
Site Address:	St Thomas A Becket's Church, Church Lane, Havant, PO9 2TU		
Proposal:	Installation of a new septic tank to serve the church; drainage to the tank; a new path; and a timber shed.		
Application No:	APP/21/00033	Expiry Date:	26/03/2021
Applicant:	PCC of St Thomas a Becket Church		
Agent:	Simon Goddard	Case Officer:	Steve Weaver
	The Goddard Partnership		
Ward:	St Faiths		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 St Thomas A Becket's Church is a grade I listed building dating from the 12th Century with alterations during the 13th, 15th and 19th centuries. The application area is to the north west corner of the churchyard. One of the church site's 18th Century gravewatchers huts (Grade II listed) constructed with flint and brick quoins with a slate roof is within the application area. The site is within Warblington Conservation Area and within the Chichester Harbour AONB. There are 3 leylandii trees in the application area which are to be removed and replaced with a native hedgerow mix approved under APP/20/01189.
- 1.2 In terms of its context the site is situated in a rural area and is surrounded by its cemeteries to the south and east, and farm buildings and agricultural land to the north and west. There are numerous mature trees growing within the curtilage of the church yard which are predominantly yew - and a maple growing close to the church yard entrance. There is a group of mixed deciduous shrubs in the northern corner of the church yard, which are not arboriculturally significant but do provide a screen for an existing oil tank located close to the gravewatchers hut. The trees within the development area and church yard are generally in good condition.

2 Planning History

07/54008/002 - Tree works, in accordance with Schedule, within the curtilage of the Church of St Thomas a Becket within Warblington Conservation Area. ,
RNO,09/01/2008

APP/10/00821 - Crown raise to 4m and remove 7No. limbs in south west quadrant of crown to 1No. Oak tree. Fell 1No. Cherry tree. Crown raise to 3m and remove 6No. limbs in south west quadrant of crown to 1No. Lime tree. Crown raise to 3m 1No. Yew tree. Reduce height of hedge to 2m (excepting mature trees). All within Warblington Conservation Area. RO 07/03/2011

APP/11/01749 - Application to carry out tree works including various crown raise and crown reduction works and selective felling of trees; all trees within Warblington Conservation Area.

Section 211 of Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) - Tree Regulations 1999 allows for the exemption of trees under stem diameter of 75mm at 1.5m, as such the Thorn hedgerow is found to be exempt from this notification. RNO,15/05/2011

APP/13/01194 - Crown raise by up to 3m Lime (T1), Rowan (T2), Cherry (T3), Yew (T4), and crown raise by up to 4m Cherry, Elderberry, Hawthorn & Elm which are part of Group 1, all trees within Warblington Conservation Area., RNO,06/01/2014

APP/15/01303 - Raise crown 1No. Lime (T4) on south side. Raise crown 8No. Yew (T5, T6, T13, T17, T20, T23, T24), 2No. Elderberry (T17-A, T20-A), 1No. Norway Maple (T25) and 1No. Apple (T10) by 1.5m, within Conservation Area of Warblington., RNO,21/12/2015

APP/16/00682 - Reduce primary limb of 1No. London Plane by 6m on south side, within Conservation Area of Warblington., RNO,26/08/2016

APP/20/01189 - Fell 3No in total Leylandii and Cupressus and replace with native hedge mix, within Conservation Area of Warblington. RNO 01/02/2021

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal relates to the installation of a shallow excavation septic tank to serve a toilet facility within the 18th Century gravewatchers hut and related drainage to the tank; a new path leading from the western entrance to the churchyard to the gravewatchers hut; and a pitched roof timber shed measuring approximately 3m x 1.8m, and 1.8m in height for the storage of chairs and garden maintenance equipment. The septic tank will lie approximately 1.7m from the gravewatchers hut; the new shed lying beyond that to the east.
- 3.2 Internal works have been approved by the Diocese under the Ecclesiastical Exemption Measure 1955 (and hence do not require listed building consent) to provide a new welcome area in the church and toilet facilities in the huts, however planning permission is still required.
- 3.3 The submitted plans also provide for the removal of 3No. Cupressus x Leylandii to be removed from the northern boundary of the churchyard and replaced using a native hedge mix of Hazel 15%, Blackthorn 30%, Crabapple 5%, Hawthorn 30%, Field Maple 10%, Dog Rose 10% - all as previously agreed under APP/20/01189.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS12	(Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB))
CS16	(High Quality Design)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: I (Church) & II (gravewatchers hut)

Conservation Area: Warblington

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

Initial response:

Thank you for this consultation - the proposal requires the felling of three trees and impact on the root protection area of at least one other tree on site.

