

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

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)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM24	(Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)
DM23	(Sites for Brent Geese and Waders)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

E1*	(High quality design)
-----	-----------------------

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Leah Turner - Hayling East

No comment

Councillor M Wilson - Hayling West Ward

No comment

Councillor R Raines - Hayling East

No comment

County Archaeologist

Planning Application APP/21/00328 Extension to Fieldside, St Peters Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0RT

Thank you for your consultation. In view of the small scale of the proposal I would not raise any archaeological issues.

County Ecologist

The application is not accompanied by any ecological information and I have therefore carried out my own non-exhaustive desk-based assessment using the application documents, online sources and GIS mapping. The dwelling is partly clad in clay hanging tiles and the proposed works would result in disturbance to these as well as the roof structure and any voids below. These features may support legally protected species such as roosting bats and nesting birds and if present these would be impacted by the proposed works.

I would recommend that the applicant commissions a Phase 1 ecological survey of the site: this should include an assessment of the potential for the site to support protected species (to be provided by a qualified ecologist). The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (www.cieem.net) holds a database of suitably-qualified ecologists.

A Phase 1 ecological survey will determine whether there is any evidence of protected species or whether the site offers habitat suitable for supporting protected species, and whether the proposed works are likely to result in impacts to those habitats or species. Unless the ecologist is able to conclude that there is no reasonable likelihood of protected species being present (due to negligible potential) or that if present they are not to be impacted by the works, it is likely that further ecological survey work (Phase 2

survey) will be required prior to determination of the application. The results of any further surveys should be used to provide an assessment of the likely ecological impacts of the proposed works and to inform any mitigation measures.

NPPF, Circular 06/2005 and Natural England Standing Advice on Protected Species, require that planning decisions are based on full, up-to-date ecological information and it is essential that all necessary survey, assessment and mitigation information is available to the LPA prior to determination, particularly in the case of protected species, which are a material planning consideration. This will enable the LPA to determine the application on the basis of full knowledge about the ecological impacts of the proposal and to ensure that any impacts can and will be mitigated, and are acceptable.

Case Officer comment : Further comments following CEMP report and Phase 1 Ecological Survey :

Thank you for consulting me on this application.

The application is now accompanied by an Extended Phase 1 Ecological and Bat Roost Assessment (Phillips Ecology, August 2021). Following an initial assessment, the dwelling was considered to offer potential for roosting bats and further surveys were carried out. The surveys recorded no bats roosting within the dwelling. No further survey works are considered necessary.

The assessment report includes some sensible ecological mitigation and enhancement measures and these are all acceptable. Measures to avoid noise and visual disturbance to the adjacent winter bird supporting habitat are contained within the report and the submitted Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP).

If you are minded to grant permission, can I suggest that all ecological mitigation and enhancement measures are secured by condition.

Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures detailed within the Extended Phase 1 Ecological and Bat Roost Assessment (Phillips Ecology, August 2021) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All ecological mitigation and enhancement measures shall be implemented as per ecologists

instructions. Reason: to protect and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2019, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, NERC Act 2006, NPPF and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

If you have any queries please don't hesitate to contact me.

Natural England Government Team

The consultation documents provided by your authority do not include information to demonstrate that the requirements of Regulations 63 and 64 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 ('the Habitats Regulations') have been considered by your authority, i.e. the consultation does not include a Habitats Regulations Assessment.

In advising your authority on the requirements relating to Habitats Regulations Assessment, it is Natural England's advice that the proposal is not necessary for the management of the European site. Your authority should therefore determine whether the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on any European site, proceeding to the Appropriate Assessment stage where significant effects cannot be ruled out.

Solent Waders and Brent Geese Strategy / SPA Functional Land

The proposals have the potential to affect SPA functional land, which forms part of a network of terrestrial sites located outside of the Solent SPAs boundaries used by SPA species (including qualifying features and assemblage species) as alternative areas for

roosting and foraging. These sites support the functionality of the designated sites and are therefore protected in this context.

