Island, PO11 0HH
Proposal: Variation of conditions 2 (approved plans), 5 (landscaping), 9 (materials), 10 (hardsurfacing) and 15 (means of enclosure) of Planning Permission APP/20/01223 (Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling including new summer house and garage together with new driveway access with associated landscaping) - to include provision of first floor accommodation over garage and revised summerhouse and terrace arrangements with minor works proposed to the existing sea wall.

Application No: APP/21/00913

Expiry Date: 01/10/2021

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Whitehead

Agent: Mr Hebden
Hebden Design Studio

Case Officer: Julie Terzoudis

Ward: Hayling West

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application relates to 48 Sinah Lane, located upon Hayling Island, which contained a two-storey property with a part chalet-style roof, rendered walls and a clay tile roof. To the rear was a pitched roof building linked to the main house and to the western side an attached garage. The site has now been cleared and groundworks are currently being undertaken to facilitate the construction of the replacement dwelling and associated buildings previously approved under planning reference APP/20/01223.
- 1.2 Access is currently achieved from the western side of the frontage. To the rear is a long garden which slopes gently towards Langstone Harbour and the shoreline. There are trees along the eastern and western boundaries and to the shoreline frontage.
- 1.3 Sinah Lane and the surrounding streets consist of narrow treelined roads, deprived of pedestrianised pavements. Dwellings in the locality comprise of large detached single-storey and two-storey properties on sizable sites with generous front setbacks and large rear gardens, with a generally leafy vernacular. Many of the sites on the northern side of Sinah Lane consist of rear gardens fronting the coast providing direct access to the water.
- 1.4 The development site is in close proximity to the Solent Maritime SAC, SPA, Chichester and Langstone Harbours Ramsar and Langstone Harbour SSSI.

2 Planning History

APP/20/01223 - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling including new summer house and garage together with new driveway access with associated landscaping., PERM,02/06/2021

3 Proposal

The application seeks the following discharge or variation of Conditions:

- 3.1 For the variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans list) to be replaced with a new list of revised approved plans to accommodate minor alterations and outstanding details;
- 3.2 For the variation of Condition 5 which required the submission and approval of a soft landscaping scheme, including a comprehensive tree planting scheme;
- 3.3 For the variation of Condition 9 which required the submission of samples and a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the buildings to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
- 3.4 For the variation of Condition 10 which required the submission and approval of a specification of the materials to be used for the surfacing of all open parts of the site proposed to be hardsurfaced; and
- 3.5 For the variation of Condition 15 which required the submission and approval of details of the type, siting, design and materials to be used in the construction of all means of enclosure including boundaries, screens or retaining walls.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Planning Practice Guidance 2016

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS9	(Housing)
CS12	(Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB))
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)
DM9	(Development in the Coastal Zone)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

DR1	(Delivery of Sustainable Development)
E1*	(High quality design)
H1*	(High quality new homes)
E3	(Landscape and settlement boundaries)
E4	(Development on the Coast)
E12	(Low carbon design)
E15	(Protected species)
E18	(Trees, hedgerows and woodland)
E19	(Managing flood risk in new development)
E20	(Drainage infrastructure in new development)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist, Havant Borough Council

I have looked over the site plans 1, 2, and 3 and the summerhouse and garage proposals and cannot see any alterations that will further affect trees therefore I have no objection to the revised proposals. As per the previous arb comments on APP/20/01223, if permission is given then conditions must be applied. Any trees planted which die within a period of 5 years should be replanted.

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

Full details for compliance to requirement B5 will be required as the proposed access drive would not comply. A sprinkler system maybe required. Bin storage location to be confirmed.

Coastal Engineering, Havant Borough Council

No comment received.

Coastal Partners (Summarised)

Coastal Partners have no objection in principle to the proposed development from a tidal flood risk perspective but are able to offer the following. The applicant has submitted an updated Planning Statement (including Design and Access and Flood Risk) compiled by Hebden design studio, referenced Rev 03 which covers Flood Risk. It sufficiently outlines how tidal flood risk at the site will be mitigated. We are happy to leave it to the EA as part of the permitting process given that the summerhouse will have no habitable accommodation and the dwelling is in FZ1

Community Infrastructure, Planning Policy & Urban Design

CIL Liable: <http://www.havant.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy-charging-schedule>.

The Applicant has not applied for self build relief for this application (self build relief was granted for the permission granted under APP/20/01223). If permission is granted the CIL liability will replace the liability under APP/20/01223 so a new Form 7 Part 1: Self Build Relief Claim Form should be submitted prior to commencement.

Councillor Brenda Linger

No comment received.

Councillor Clare Satchwell - Hayling East

No comment received.

Councillor I Scott Hayling West

No comment received.

County Ecologist, Strategic Environmental Delivery

The submitted Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) provides details of specific measures to avoid and mitigate potential impacts on the adjacent Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area and Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC). I am content that if these measures are implemented the potential impacts can be effectively avoided. There are no other ecological matters for comment.

Engineering Services, Havant Council

No comment received.

Engineering/Drainage

No formal comments received.

Environment Agency (Summarised)

We request that a flood risk mitigation condition be attached to any planning permission granted. The proposed development will only meet the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements in relation to flood risk if the planning condition is included.

Further Advice - Environmental Permit

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit or exemption to be obtained for any activities which will take place:

- on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)
- on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres if tidal)
- on or within 16 metres of a sea defence
- involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert
- in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission.

For further guidance please visit:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits> or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03708 506 506 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm) or by emailing enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk.

Hampshire Constabulary, Tasking & Co-Ordination Directorate

No comment received.

Hampshire Highways

The applicant is proposing a variation of conditions of planning permission APP/20/01223 which the Highway Authority had previously provided no objections for. Due to the scale of the proposal and that there is no change to the vehicular access, HCC's standing advice should be referred to in the first instance. As a result, the Highway Authority will not provide detailed comments on this planning application.

Harbour Office, Langstone Harbour Board, Langstone Harbour Board

The Board's Planning Sub Committee has considered this application and has no objections to the proposals.

Highways Development Planning, Strategic Transport, Economy, Transport and Environment Department

No comment received.

Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council

Comments 06/12/21: From a landscape perspective we have the following comments in relation to the variation of conditions 2, 5, 9, 10 and 15;

Condition 2 – No adverse comments recommend to discharge condition no. 2.

Condition 5 – No adverse comments recommend to discharge condition no. 5.

Condition 9 – No adverse comments recommend to discharge condition no. 9.

Condition 10 – Insufficient information submitted to discharge condition no. 10.

Hard landscape details requiring submission of fully annotated plans at sufficient scale that comprise a range of coloured and textured surfacing treatments, which identify:

- hard surfacing material type / product reference and colour

- laying bond
- edging or kerb detail / type
- retaining structures or steps

Condition 15 – Insufficient information submitted to discharge condition no. 15.

Details of all proposed boundary treatments must be submitted for comment, its appears details of the replacement rendered wall have not be submitted and we require information on colours to ensure it is appropriate.

Comments 21/12/2021: I have revised the Landscape Plan - Hardscape and having seen the proposed details I have no adverse comments and recommend to discharge conditions no. 10 and 15.

Local Lead Flood Authority HCC

Comments 03/11/2021: We would not usually comment on minor applications but given the sensitivities in the area, I have had a look at the information provided and have the following comments:

- No drainage information has been provided so it is not clear how water from the site will be managed. This area is difficult to drain and soakaways are extremely unlikely to be suitable.
- No level information has been provided. It is essential that levels are not amended or if they are, water is directed away from proposed or adjacent dwellings so that flood risk on or off site is not exacerbated.

Comments on further information 30/11/2021: As discussed, we have reviewed the drainage proposals provided by the applicant and they have demonstrated that they can achieve a gravity connection to the sea as infiltration has proved to be unviable for deeper infiltration systems with the relatively high groundwater level. As such, this allows for surface water to be managed appropriately. We do not have detailed levels to check that overland flows are not being redirected however the applicant is aware that they need to ensure overland flow routing needs to remain as existing. At this stage, and given the size of the development, we do not feel it is appropriate for us to request any further information as we would not usually comment on minor applications. Our focus is on ensuring the drainage proposals are fit for purpose.

Natural England, Natural England Consultation Service

No objection - subject to appropriate mitigation being secured

We consider that without appropriate mitigation the application would:

- have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, and the Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- damage or destroy the interest features for which Langstone Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) has been notified.

In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following mitigation measures are required / or the following mitigation options should be secured:

- A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) - We advise that an appropriate planning condition or obligation is attached to any planning permission to secure these measures.

Natural England's advice on other natural environment issues is set out below.

Further advice on mitigation - Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)

Natural England notes that your authority, as competent authority, has undertaken an

appropriate assessment (AA) of the proposal in accordance with regulation 63 of the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended). Natural England is a statutory consultee on the appropriate assessment stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Your appropriate assessment concludes that your authority is able to ascertain that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the sites in question. Having considered the assessment, and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal, Natural England advises that we concur with the assessment conclusions, providing that all mitigation measures are appropriately secured in any planning permission given. Further advice on mitigation measures is provided below.

Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

It is noted that a CEMP has been provided by the applicant, uploaded onto the planning portal on the 25 August 2021. The development is in close proximity to the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area and Ramsar site, the Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Langstone Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Without best practice working methods and mitigation there is risk during the construction phase of the development that pollution from machinery, equipment or materials may enter into the water.

The CEMP should be secured by an appropriate planning condition or obligation and include the following:

- A list of defined potential impacts on the SPA & SSSI
- Details of methods for pollution control to ensure that no pollution (such as debris from dust or surface run off) is able to enter the water.
- Details on the storage and disposal of waste on site
- Details on how sediment/concrete/other debris that may be accidentally released during construction will be captured to prevent entering the water
- Details of Biosecurity to ensure that all equipment brought onto site does not bring any contaminants such as invasive species onto the site and into the waters.

As advised by Natural England, the AA outlines the measures proposed to mitigate construction impacts on European designated sites.

Noise and Visual Disturbance

The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) examines the potential for impacts to be caused through noise and visual disturbance detailed in Section 2. Where potential impacts are identified, Natural England would recommend that impacts are avoided by securing the following planning condition:

Noise disturbance: The distancing of construction machinery from the designated sites has been specified in the AA, Natural England advises that percussive piling or works with heavy machinery (i.e. plant resulting in a noise level in excess of 69dbAmax – measured at the sensitive receptor) should also be avoided during the bird overwintering period (i.e. October to March inclusive). The sensitive receptor is the nearest point of the SPA or any SPA supporting habitat (e.g. high tide roosting site). If such a condition is problematic to the applicant, then Natural England will consider any implications of the proposals on the SPA bird interests on a case by case basis through our Discretionary Advice Service.

Visual Disturbance: It is noted that the AA provided states that 'a suitable temporary

visual screen will be installed along the northern boundary of the construction site between 1st October and the 31st March', this is aligned with the advice of Natural England on appropriate mitigation for visual disturbance.

It is advised that the impact is properly assessed and any identified impacts are addressed in line with the [SWBGS Guidance on Mitigation and Offsetting Requirements](#).

The approved CEMP should be secured via an appropriately worded condition attached to any planning consent and shall be adhered to at all times, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Norse South East, Operations Director

No comment received.

Traffic Management, East Hampshire District Council

The traffic team have no adverse comment to make.

Waste Strategy Team Leader, Community Group

No comment 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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received, which includes representations received following a re-consultation with neighbours on 26/10/21: : 10 representations received (11 names) 10 Objecting and 1 neutral.

Comments
Firstly, the first floor of the garage block that was removed from the original application after many objections from residents, in order to get approval, has been re-instated with minor alterations, but still presents an "industrial unit" appearance to Sinah Lane, quite out of keeping with the mixed styles of residential buildings existing. Secondly, the bewildering multitude of documents on this application (45), some of which are carried forward from the previous application (93), contain many errors and misleading drawings and outlines, and carry few clear measurements as to size, height, location, spacing from adjacent existing buildings, making it impossible to assess potential issues conflicting with Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011, namely Impact on Residential Amenity. Despite my requests, the Project manager has failed to provide these measurements, preventing not only the calculation of the proposed garage and accommodation obscuring daylight from our kitchen, in line with Havant Borough Design Guide SDP 2011, section 5.09. , but also the distance and sight-line from the new side window of the upper floor on the east elevation, straight into our front bedroom, an estimated distance of only 15

feet! In fact, the submitted drawing "Garage Elevations" contains a major error, in that it shows an outline of the old house on the plot, demolished long before this new application, and which should not be used for comparison with this new build.