To assess the application further and to provide an informed consultation I would require an AIA to include an AMS and TPP for the site in terms of the new path construction and any other trees that could be affected by the development.

In principle I would raise no objection to the removal of the three Leyland Cypress if the proposed mitigation planting is conditioned along with the inclusion of three native trees such as Rowan or Field Maple.

Response following receipt of additional information:

Thanks for this and I would like to be as pragmatic as possible, however we really would need an AMS and TPP for the Field Maple and Rowan to be in line with BS 5837 requirements and ensure the trees are adequately protected - we can forgo a full AIA which should assist the applicant.

Response following submission of AMS Ref: HBD2107IAMS:

The report is to a high standard and comprehensive, however I would appreciate some extra information in relation to the foot path entering the RPA of the Field Maple - this is a high-quality Category A tree.

The tree already has a compromised RPA and I would need to know the further incursion into the RPA from the proposed path and this added to the existing incursion to provide a total percentage incursion into the RPA of the tree.

In addition, to this the path is of stone with a cement base, is there an alternative to this which will allow for a gaseous exchange to take place?

Final response following submission of revised AMS Ref: HBD2107IAMSR1:

I can confirm that I now have no objection to the proposal on Arboricultural grounds.

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

No objection.

The planning unit / red-line site is within the AONB protected national landscape. Suggested considerations: - schedule of materials to be as indicated on submitted application forms.

The adopted guidance requires a clear demonstration that no harm is caused to the AONB. The sites location within open countryside within the AONB is a key consideration. The positioning of the proposal would have a localised impact on the

character and appearance of the site and the immediate surrounds. The structures scale, design and appearance with suitable construction materials would enable the building to sit unobtrusively within its setting. The proposal would have a limited visual impact on the AONB protected national landscape character. The proposal is unlikely to have any significant impact or effect on the AONB in relation to wildlife conservation and protection.

Conservation Officer

The Church of St-Thomas-a-Becket sits at the heart of the Warblington Conservation area and is Grade I listed. As such it is one of the most historically significant structures in the Borough. The church dates for the late 12th Century with alterations during the 13th, 15th and 19th centuries. Externally the building is of flint and stone rubble with stone dressings and a tile roof. Two late 18th Century (Grade II listed) gravewatchers' huts constructed in flint with slate roofs, stand at opposite corners of the Churchyard.

The proposals seek planning permission for the provision of a septic tank (with associated drainage), a timber clad shed and a pathway.

Legislative and Policy Context

When assessing the proposal, the following legislation and policy context is taken in consideration.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Conservation Area, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in February 2019 and sets down the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications. The 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2', states at paragraph 4:

'The significance of a heritage asset is the sum of its archaeological, architectural, historic, and artistic interest' and provides at paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 that in order for the Local Planning Authority to make decisions in line with legal requirements, the objectives of the development plan; and, the policy requirements of the NPPF, great importance is placed on understanding the nature, extent and level of the significance of the heritage asset.

The revised NPPF (February 2019) sets out in Chapter 16, the core principles relating to development affecting Heritage Assets that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions in the following paragraphs:

'184. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable

resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

189. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

190. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

191. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Considering potential impacts

193. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

With regards to local planning policy, the following are relevant:

Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will be granted for development that:

Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest.

Policy CP16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states 'Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site'.

Policy DM20 of the Allocations Plan states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that conserves and enhances the historic assets of Havant. It also states that application which affect, or have the potential to affect, heritage assets are expected to provide a Heritage Statement that:

1. Describe the significance of the asset and its setting, using appropriate expertise and where necessary original survey, at a level of detail proportionate to its significance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal.
2. Sets out the impact of the development on the heritage assets and mitigation that is proportionate to the impact and the significance of the heritage asset, including where possible positive opportunities to conserve and enjoy heritage assets.

Assessment

Given the position of the shed, septic tank and the pathway I have no reason to believe it will have any significant impact on the setting of the listed watchhuts or church. The scale and design of the shed and the pathway would also be acceptable causing no adverse impact on the architectural or historical interest of the building.

Councillor D Guest - St Faith's

No comments were received

Councillor J Branson - St Faith's

No comments were received

Councillor T Pike - St Faith's

No comments were received

County Archaeologist

Thank you for your consultation regarding the installation of a septic tank and associated drain. The site is an archaeologically sensitive location given the Saxon origin of the church and likelihood that the church was focus of any early settlement at

Warblington. However the ground works are very small in scale and provide little opportunity for archaeological insight. Accordingly I would not raise any archaeological issues.

I note that section 5 of the Heritage Statement addresses archaeology in terms of the likelihood of encountering human remains. Given the long period over which the church yard has been used the likelihood that a specific burial might offer any archaeological insight seems unlikely. I note that human remains will be treated in accordance with current guidance.