The development site is adjacent to Site H60G, which is classified as a Core Area in the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy. To mitigate impacts to the Core Area, we recommend the below:

Construction Environmental Management Plan

Natural England advises a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should be submitted to and approved in writing by the district ecologist/biodiversity officer that identifies the steps and procedures that will be implemented to avoid or mitigate constructional impacts on species and habitats. The CEMP should address the

following impacts:

- ☐ Dust suppression
- ☐ Waste disposal
- ☐ Noise/visual/vibrational impacts
- ☐ Visual screening (for SPA birds)

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.

Wherever possible, 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 be avoided during the bird overwintering period (i.e. October to March inclusive). 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.

Note: The sensitive receptor is the nearest point of the SPA or any SPA supporting habitat (e.g. high tide roosting site).

Species and Biodiversity Enhancement

Natural England refer your authority to our national standing advice for protected species. As standing advice, it is a material consideration in the determination of the proposed development in this application in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation and should therefore be fully considered before a formal decision on the planning application is made.

It is a requirement of all development to enhance the natural environment, as stated in the NPPF (2018 as amended), paragraphs 170, 174 and 175. Natural England recommend that an appropriate level of enhancement, such as the addition of bat boxes and/or bird boxes, are secured as part of this application.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals>

Please feel free to contact me if you have any further queries on this consultation.

Case Officer comment : Further comments following CEMP report and HRA :

Thank you for consulting us on the HRA and Appropriate Assessment for the above application.

Natural England notes that your authority, as competent authority under the provisions of the Habitats Regulations, has undertaken an Appropriate Assessment of the proposal, in accordance with Regulation 63 of the Regulations.

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. Provided the submitted CEMP is appropriately secured and adhered to at all times, we are satisfied that the applicant has mitigated against the potential adverse effects during the construction phase on the integrity of the SPA and it's functionally linked land.

Please contact me if you have any queries relating to this advice

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: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
We wish to object to the proposed plans for the extension to Fieldside on the basis of the two windows in the North elevation which face our home and which, if permitted, would overlook the only private part of the garden that we have.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the proposal.
The proposed second storey bathroom en suite window has a clear view into our currently private seating and dining area. We would respectfully suggest that at the very least this window should be of restricted/limited opening (perhaps a small top opening fanlight only) and that the window should be of high level obscure glass.	Please see' Planning Considerations' section of the report.
The narrow, letter- box type window on the single storey extension will be very close to our boundary, not a lot more than 2 metres. It will be above the	

fence line, facing the middle of our currently private area. Since this window will serve the main open plan family living area of the home and specifically the kitchen, we are concerned that there will be a real increase in noise from the window which will compromise the peaceful enjoyment of our garden seating area. We note that a large number of windows are proposed for the West elevation and wish to question why the letter- box type window facing us is needed at all on the North elevation. We respectfully request that this is removed altogether from the plans.	
We write to “FORMALLY OBJECT” to the above proposed development. Following our review of the application documentation we wish to submit our clients objections which can be fairly stated as follows: Location and Site Plan 1. The drawings are incorrectly drawn in that the side southern elevation of Fieldside steps forward in a westerly direction by approximately 400-500mm beyond the line of the western elevation of Chaddersley this incorrectly noted on the proposed floor plan or the site plan. 2. The application paperwork makes no reference to the demolition of the existing dining room extension. Indeed it is not clear from the Application Documentation where exactly the new extension will be constructed, or whether it be the same footprint as the existing. This needs to be clearly identified and overall measurements provided to enable a reasoned appraisal to be made by all of the	This has been raised with the applicant however the plans are up to date and sourced from the Ordnance Survey. There may be a discrepancy on the OS Plan however in this case this would only be slight and not likely to result in a significant set forward which would result in harmful overshadowing. Given that the proposals closest to Chaddersley lie above an existing single storey extension, an assessment of the relationship with, and impact on, this neighbouring property to the south has been able to be undertaken. A site visit has also been undertaken to the site by the case officer to assess the proposals at first hand. The block plan has since been updated . The plans are scaled and therefore measurements are not necessary.