Thirdly, the proposed alteration to the sea wall adjacent to Langstone Harbour, seems to involve nameless contractors breaching the existing seamless seawall covering several properties, and the insertion of Gabion blocks on the foreshore.

Surely the Council, the Harbour Board, the Environment Agency, Coastal Partners, Ecology Team, will all agree that the integrity of the seawall along the foreshore of Langstone Harbour is VITAL. Any alteration of this wall must be carried out by very experienced engineers.

For the above reasons, whilst I admire the bold and imaginative design of the main house itself, and wish to enjoy cordial future relations with our new neighbours, I regretfully have to object to this application, and ask that the Planning Officer consider the matter carefully, and confirm facts with me if in doubt.

I object to this application concerning the revised garage design.

The design for the garage is an improvement on the industrial looking garage that was previously submitted, however the new application states "first floor accommodation over garage". This sounds like a back door way for a retrospective application for converting the garage for habitual use. This would be out of character for this lane. I would strongly suggest that a covenant be placed that this is not possible now or in the future. While reading the through the submitted documents EXTENDED PHASE 1 ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT & PHASE 2 BAT SURVEY states that a EPSM licence is required from Natural England before demolition the property. Was this done? Is there a licence is so where. Or it a case of fait accompli?

I am objecting (again) to the design and placement of the two story garage.

This is out of keeping with all the garages on the north side of Sinah Lane. A majority of the buildings in the neighbourhood of this development are white so this garage is not in keeping with the overall appearance of this quiet residential lane.

The plans for the garage for 48 Sinah Lane is totally out of keeping with the caricature in this quite lane which at one time was recognised by Havant Borough Council as an area to be preserved. The design looks like an industrial unit and I am sure that in the future there will be a planning application to change this to a dwelling (with extensions). This would then add to the infilling of gardens which is not taken into account when considering the traffic density on the Island which is known problem for the whole of the Island.

Lack of, or conflicting Information. The current application includes documents which are unclear, lack sufficient detail or reference points and, on occasion. inconsistent or contradictory with one another and the previous application. These deficiencies coupled with the sheer number of documents in both applications make it impossible for the layman to identify, compare and analyse the variations (changes) sought with a view to making a balanced evaluation as their reasonableness or otherwise. It is understood that the Council has sought clarifications from the Applicant/Agent, in particular to obtain a summary of the variations as they appear in the documentation. It is further understood that the Council has not received any such material to date. I have also requested similar information from the Agent without success. Consequently I object to this entire application pending clarification by the Applicant. I would also urge the Council to notify the Applicant, for the avoidance of doubt, that no works associated with the variations should be commenced until such clarification is received.

I hereby OBJECT to the following specific items as they have been presented in

this application:

A. Condition 2 - approved plans

1. Objection. Two story garage. The initial two-story design (APP/20/01223) was withdrawn in the face of numerous objections and replaced with a single-story design. This current application now reverts to two stories but the revised design does little or nothing to address the original objections. In summary the overall appearance is still too industrial/commercial. That and the box like structure give it an overbearing bunker-like look that would dominate and be inappropriate for a leafy, wooded road comprising mature residential properties. It should also be noted that there is an inconsistency in the building's orientation on the plot as shown, between the elevation drawings and plan drawings (see "compass rose" indication on plans).

2. I am not against a two-story structure in principle but would urge the Council to require the Applicant to develop a more sympathetic and appropriate first floor design which might be achieved by a combination of:

i. overall reduction in first floor foot-print (size) - less overbearing given proximity to road

ii. slanting (pitched?) elevations to reduce and soften visual impact and sight lines - less block like/industrial appearance

iii. remove monopitch roof, replace with something in zinc(?), possibly a mansard(?) with a lower roof line

iv. "green" rooves have their merits but, orientated towards the road, this would be highly incongruous in a residential, mature street - replace with conventional roof

v. the three car-wide, roller shutter is mammoth and merely heightens the industrial look similar to a logistics/loading bay which greatly detracts from the existing visual appearance and appeal of the road - should be reduced to two car width and ideally changed to bifold or more traditional doors

vi. materials - the introduction of zinc cladding, combined with the wood (eg. roof or elevations, in part or in whole) would help and better pick up the design of the house.

3. The proposed design does not reflect the design qualities of the main house nor live up to the overall design intent promised in the Applicant's DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT underpinning the whole project.

4. Objection. Garage - Permitted Use. HBC's document "Grant of Planning Permission" dated 02.06.2021 in respect of the previous application does not appear to place any restriction on the permitted use of the garage presumably as the approved design was a single-story building with no services. Given the potential for utilisation creep afforded by a two-story structure, alternative uses (eg. running a business, habitation, renting out etc) should not be permitted. Accordingly appropriate restriction(s)/designated use conditions should be applied in the event that permission is granted for a two-story building.

5. Objection. Main House. Balcony to the North Elevation. A balcony with a very substantial foot print was envisaged in the original design but was reduced significantly following discussions between the Applicant and neighbours. This was appreciated and may still be the Applicant's intention. However, Drawings Nos. 3.200 Rev 02 & 3.201 Rev 02 (South/West and North/East Elevations) show a LARGE balcony while 3.101 Rev 03 (First Floor and Basement Plans) shows a SMALL balcony. For the layman it is not clear which of these drawings (and others) take precedence. The adverse impact of a such a large balcony, if this is the case, would be considerable in terms of loss of privacy and enjoyment of gardens on immediate and near neighbours. For avoidance of doubt this warrants formal/written clarification. (NB. the size and orientation of a large balcony, nearly reaching the boundary with No 50 Sinah Lane, would offer unrestricted sight lines, from height over boundary hedges, up the gardens to the back of Nos 44, 46, 50,

52 and 56 Sinah Lane.