County Ecologist

Thank you for your consultation. The works to remove a section of overgrown hedgerow for the installation of a timber shed, has the potential to impact notable species: nesting birds, reptiles and hedgehog. The removed hedgerow is to be replaced by native species hedgerow planting (as shown in the proposed site plan). The installation of a new septic tank and new path will impact a small area of mown grassland, which will have limited ecological impact.

This development provides opportunities to enhance biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages measures that would result in biodiversity gains; the 'environmental' dimension of sustainable development – the central tenet of the NPPF – is afforded equal emphasis to the 'economic' and 'social' dimensions. Additionally, Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 sets out that local authorities: 'must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'. Section 40(3) clarifies that 'conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'. Given the nature of the development, I would suggest that in this case, the most appropriate enhancement would be for the applicant to install a hedgehog house at the base of the created hedgerow, leaving a band of grassland in-front of the hedgerow uncut over the summer months and leaving log piles at the base of hedgerows.

I would agree that the replacement planting is sufficient to mitigate for the loss of habitat, and I would recommend that the following advisory notes are added to the planning permission.

- To avoid any potential impacts to reptiles: It is recommended that any reptile habitat such as stored materials, debris, log piles or tree roots should be carefully cleared by hand during warmer months as if hibernating reptiles are disturbed they will die. Particular care should be taken when clearing the ground prior to any work and when leaving the excavated area/trenches overnight, sloping boards or steps should be provided to allow animals such as hedgehogs to escape. Trenches should be checked before works start each day for any wildlife that could be trapped. Any reptiles revealed should be moved to adjacent retained rougher / boundary habitat or allowed to move off on their own accord.

- Birds nests, when occupied or being built, receive legal protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). It is highly advisable to undertake clearance of potential bird nesting habitat (such as hedges, scrub, trees, suitable outbuildings etc.) outside the bird nesting season, which is generally seen as extending from March to the end of August, although may extend longer depending on local conditions. If there is absolutely no alternative to doing the work in during this period then a thorough, careful and quiet examination of the affected area must be carried out before clearance starts. If occupied nests are present then work must stop in that area, a suitable (approximately 5m) stand-off maintained, and clearance can only recommence

once the nest becomes unoccupied of its own accord.

- The application should include measures to ecologically enhance the site. I would recommend the installation of a hedgehog house along the base of the section of hedgerow to be created and leaving areas of grassland uncut over the summer months such as 1.5m in-front of the hedges and places log piles at the base of hedgerows.

Officer comment: *The suggested advisory notes can be added to the decision notice as informatives.*

County Minerals

No response received

Historic England

On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like detailed advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

Natural England Government Team

NO OBJECTION

Please see our further advice below:

Package Treatment Plants

Where septic tank discharges are causing contamination of watercourses, other options for reducing levels of pollution may be useful. It should be noted, however, that all new discharges from any waste water treatment systems will need to be subject to the appropriate regulatory control by the relevant regulatory agency.

A more environmentally friendly option may be a package treatment plant. These produce a higher quality of effluent than a septic tank system alone, because they use micro-organisms to break down organic matter in the effluent before it is discharged to soakaway. Depending on the type of system used, it has been suggested that these treatment plants can reduce the P content of discharged effluent by up to 99% (Heistada, 2006). However, before any firm conclusions can be drawn more research is required that compares effluent from these sources to standard septic tank systems. This is especially true where package treatment plants discharge directly to a water course. In this situation, a standard septic tanks system that discharges to a drainage field may retain more P than a package treatment system that discharges directly to a waterbody.

Southern Gas Network

No response 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: 1

Number of site notices: One

Statutory advertisement: 19/02/2021

Number of representations received: 0

7 Planning Considerations

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

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the locality and AONB
- (iii) Impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings
- (iii) Impact upon trees and ecology

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within a non-urban area where further development is normally restricted. Policy AL2 of the Allocations Plan sets out the circumstances in which developed outside urban areas will be supported - these essentially comprising small scale householder development; development meeting an overriding public need (eg for community or recreation use); and development in accordance with the policies for rural areas set out in the NPPF.

7.3 In the present case the proposals relate to works that will be ancillary to, and support the primary function of an active church. This is considered to meet a community need and thus, in principle, there is no objection to the proposed small-scale development in this location.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the locality and AONB

7.4 The works as proposed are located within the north western part of the churchyard, with a good degree of screening provided to the area to be occupied by the shed by the existing planting and the adjacent gravewatchers hut. With regard to the shed, it is intended to be dark stained (ebony) and is of modest proportions (1.8m wide, x 3m long x 1.8m high). Taken together, the location of the shed and its size and appearance are not considered to have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the locality and the wider AONB.