adjoining owners.	
3. There are no detailed measurement provided upon the site or proposed floor plan to clearly indicate the overall projection, depth or height of the extension, the absence of dimensions which indicate the overall footprint makes an appraisal of the proposal to be very difficult if not impossible to fully assess. These omissions on the drawings have an adverse impact upon Chaddersley as it effects the outlook from and light available to the windows of the existing dining room accommodation.	Please see above.
4. The southern boundary fence is owned by Chaddersley, clearly the proposed extension is approximately 4.0m from this, the proposed two storey extension will extend some 3.0m above the height of the fence and the extension will be overbearing and significantly and adversely impact upon Chaddersley.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.
5. The proposed southern elevation to the two storey extension is located in relatively close proximity to the north-western accommodation of Chaddersley, being only approximately 4-5m from the southern boundary fence line. It is clear that the habitable rooms and privacy of the rear garden to Chaddersley will be adversely impacted and affected by the reduction in northern natural light along this boundary line due to the height, bulk and overall mass of the proposed extension.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.
6. The proposed extension incorporates two high level rectangular (narrow) windows on the southern external wall, one to the kitchen / family room area and a second window to Bedroom 2 (note there are two bedroom 4's shown on the drawing PG5094.20.02 rev E, but no Bedroom 1 indicated). It is submitted that these windows will impact upon the privacy and peaceful enjoyment of the existing dining room accommodation	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

and rear garden areas to Chaddersley.	
These windows are not essential for the habitable use of the proposed accommodation within the extension and therefore may readily be removed. Failing the Planning Officers Agreement to their removal then the glazing must be obscured with no opening lights incorporated in the frames, also a minimum finished floor to cill height of not less than 2.0m internally should be conditioned.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.
7. A further and equally important factor is the orientation of the two properties, the front elevations have an easterly aspect which means the sun will rise and travel from the front eastern gable to the property through to the rear western gable and garden areas. The proposed increase in height of the extension above the fence height will result in a significant increase in the shadowing line, consequentially Chaddersley will lose natural day and sunlight from not only the living accommodation within the dwelling but also the rear garden / amenity space.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.
8. We feel it prudent to noted that there are no existing ground or proposed levels provided or indeed sufficient measurements indicating the overall building plan size but more importantly the exact height of the proposed extension, the extension roof meets the existing roof at approximately mid-point, this is not clear?	Ground levels have been noted on site by the case officer.
9. Both the ground floor kitchen / family areas incorporate full width folding / sliding fully glazed doors. Whilst at ground level this is acceptable, this clearly is not the case for the Bedroom 2 accommodation at first floor level. These doors and the associated proposed glazed balcony will result in a direct line of sight and overloading across the rear garden to Chaddersley. The provision of the balustrading fixed to the external face of the external wall will inevitably encourage leaning over	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

again further adversely impacting upon the peaceful enjoyment and privacy of Chaddersley's rear garden. For this reason we respectfully request following the balustrading should be set back 500mm i.e. the depth of the external wall to reduce the adverse overlooking impact of the balcony in addition 30% or (1/3rd) of the return southern end wall / glazing of the balcony's reveal be increased in width or alternatively a fixed pane of glazing with obscured glass provided to minimise the overlooking impact directly adjacent to the southern boundary. The above proposals can be readily incorporated into the design which in effect will set the doors and balcony back in line into Bedroom 2. 10. A further consideration is that as the proposed development is set within a rural area, consequently noise disturbance will need to be carefully controlled and limited to 09:00-16:00 hours Monday to Friday with no weekend working. In addition wherever possible mechanical machinery should be avoided to minimise disturbance to wildlife and adjoining areas. It is submitted that in consideration of the above criteria the proposed Planning Application should be rejected due to the unacceptable, significant and detrimental effects that the proposal will have upon the occupation and quiet enjoyment of our clients property, Chaddersley. We look forward to formal confirmation of receipt of this letter and your further advice as to the acceptance or otherwise of these reasons for our clients objections to the proposed development.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report. Noise disturbance is a matter controlled through Environmental Health legislation and an appropriate informative about recommended working hours could be included with any decision.
--	---