6. Equally a large balcony with its proximity to the harbour would inevitably become a social focal point likely to disrupt quiet enjoyment of neighbouring gardens.

B. Condition 5- Landscaping

Comment. The drawings produced by the landscape designer have no apparent reference points and show few hard features (eg. existing buildings) to assist in identifying their position and in some cases the orientation of the beds and planting. However, the planting appears particularly dense (no problem in itself) but with the absence of references it is difficult to judge whether this impacts on neighbouring buildings and planting. Similarly, it is difficult to establish from the Planting List which are native species likely to grow into major specimens. Clarification should be sought

C. Condition 15 - Means of enclosure

Comment. Drawing 3.010 rev 5 (Site & block plan) and similar drawings do not show the provision of any means of enclosure on the western boundary over a stretch running southwards from the position of the garage/No 50 dwelling to the road (ie. the old front garden). The Applicant has previously stated his reasonable desire for privacy, safe enclosure for his dogs and a clearer delineated boundary which are all reflected over the rest of the boundary. The Council is requested to clarify the Applicant's intention for this section.

D. New Seawall

Comment. When building the new seawall, it is essential that neighbours' existing seawalls are not disturbed in anyway nor broken-into for the purpose of tying-in the new wall. The new wall should be butted up to the existing walls, using proprietary marine jointing sealants, and structurally reinforced to the rear to anchor it as necessary, in such a way that the sea cannot ingress behind the wall. From bitter experience even a small amount of water under wave pressure at the top of the tide will scour-out behind the wall leading to major problems later. It is requested that the Council apply appropriate technical conditions to this item.

The numerous drawings/documents in this application for variations and the original application (APP/20/01223) refer to the first floor of the garage variously as: storage, home office, hobby room and accommodation. The actual intended use is therefore confusing as is the term accommodation which could be taken as accommodation for business purposes or habitation (eg airb&b). Both of which would be unsuitable and inappropriate. I would strongly urge the council to place a condition on the permitted use of the first floor accordingly. I note that no such condition was placed on the previously permitted garage as ultimately (after amendments) it was only a single story! Without such a condition it would be extremely easy to change physically the use of the first floor at a future date. Such a condition of use would provide much needed clarity.

Sinah Lane has no street drainage (grilles) and is already under pressure from the 'nuisance' caused by standing water from quite modest rainfall. The recent increase in this problem, caused by direct run-off from the current enabling (temporary) works on site, clearly demonstrates how vulnerable this stretch of the Lane is to any additional run-off. Given the quantum increase to be expected from a large two- story garage and extensive hard landscaping the situation would be intolerable if adequate drainage and associated systems are not in place.

Therefore, I fully endorse the comments by the Local Lead Floor Authority consultee document dated 03 Nov 2021. The Council (and any other relevant authority) must be in a position to fully evaluate and assess the adequacy and effectiveness of the proposed system(s) before planning consent is given. In particular there should be sufficient capacity to deal with the changing pattern of

weather with heavier bursts of rainfall particularly in immediate coastal areas such as this (ie. the problem is more severe than further inland). It would also seem prudent, as suggested by the LLFA, that reliance is not placed solely on soakaways (or similar) and that at least some rain water from the building and immediate area is discharged to the foul water system. I urge the Council not to grant consent until the information detailed by the LLFA is received and an evaluation completed. Trying to address any problems after the garage and drives are built would be a nightmare for all concerned.

We object to the revision of the garage plans on two grounds; namely visual and safety. Sinah Lane is a residential lane with traditional and historic properties and where there are outbuildings fronting the lane these are mainly screened by mature trees and shrubs. The proposed two storey garage is of modern office type and therefore visually jarring and incongruent with its surroundings. While a wall or front fence would screen a single storey outbuilding, it will not alleviate the rigid block construction of the proposed two storey unit.

However our greatest concern is safety. (redacted) driveway and that of the opposite former property are offset. When we bought our property we had no concerns about access. However this application involves moving the new driveway to a position (redacted), scarcely more than a car length in distance. We indicated in our previous comments that this proposed a risk to us as we have of necessity to reverse into Sinah Lane due to the design of our driveway. Sinah Lane is a narrow, winding lane with poor sightlines and this manoeuvre has to be undertaken carefully. Therefore additional traffic directly behind us is a very unwelcome prospect and potentially hazardous. By revising their garage plans, we believe that the new owners are creating an unacceptable risk for us. We infer from their application that they intend one of two things: either the second storey will be used as office space, potentially from which to run their business interests. This will involve visits from employees, contractors and others thereby doubling or further increasing traffic flow into and out of the property and thereby impacting our access.

Alternatively, as the revised plans are now terming the additional space as accommodation, the intention may be to use the garage block as holiday lets and perhaps ultimately to redevelop the property as a separate dwelling. In which case our above concerns about traffic volumes are amplified. As a dwelling for one family, with normal coming and going, we consider the driveway issue an acceptable risk, but as a multi-use property, potentially two properties, then the risk to our access is unacceptable and reinstate our earlier objection to a two storey garage/office/dwelling.

I note that on the recent drawings submitted the elevations of the garage are the same as those first presented and withdrawn/rejected. I feel the elevation facing Sinah Lane is totally out of keeping with all other buildings facing the lane. The single garage door needs to be reduced to 3 doors to prevent the building looking like a distribution depot. No provision is made for access to the "Green Roof", for maintenance. On the first plan a W.C. was provided on the first floor. Is this still the case? With so many drawings having been submitted and misleading compass indications, confusion is bound to ensue.

Effect on daylight, privacy and outlook

The addition of a first floor to the garage only approximately 6m from our kitchen window will cut out daylight from our kitchen. This window is the only source of natural light for the room. This appears to go against Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2001 (Daylight 5.09). The window on the east elevation of the first floor

faces directly into a bedroom window and therefore invades our privacy. The plan of the south elevation is misleading and, I believe, irrelevant. The notation shows "outline of existing house". At the time of this application there was no house. The original house was demolished before receipt of this application. We have had difficulty finding out the exact measurements for the application. Those provided on the website are scaled down plans which state "Do not scale from this drawing...". We have spoken to the architect who agreed to provide us with exact measurements and accurate scale drawings. We have not yet received these.