7.5 With regard to the new pathway, septic tank and drainage proposed, these elements of the proposals are all at or below ground level, and are limited in their extent on the site as a whole. They are also not considered to have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the locality and the wider AONB.

7.6 It is noted that Chichester Harbour Conservancy, in raising no objection to the proposals, have commented "*The positioning of the proposal would have a localised impact on the character and appearance of the site and the immediate surrounds. The structures scale, design and appearance with suitable construction materials would enable the building to sit unobtrusively within its setting. The proposal would have a limited visual impact on the AONB protected national landscape character.*"

(iii) Impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings

- 7.7 The application site lies within the Warblington Conservation Area, and relates to a Grade II listed gravewatchers hut, as well as lying within the churchyard of a Grade I listed church. This engages a number of statutory duties on the local planning authority when determining a planning application in such a context.
- 7.8 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Conservation Area, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area. In addition, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets down the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications.
- 7.9 In this case, the application's submission is understood to have followed pre-application discussions with the Council's Heritage Team. They have also been consulted on the application, and have assessed the proposals as follows:
"Given the position of the shed, septic tank and the pathway I have no reason to believe it will have any significant impact on the setting of the listed watchhuts or church. The scale and design of the shed and the pathway would also be acceptable causing no adverse impact on the architectural or historical interest of the building."
- 7.10 On this basis, it is considered that the development proposed would preserve the setting of the listed buildings on the site, and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- (iv) Impact upon trees and ecology
- 7.11 The application proposals have the potential to impact upon trees within the churchyard, both in relation to the construction of the pathway, and in the positioning of the shed and septic tank.
- 7.12 With regard to the former, this passes through the Root Protection Area of a mature Field Maple which adds significant visual quality to the churchyard. Following initial concerns raised by the Council's Arboricultural Officer, a revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been prepared which sets out a clear methodology for construction of the footpath to avoid damage to the rooting areas, and the Arboricultural Officer has raised no objections to the proposals in the light of this new information.
- 7.13 With regard to the latter, both the shed and septic tank excavation lie in an area behind existing screening, which is not of particular arboricultural quality but is helpful in screening the new shed. The revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment sets out tree protection measures to protect the existing screening, and again no objections have been raised by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. The submitted plans also make provision for the replacement hedge planting the subject of APP/20/01189.
- 7.14 With regards to ecological issues, as noted by the Council's Ecologist the works to remove a section of overgrown hedgerow for the installation of a timber shed, has the potential to impact notable species: nesting birds, reptiles and hedgehog. The northern boundary screening due to be removed pursuant to APP/01189 is to be

replaced by native species hedgerow planting (as shown in the proposed site plan). The installation of a new septic tank and new path will impact a small area of mown grassland, which will have limited ecological impact.

- 7.15 The Council's Ecologist is content that the replacement native hedgerow planting will be sufficient to mitigate for the loss of any existing habitat, and has suggested a number of informatives which can be added to any permission.
- 7.16 Natural England in their consultation reply have discussed the merits of package treatment plants over septic tanks, whilst noting that any discharges are nonetheless the responsibility of the relevant regulatory agency. However they have also raised no objection to the proposals and on this basis it is not considered there is any basis in planning terms to resist the installation of the septic tank as proposed.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development would support the provision of a small scale community facility which is considered acceptable in principle, and would have no adverse impacts upon the character of the area or the Chichester Harbour AONB. The works would preserve the setting of the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings, and appropriately addresses its potential impacts on trees and ecology. Accordingly, the application is recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/21/00033 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:

Heritage, Design and Access Statement - St Thomas a Becket, Warblington - SJG927/DA4117 - The Goddard Partnership Limited - December 2020
Site Location Plan 927/099
Proposed Site Plan 927/150 Revision P3
Arboricultural Impact Assessment Reference HBD2107IAMS R1

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 The landscaping works shown on the approved plans shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following the construction of the shed and septic tank the subject of this permission. Any trees or hedge plants planted 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 hedge plants 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 CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 All existing trees or hedgerows shall be retained, unless shown on the approved drawings as being removed. All retained trees and hedgerows on the site shall be protected from damage for the duration of the works on the site by the erection of heras fencing, and the installation of the proposed hard surfacing strictly in accordance with the details shown on approved drawing 927/150 Revision P3. Any trees or parts of hedgerows removed without the Local Planning Authority's consent or which die or become, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously diseased or otherwise damaged within five years following contractual practical completion of the approved development shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable and, in any case, by not later than the end of the first available planting season, with plants of such size and species and in such positions as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity afforded by existing hedges or hedgerows and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.