7 **Planning Considerations**

- 7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Parking
- (v) Ecology

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is not within the defined urban area, therefore development will only be permitted if it is consistent with the policies for the countryside set out in national policy as specified in Policy CS17. Whilst the principle of new dwellings is not supported in non-urban locations, in this case the application proposes the extension of an existing building and no objection is raised to this as a matter of principle as it accords with Policy AL2 of the Allocations Plan.

7.3 This proposal follows a previous application which was refused due to the impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property, Clamshells which is located to the north of the application site. The previous proposal included a two storey extension located in very close proximity to Clamshells and the reason for refusal was as follows :

The proposed extension would by reason of its height, mass, bulk, design and proximity to the boundary result in an overbearing and excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring property at Clamshells, St Peters Road, harmful to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of this property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7.4 This current proposal is a revised version of the previous proposal and has been amended, with the two storey element now centrally sited , resulting in a larger separation distance between the two storey element and Clamshells. The balcony has also been removed and replaced with a juliet balcony.

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

7.3 This proposal comprises single storey and two storey extensions located to the rear of the property. The single storey extension would come level with the north elevation side wall and it would have a depth of approximately 3.6 metres, a width of 3.5 metres and it would have a flat roof with a height of 2.75 metres with a raised lantern rooflight. This would then step up to form a two storey extension following the demolition of the existing rear element and this would be centrally sited. The two storey extension would have a ridge height of approximately 6.3 metres , a width of 4.8 metres and a depth of 3.6 metres , level with the single storey element. Proposed materials include siberian larch vertical cladding to the single storey elements and white render to the first floor extension.

7.4 This additional space would form a larger kitchen/dining area at ground floor level served by bi-fold doors and a window to the rear and high level windows to the side elevations , a new door would also be added to the north elevation to serve the utility room and there would be some alterations to fenestration. At first floor level the extension would create a master bedroom served by a juliet balcony to the rear and high level window to the south side. The extension would allow for internal reconfigurations of the first floor , transforming what is currently bedroom 4 into 2 ensuite bathrooms , changing the existing bathroom to create a bedroom 4, removing

the bathroom side window and creating a window to the front elevation , the window would be moved back to serve one of the ensuites on the north elevation. A high level window would be added on the south side to serve the ensuite which appears to already have been installed.

- 7.5 The proposed extension would be located to the rear of the site and would not be readily visible from the public domain. Whilst it would be visible from the agricultural land to the west , the extension itself is not judged to result in any harmful impact on the setting of the area. The extension would be centrally sited at first floor level and is deemed to be generally modest in scale and design, with the ridge set below that of the main roof and materials comprising render and timber cladding which are not judged to be harmful in appearance. The extensions and alterations to fenestration are judged to be in keeping with the Havant Borough Design Policies and Policy CS16 of the Local Plan.
- 7.6 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy). It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.7 To the north of the application site is Clamshells which is a two storey, semi-detached property .The previous application comprised of a two storey extension located level with the side elevation of the existing property and therefore within very close proximity of Clamshells. This proposal has been amended with the two storey element now centrally sited, therefore separated from the north side boundary by approximately 6 metres . This additional set off is now judged to be substantially increased in order to reduce the overbearing impact which the previous proposal would have had . The single storey extension would still be located close to this boundary, however at single storey level there is less resulting mass and bulk . There would be a window on the single storey extension facing north however this would set 1.7 metres above finished floor level, reducing any overlooking and this would also be fixed shut to reduce any noise impact on Clamshells due to the close proximity of the window to the adjacent private patio area at Clamshells. The side elevation bathroom window would also be obscure glazed and would be top opening. The utility room door is not judged to result in additional, harmful noise or activity and could be installed under normal permitted development rights.
- 7.8 To the south of the application site is Chaddersley which is a two storey, detached property. The proposed two storey extension would be sited approximately 5.5 metres to the north of the shared side boundary. The extension would not infringe upon the 45 degree line taken from the mid point of the closest window at Chaddersley and in conjunction with the siting to the north, is not considered to result in additional harmful overshadowing . The two storey extension would evidently impact the outlook to the side for both Chaddersley and Clamshells due to the fairly close siting of the properties to one another , however whilst the extension would be an evident feature, it is not considered to be harmfully overbearing to the amenity of Chaddersley due to the set off distance. There would be a high level window on the side elevation of the two storey extension serving the bedroom on the south elevation however this would be set at high level with the cill height 1.7 metres above finished floor level. The bathroom window would be set back and less likely to result in overlooking however this also would be high level. The side elevation window serving the single storey element again would be set at high level and would be set in away from the side