Design, appearance and layout

The garage block is a large building approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ the width of the plot. With the addition of a first floor this non residential building would be completely out of character with the rest of the buildings fronting Sinah Lane which are all residential. The previously approved single storey garage at least would be somewhat disguised behind the applicants' planned wall and gate. The applicants removed the planned first floor from the original application (APP/20/01223) in response to residents' concerns. It is disappointing that the applicants have decided that those concerns are no longer worth considering.

Loss of open spaces, countryside and other natural habitats

I would also like to object to the effect of the gabion sea wall on the natural habitat. The seashore along this stretch of Sinah Lane up to the Kench is very natural and open which is what gives this area fronting Langstone Harbour its appealing character. The sea walls along this stretch are of a similar construction with natural seaside vegetation growing along the top, as well as the base, of the sea walls. The introduction of a gabion wall would be out of keeping, adding a more formal feature along this lovely part of the shoreline and preventing the growth of natural flora atop.

Should the planning department be minded to approve this style of wall, I would like reassurance that there would be no risk of breaching our section of sea wall by removal of the applicants'. In addition, there should be strongly enforced mitigation to protect the over wintering birds which have now arrived and use Langstone Harbour, including this stretch of shoreline, for feeding as do the summer residents.

Sinah Lane is a semi-rural location comprised of traditional, designed, domestic houses interspersed with several protected buildings which in total, determines its character. The proposed building at 48 Sinah Lane is industrial in its design and is completely at odds with the surroundings, creating a harsh, blocky elevation to its frontage which contrasts unattractively with the long established environment. I am, therefore lodging an objection to the design being approved.

Accepting the right of the owners to maximise the value of their property, it is also my right to maintain the essential rural character of Sinah Lane and hence the value of my property. It seems, from the plans submitted and the alterations, that this proposed development will adversely affect this character. Specifically, making the building, currently proposed as a garage, into a 2 storey structure with a very wide roller door. ie 3 cars wide clearly increases the impact on the Lane frontage. This would seem more suitable for commercial premises rather than a residential property in a country Lane. The proposal for a "green roof" needs to be looked at from the perspective of the future appearance and the likelihood or otherwise of regular maintenance. If there are to be alterations to the existing plans then they should be more in line with the other properties in the Lane. In essence to look more residential than commercial.

The documents in this planning application are almost impossible for a layman to

understand. I have two objections:

First, the Garage and office which replaces the former house is completely out of character with the area. It looks just like an industrial estate unit. I do not object to a new building on this site, but the latest application makes it bigger without any attempt to improve the design. I hope that something better can be designed.

Second, I am unsure what is now proposed for the balcony to the main house. On past permissions the Council have prevented occupants viewing across other people's gardens from their balcony's. I object in the strongest terms to any feature which offers a view over my garden and invades my privacy.

The management of the works is virtually non-existent.

I am writing to OBJECT strongly to this application, both on the substance and the way in which it has been submitted.

The double storey garage at the front of the plot is completely out of keeping with the rural nature of Sinah Lane. There is no comparable structure of this nature and height on the lane and the application seeks to create a monstrously inappropriate precedent in a peaceful residential setting. The application is vague as to future occupational intentions, creating a risk of change of use creep over time, again to the detriment to the nature of the residential lane and its residents.

This application is dispiriting and appears deeply cynical. In securing planning consent for the main development, the applicant withdrew his proposal for a first floor elevation of the garage in order to persuade neighbours to withdraw their objections to the scheme. Its reinstatement, together with the oblique and confusing details as to what has changed between the original and this new planning variation, demonstrate contempt, bordering on bad faith, towards local residents.

The proposals for extending the sea wall and summerhouse at the Langstone Harbour end of the garden appear designed to be too confusing to allow meaningful challenge. I would ask the planners therefore to reject any increase in height or massing pending the Applicant providing a clear and more detailed description, and to ensure that any changes to the sea wall gain the explicit consent of the Harbour Board, the Environment Agency, Coastal Partners. I also request that any alteration of this wall must be carried out by qualified engineers, and properly supervised on a daily basis by the relevant authority (Environment Agency, Ecology, Harbour Board). To date, supervision on the site has been shambolic and we are not willing to see coastal defences undermined by inexperienced contractors operating under inadequate supervision. The proposed Gabion blocks are out of keeping with the established aesthetic appearance of the shoreline, both looking out to the harbour from the houses immediately adjacent to the applicant site, and from the harbour looking towards the shore.

In addition to requesting that you reject all the variations to the original planning proposal, I would ask that you also require the applicant and his team to evidence that they are conducting the development of the consented scheme in a way that is safe and considerate of the neighbours who (unlike the applicant) have to live with disruption six days a week. This aspect has been greatly aggravated by the absence of any person carrying out project management/supervision duties directly on site who is actually employed by the applicant as opposed to sub-contractors with their own agendas (time and money). I would also ask that the Council procures evidence from the applicant that appropriate method statements and risk assessments are in place and being adhered to, commensurate with the particular site conditions including, but not limited to, the proximity to neighbouring buildings.

Further to my previous input, I can now confirm that as of midday 29th September, the last day of public objections, I have STILL not received the detailed dimensions

of the application which were earnestly promised to me by the architect. I now realise that this was a ploy to forestall my official objection. For a professional to act in this way, withholding vital information that is germane to an application, appears to be unprofessional, unethical, and most reprehensible.

Could I suggest that you check Site Notice. The one in this application refers to Holly Bank Farm which I think you would agree is not even on Hayling Island!!!

Having just read the comments from the LOCAL LEAD FLOOD AUTHORITY, particularly about flooding issues potentially caused by the works ongoing on this site in Sinah Lane, I draw the inference that Havant Planning should have been aware of the importance of potential flooding, BEFORE granting the original consent on this site, and should certainly be assessing it upon this further application. If we assume that the Local Lead Flood Authority know their business, they are clearly stating that in their opinion, the plans submitted show insufficient detail, in regard to levels and drainage detail.