boundary.

- 7.9 The proposed juliet balcony would not step out and would have outlooks directly down the rear garden of the application site and not down towards private amenity spaces of neighbouring properties. There are existing views down towards the end of the rear gardens of neighbouring properties from the existing windows as is normal where properties are sited within close proximity and juliet balconies could be installed to the existing first floor rooms under normal permitted development rights. Taken together, it is considered that therefore there would be no additional harmful overlooking likely to occur towards the more private areas of the rear gardens of adjacent properties which includes the patio areas close to the rear elevations. To the west of the application site is agricultural land and towards the east is the road, which the proposal is not deemed to impact.
- 7.10 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.11 This proposal would not result in any additional bedrooms, therefore no further parking allocation is required on site.

(v) Ecology

- 7.12 To the west of the site, directly to the rear of the application site is a core area and to the north east and south east are further core and primary support areas although these are separated from the site - these are listed in the Solent Waders & Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS). The site could also have potential significant effects on protected sites within the Solent, including the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA). Following consultee responses from both the County Ecologist and Natural England, a CEMP report has been provided by the applicant. A HRA has also been undertaken by Havant Council and both Natural England and the County Ecologist have been re-consulted on these documents. The County Ecologist has been consulted in regard to this application and has raised concerns due to the potential disturbance of bats due to the proposed works. A Phase 1 Ecological Survey has therefore been requested and this has been provided by the applicant. The report states that no bat roosting has been recorded within the dwelling. The County Ecologist has been re-consulted on this and uphold no objection to this proposal with a condition requested stating that development would need to proceed in accordance with the ecological assessments.
- 7.13 Regarding construction impacts, a CEMP was submitted on 3rd of August 2021 and having considered this and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal, Ecology and Natural England have advised that they concur with the assessment conclusions, providing that all mitigation measures are appropriately secured in any permission given - a condition is proposed to this effect.
- 7.14 Natural England advises that the appropriate assessment concludes that the LPA is able to ascertain that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the site in question. That being the case, permission is able to be recommended under the Habitats Regulations.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and the character of the area, and mitigates its impact on ecology. It is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.
-

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/21/00328 subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

Location plan uploaded on the 08.04.2021

Amended proposed block plan uploaded on the 24.06.2021

PG5094-20-02 REV I Proposed plans uploaded on the 07.09.2021

Phillips Ecology Extended Phase 1 Ecological and Bat Roost Assessment

Final Report received 2nd August 2021

Construction Environmental Management Plan received 2nd August 2021

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the bathroom window in the first floor on the side elevation facing north shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

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

- 4 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.

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.

- 5 Development activities shall proceed in strict accordance with the submitted Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) received on the 2nd August 2021.

Reason: To protect biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, the NERC Act (2006), National Planning Policy Framework and with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

- 6 Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures detailed within the Extended Phase 1 Ecological and Bat Roost Assessment (Phillips Ecology, August 2021) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All ecological mitigation and enhancement measures shall be implemented as per the ecologists instructions.

Reason: To protect and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2019, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, NERC Act 2006, National Planning Policy Framework and with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.