Comment: The material planning concerns raised within the above representations are reviewed within the following section 'Planning Considerations'. No reference is made to any matters raised above which would not be considered a material planning consideration. Any issues raised which are not relevant to the changes proposed within the variation application are also not considered.

Most concerns raised above relate to the incongruous design of the proposed two-storey garage building. Revisions have now been made to the originally proposed design taking into account the concerns made regarding the architectural design.

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) Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans)
- (iii) Variation of Condition 5 (soft landscaping)
- (iv) Variation of Condition 9 (proposed construction materials)
- (v) Variation of Condition 10 (hard landscaping)
- (vi) Variation of Condition 15 (proposed boundary treatments)
- (vii) Other matters
- (viii) CIL and developer contributions

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. The principle and final design of the replacement dwelling was considered acceptable through the granting of approval of planning application ref: APP/20/01223 dated 02 June 2021.

7.3 This variation application being assessed seeks to discharge or vary several conditions placed on the original approval APP/20/01223. The assessment made below relates ONLY to the matters relevant to this variation application APP/21/00913. No further consideration can be undertaken on any matters secured within the approval granted for the original application under APP/20/01223.

(ii) Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans)

7.4 The approved plans list which forms Condition 2 is to be updated through several amendments to the scheme and through the submission of details to discharge conditions on the original permission (APP/20/01223). The following revisions have been made to the approved development:

- Garage design amended to include additional storey (discussed below)
- Boundary fencing (discussed in (vi) *Variation of Condition 15*)
- Landscaping/hardscaping plans submitted for approval (discussed in (iii) *Variation of Condition 5* & (v) *Variation of Condition 10*)
- Gabion wall to the foreshore (this revision has been removed with only minor alterations now made to the alignment of the existing sea wall) and additional decking around the summerhouse (discussed in (vii) *Other matters*)

7.5 The approved garage design was revised and now includes a first-floor level to facilitate a home office and hobby room. Further design revisions were made during this assessment in response to representations received which raised concerns with the block-like features and overly commercial and stark design initially proposed for the garage.

7.6 The revisions remove the wide commercial-style garage door, replacing it with two sectional garage doors, providing a domestic dwelling-like appearance more suited for the prominent location of the building. A double gable pitched roof also replaces the blocked roof previously proposed, presenting a more traditional residential roof form to the street frontage. The design revisions provide a sympathetic residential outbuilding, which would be located on the footprint of the original dwelling and would now present as a cottage style 'dwelling' to the street. Following these revisions, no further visual concerns are raised regarding the proposed two-storey garage building.

7.7 A single window is proposed on the eastern elevation of the garage which could provide opportunity for overlooking to the neighbouring occupiers at No. 46 Sinah Lane. This window is proposed as obscured glazed to remove any perceived or actual overlooking and would be conditioned as such. No windows are proposed on the western elevation of the garage.

7.8 A separation gap of 6.5m is proposed between the eastern elevation of the garage and the side elevation of No. 46 Sinah Lane. It is accepted that the garage now proposed is a two-storey structure, with the eastern wall located 0.7m closer than the two-storey element of the previous dwelling. However, although slightly higher, a greater separation gap is now proposed than the previous dwelling, whose built form had extended up to the eastern boundary to a height of 3.8m. A separation gap of 5.0m is proposed from the neighbouring dwelling No. 50 Sinah to the west, which replicates that of the previous dwelling.

7.9 The proposed side setbacks between the two-storey garage and the neighbouring dwellings at No. 46 and No. 50 Sinah Lane are not considered to result in the introduction of any significant overbearing or overshadowing impacts.

7.10 Concerns were also raised with the potential for increased intensity uses of the first-floor of the double garage, such as a commercial business or holiday let. Any change to the residential use of the garage building would require approval through a change of use planning application. A condition would be applied to the variation application to ensure the garage building is retained as ancillary to the main dwelling.

(iii) Variation of Condition 5 (soft landscaping)

- 7.11 The variation application seeks to discharge Condition 5 which required the submission and approval of a soft landscaping scheme and comprehensive tree planting scheme. Council's Arborist and Landscape Officer were consulted regarding the acceptability of the submitted landscaping and tree planting schemes.
- 7.12 The Landscape Officer reviewed the proposed landscaping scheme and with no adverse comments made a recommendation for the discharge of Condition 5.
- 7.13 Council's Arborist Officer provided confirmation that the alterations proposed on site would not result in any additional impacts to the existing trees or root protection zones. Therefore, no objection was raised to the revised proposals, provided the previous conditions requested on APP/20/01223 are re-applied.

(iv) Variation of Condition 9 (proposed construction materials)

- 7.14 The variation application seeks to discharge Condition 9 which required the submission and approval of a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the buildings.
- 7.15 A materials palette was submitted in support of the discharge of Condition 9. Materials proposed for the ground floor of the dwelling are a mix of render – K-Rend silicone through colour - Pure White and UV oiled natural cedar cladding. The first floor comprises of a VM zinc cladding with a quartz finish. The materials proposed for the detached garage would incorporate the same white render on the lower level and oiled cedar cladding on the first floor, ensuring a visual connection with the main dwelling.
- 7.16 All the materials proposed on the site can be found and are common within the locality. The mixed palette of materials break-up the mass of the two buildings and add interest through contrasting materials. The proposed materials are considered appropriate and would not appear incongruous within their location. The discharge of Condition 9 is therefore considered acceptable.

(v) Variation of Condition 10 (hard landscaping)

- 7.17 The application seeks to discharge Condition 10 which required the submission and approval of a specification of the materials to be used for the hard surfacing. Information was submitted to enable review of the hard landscaping proposed and ascertain its appropriateness within the existing landscape.
- 7.18 The submitted details were reviewed by Council's Landscape Officer, who confirmed support for the proposed hardscaping, in conjunction with the soft scape also supported. A recommendation was made by the Landscape Officer for the discharge of Condition No. 10

(vi) Variation of Condition 15 (proposed boundary treatments)

- 7.19 The application seeks to discharge Condition 15 which required the submission and approval of details of the type, siting, design and materials to be used in the construction of all means of enclosure including boundaries, screens or retaining walls.

- 7.20 The replacement front boundary wall is to be treated in K-Rend White, through colour silicone render system to match the render on the replacement dwelling. The Landscape Officer provides support for the front boundary wall, making a recommendation for the discharge of Condition 15.
- 7.21 Boundary treatments proposed for the eastern and western side boundaries comprise 2.0m close-boarded fencing partway, up to the extent of the replacement dwelling. The remaining side boundary would be enclosed with a lower, more open-style of post and rail fencing at 1.2m in height. Significant mature trees and thick vegetation run along both side boundaries, with additional new planting proposed. The verdant nature to the rear provides abundant natural screening, complemented by the open nature of the post and rail fence. No concerns are raised with the proposed boundary treatments and a recommendation for the discharge of Condition 15 is made.

(vii) Other matters

Impact on ecology and revised HRA

- 7.22 The site is located adjacent to Langstone Harbour and its international designations as a SPA, RAMSAR and SAC. The proposed works undertaken within the development, would take place within the buffer zone of these designations, and in the case of the replacement Gabion sea wall, within the SAC.
- 7.23 It is acknowledged that the removal of the proposed Gabion wall from the revisions reduces the potential for impacts to these designated sites, however there would still be the potential for adverse effects from the works proposed to realign the existing sea wall.
- 7.24 As competent authority, an appropriate assessment (AA) of the revised proposal was undertaken in accordance with regulation 63 of the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended). The appropriate assessment concluded that with suitable mitigation the development as proposed would not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the sites in question.
- 7.25 Natural England is a statutory consultee on the appropriate assessment stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process and was consulted as part of the variation application. Having considered the assessment, and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal, Natural England concurred with the assessment conclusions, providing that all mitigation measures are appropriately secured in any planning permission given.
- 7.26 The submitted Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) provides details of specific measures to avoid and mitigate potential impacts on the adjacent Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area and Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Council's Ecologist has also confirmed that if all these measures are implemented the potential impacts can be effectively avoided. A condition would be applied to any approval to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures set out within the supporting CEMP.

Localised flooding issues on site

- 7.27 Demolition of the existing dwelling was undertaken during the autumn months in 2021. During this time complaints were made to Council regarding an increase in flooding to the neighbouring property No. 50 Sinah Lane, which could potentially be exacerbated

by the ongoing groundworks at the subject site.

- 7.28 The NPPF requires the submission of very limited surface water drainage information for minor development schemes for planning applications, with the original application confirming within the Design and Access Statement that SUDS would be utilised on site. The site also falls within Flood Zone 1 and therefore the site was not required to submit a comprehensive flood risk assessment.
- 7.29 The Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) would not normally be consulted on this scale of development. However, due to the localised flooding issues and the increase in the intensity of the use of the site (with the proposed garage sitting on the footprint of the original dwelling and an additional new dwelling set to the rear), a consultation with the LLFA was undertaken to inform an adequate surface water drainage scheme for the site.
- 7.30 The LLFA requested proportional surface water management details for review, which were submitted by the applicant. The drainage proposals provided by the applicant demonstrated that a gravity connection to the sea can be achieved. This method was preferable as infiltration proved to be unviable for deeper infiltration systems with the relatively high groundwater level. As such, this would allow for surface water to be managed appropriately on the site.
- 7.31 Although detail regarding the redirection of overland flows was not provided, due to the consultation level required, it was not appropriate to request this level of detail. The drainage officer is satisfied that the applicant is aware that overland flow routing needs to remain as existing. The applicant is to consider a number of options to reduce the risk of water flowing towards the neighbour, however, the level changes on site are not significant, and therefore the development is unlikely to have a measurable impact.
- 7.32 Based on the above advice, it is accepted that surface water can be managed appropriately on the site, and no further information is required. It is reminded that under Common law a property owner is required to develop and use their land in a way that does not increase the risk of flooding to neighbouring property. Fit for purpose long term drainage of the site is the sole responsibility of the landowner.

(viii) CIL and Developer Contributions

- 7.33 The proposal would be CIL liable, although it is noted that the applicant is claiming self-build exemption. Based on the submitted floorspace calculations the CIL liability would be for 297 sqm of floorspace (this takes account of the demolished floorspace of the existing dwelling). The revisions to the approved development proposed within the variation application do not increase the internal floor area from that declared in Section 6 on the CIL Form 1 for the original application (App/20/01223).
- 7.34 As this would be a replacement dwelling there would be no SRMS or Nutrients mitigation requirements.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 In conclusion, sufficient information has been submitted and assessed acceptable to support the discharge of conditions requested within the application. The revisions to the development approved under APP/20/01223, and assessed under this application are acceptable in principle. The 'approved plans' list should be updated, and the

variations within the application should be approved.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/21/00913, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development must be begun by 2/6/24.
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:

Design and Access Statement Drw. No. 2016 3.700 REV 04 - received 04 Oct 2021
Materials Palette Drw. No.3.710 - received 25 Aug 2021
Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) REV 01 - received 25 Aug 2021
Extended Phase 1 Ecological Assessment and Bat Roost Assessment (APRIL 2021) - received 08 Oct 2021
Landscape Proposals Drw. Nos. L01, L02, L03, PP01, PP02, PP03, PP04, PP05, PP06, PP07, PP08, PP09, PP10 - received 04 Oct 2021
Landscape Plan - Hardscape Drw. No. 206 4.009 REV 00 - received 8 Dec 2021
Planting Schedules - received 25 Aug 2021
Tree Report BS5837 (Sept 2020) - received 25 Aug 2021
Tree Canopies Drw. No. 3.016 - received 25 Aug 2021
Tree Protection Plan Drw. No. 3.010 REV 04 - received 25 Aug 2021
Arboricultural Impact Assessment / Statement and Tree Protection Plan (March 2021) - received 25 Aug 2021
Existing Ground and First Floor Plans Drw. No. 1.100 - received 25 Aug 2021
Existing South and West Elevations Drw. No. 1.200 - received 25 Aug 2021
Existing North and East Elevations Drw. No. 1.201 - received 25 Aug 2021
Location Plan Drw. No. 3.000 - received 25 Aug 2021
Window Distances Plan Drw. No. 3.014 - received 25 Aug 2021
Aerial Overlay Drw. No. 3.015 - received 25 Aug 2021
Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drw. No. 3.100 - received 25 Aug 2021
Proposed First Floor and Basement Plans REV 03 Drw. No. 3.101 - received 25 Aug 2021
Roof Plan Drw. No. 3.102 - received 25 Aug 2021
South and West Elevations Sheet 1 Drw. No. 3.200 REV 02 - received 25 Aug 2021
North and East Elevations Drw. No. 3.201 REV 01 - received 25 Aug 2021
Fence Details Drw. No. 3.240 - received 25 Aug 2021
Deck and Planter RPZ Drw. No. 3.302 - received 25 Aug 2021
Site and Block Plan Drw. No. 3.010 REV 07 - received 08 Oct 2021
Site Plan Part 1 Drw No. 3.011 REV 04 - received 25 Aug 2021
Site Plan Part 2 Drw No. 3.012 REV 03 - received 25 Aug 2021
Site Plan Part 3 Drw. No. 3.013 REV 05 - received 08 Oct 2021

Summerhouse Plan Drw. No. 3.120 REV 03 - received 08 Oct 2021
Summerhouse Elevations Drw. No. 3.220 REV 04 - received 08 Oct 2021
Garage and Ancillary Accommodation Plan Drw. No. 3.110 REV 05 - received 26 Oct 2021
Garage Elevations Drw. No. 3.210 REV 04 - received 26 Oct 2021

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 No development hereby permitted shall commence unless and until a pre-commencement site visit has taken place between the Site Manager, the developers/applicants Arboricultural Consultant and a Havant Borough Council Arboricultural Representative to ensure that all tree protection is in place and installed to an appropriate standard. The tree protection shall remain in place during the demolition and construction phases.

All works within the Root Protection Areas of trees must be supervised by the Arboricultural Consultant to ensure that no harm to trees occurs. Furthermore, the approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan must be strictly adhered to.

Reason: To ensure that important trees are retained in the interests of the character and visual amenities of the area and ecology having due regard to policies CS11 and DM8 of Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 No underground services shall be provided with the Root Protection Zones of retained trees or hedges unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that important trees and hedges are retained in the interests of the character and visual amenities of the area and ecology having due regard to policies CS11 and DM8 of Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 The landscaping/hardscaping works shown on the approved plans [Landscape Plan - Hardscape Drw. No. 206 4.009 REV 00, Landscape Proposals Drw. Nos. L01, L02, L03, PP01, PP02, PP03, PP04, PP05, PP06, PP07, PP08, PP09, PP10, Planting Schedules and Arboricultural Impact Assessment / Statement and Tree Protection Plan (March 2021)] shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with any timing / phasing arrangements agreed or within 18 months of final occupation of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or shrubs planted or retained in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its consent in writing to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs and having due regard to policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant

Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (Ref; 'Planning Statement (Including Design, Access and Flood Risk) 2016 3.700' Rev 04, compiled by Hebden Design Studio) and the following mitigation measures it details:

- Finished floor levels shall be set no lower than 5.05m above Ordnance Datum (ADD)
- Water resistant materials shall be selected where appropriate
- A non return valve shall be fitted in the sewer pipe
- All electrical sockets shall be raised

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants having due regard to policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 7 Development shall proceed in accordance with the measures set out in Section 15 Mitigation Recommendations and 16 Enhancements, of the Extended Phase 1 Ecological Assessment and Bat Roost Assessment Phillips Ecology Final Report April 2021. Thereafter, the replacement bat roosts shall be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the favourable conservation status of bats In accordance with DM8 Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8 The development hereby permitted including demolition shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan REV 1, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to control the demolition and construction phases to prevent harm to internationally and nationally protected sites and protected species together with the character and amenities of the area and neighbouring residents having due regard to policies CS11, DM8 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Wildlife and Countryside Act, the Habitat Regulations and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 9 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms, hereby approved plans, and the Materials Palette 3.710, and are to be retained in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in advance.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the

National Planning Policy Framework.

- 10 The finished floor and site levels shall be as approved on Site Plan Part 1 Drawing No. 3.011 Rev 04, Site Plan Part 2 Drawing No. 3.012 Rev 03 and Site Plan Part 3 Drawing No. 3.013 Rev 05
Reason: In the interests of reducing flood risk, the character and appearance of the area and residential amenities having due regard to policies CS15 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 11 The occupation of the building hereby permitted shall not commence until the existing vehicular access to the site from Sinah Lane has been closed and the highway verge re-instated.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policies CS16 and CS20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 12 The roof area on the southern side at first floor level and the terrace roof area on the northern side at first floor level shall at no time be used as balconies.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of adjoining residents having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 13 13 The windows at first floor level in the west elevation of the dwelling serving the en-suite bathrooms to the Master Suite and bedroom 2, and the first floor window on the eastern elevation of the detached garage shall:

at all times be and remain glazed entirely with obscure glass, the particular type of which glass shall provide a degree of obscuration no less obscure than that which is provided by Pilkington's Texture Glass Obscuration Level 4.

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.
- 14 The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until details of a privacy screen with a minimum height of 1.7m above finished balcony floor level have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to be positioned to the east and west sides of the balcony hereby approved. The approved screens shall be installed prior to occupation and thereafter retained and maintained in accordance with their approved design.
Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and occupiers of neighbouring property and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 15 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy

DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 16 Percussive piling or works with heavy machinery (i.e. plant resulting in a noise level in excess of 69dbA max – measured at the sensitive receptor) shall be avoided during the bird overwintering period (i.e. October to March inclusive) unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in advance. Note: The sensitive receptor is the nearest point of the SPA or any SPA supporting habitat (e.g. high tide roosting site).

Reason: In order to control the demolition and construction phases to prevent harm to internationally and nationally protected sites and protected species together with the character and amenities of the area and neighbouring residents having due regard to policies CS11, DM8 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Wildlife and Countryside Act, the Habitat Regulations and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 17 The garage building hereby permitted shall be used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as such and shall not be used for any business, commercial or industrial purposes whatsoever.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.