

Mrs Haywood
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

02 November 2015

Dear Mrs Haywood,

PLANNING APPLICATION

APP/15/00919 - LAND NORTH OF, STATION ROAD, HAYLING ISLAND

I refer to our meeting dated 07 October 2015. Please find enclosed a set of amended plans and reports as follows:

Planning Layout Rev J
Coloured Layout Plan Rev F
Design and Access Statement
Affordable Housing Plan - Rev C
Bin and Cycle Store Plan – Rev B
External Enclosures – Rev B
External Finishes – Rev A
Hard Surfacing Plan Rev B
Internal Visibility Splays
Landscape Masterplan
Landscape Proposals Sheets 1 – 5
Management Areas Plan Rev B
Parking Strategy Plan Rev B
Plots 38 – 41 Rev B
Refuse Vehicle Tracking
Sales Area Layout Plan Rev B
Storey Heights Plan Rev B
Lighting Plan
Arboricultural Impact Assessment
Updated Preliminary Ecological Assessment
Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy
FRA Appendix B
FRA Appendix C

Noise Impact Assessment
Draft Unilateral Undertaking

The amended plans and reports reflect formal comments received from yourself and internal/external consultees.

HCC Archaeologist

The HCC Archaeologist concurs with the Archaeological Assessment submitted in support of the application. He confirmed that the assessment and recording of any archaeological deposits should be secured through the attachment of suitable conditions to any planning consent that might be granted. We are happy for conditions to be attached to the planning consent.

Environment Agency

The Environment Agency have raised no objection to the scheme but have made an advisory comment with respect to Section 23 LDA (1991) applications to the LLFA. A Section 23 application will need to be made to the LLFA for two culverted sections of ditch to the western side of the B1 car park. As this lies outside of the Barratt Homes element, these applications will be made by our development partner for the B1 units. There does not appear to be any adverse impacts to culverting these two short sections as this is the head of the ditch and the outfall size discharging from the public surface water sewer is small. We would not therefore expect such application to be refused.

Southern Water

Southern Water has confirmed that the existing public sewer network currently has inadequate capacity. They further confirm that additional off-site sewers, or improvements to the sewers, will be required to provide sufficient capacity to service the development. As reported in paragraph 6.2 of our Flood Risk Assessment the necessary works will be requisitioned from Southern Water. Since the issue of the Southern Water consultation dated 29 September 2015, Southern Water have issued (2 October 2015) their stage 1 Section 98 requisition proposals which identifies a need to upgrade 46m of existing 225mm DN off site sewer to 300mmDN. The updated Flood Risk Assessment now reflects this requirement and contains the Southern Water Section 98 Scheme drawing. We will enter into an agreement with Southern Water for the construction of this upgrade.

Ecology

Barratt Homes have made a commitment in writing to repair the gaps in the western boundary hedgerow. Natural England have also confirmed in writing that the Brent Goose Mitigation Strategy remains acceptable. This information has been emailed to Tristan Norton on 13/10/2015. An updated Preliminary Ecological Assessment is also enclosed for your information.

Environmental Health

A Noise Impact Assessment has now been prepared following comments received from the Council's Environmental Health Officer. The report concludes that an acoustic barrier fence should be constructed at the site boundary with Travis Perkins. The assessment also indicates that internal noise levels in all properties will be within acceptable limits at all times.

The assessment has established that noise levels in private gardens are unlikely to exceed the (aspirational) target noise level suggested by the World Health Organisation of 55 dB L Aeq, 16 hour during the day and on this basis is considered acceptable. Acoustic specifications for glazing systems and alternative means of ventilation have been provided to ensure that internal noise levels of 35 dB L Aeq, 16 hour during the day and 30 dB L Aeq, 8 hour at night are not exceeded.

On the above basis it has been comprehensively demonstrated that a satisfactory acoustic environment may be achieved within the proposed properties.

Landscape Architect

The Landscape Architect requested a series of changes to the scheme. I will address each point below.

Paragraph DS2: I can confirm that the Barratt Homes does have a right of access into the adjoining field to manage and maintain the SUD's pond.

Paragraph DS3: We are disappointed that the Landscape Officer has not read and understood the Flood Risk Assessment. Appendix C of the Flood Risk Assessment clearly sets out that the bank gradient to the basin is 1:3. Our ecologist has confirmed that the design of basin suits the ecological requirement of the site.

There is a high seasonal groundwater level which limits the invert level of hypothetical tanks beneath car park courts. Similarly there are minimum depths of cover to surface water conveyance pipes and there is relatively low gradient between the two parking courts on the southern edge of the site and the infiltration basin in the Northeast corner. Notwithstanding this the two parking courts comprise very small areas of the site and application of a minimum practicable flow rate of 5 l/sec from each car park would not actually require any significant volume of storage to achieve the discharge rate. Also SUDS hierarchy is for soft SUDS before hard SUDS such as tanks. The application scheme follows the principles of the existing outline consent on the site but includes for consideration of the hydrogeological context.

With respect to the engineered appearance the size of the basin is a function of the run-off volume, soil permeability and groundwater regime. The design has to take account of the seasonal winter

groundwater level as set out in paragraph 11.1 of the Flood Risk Assessment. "An infiltration basin/pond is however viable based upon the information contained in the Wilson Bailey soils report. At times of low groundwater level it will empty completely, at times of high groundwater it will empty down to the seasonal groundwater level. The operational storage volume that can be relied upon is therefore the volume above the seasonal high groundwater level". If the seasonal Winter GWL did not have to be considered the basin could be of smaller area and reliant upon the availability of full storage depth all year round. The basin is as small as it can be for the site specific parameters and the 0.1%AEP +CC design standard.

Paragraph EE1: The external enclosures plan has now been amended accordingly. The use of red to identify 1800 height screen fence has been amended to brown to prevent confusion.

Paragraph EE2: Specification/appearance of the proposed enclosures is now provided on the plan.

Paragraph EE3: The existing watercourse will not be 'boxed off' by 1800mm screen fence, but will be enclosed by a 1.1m palisade fence.

Paragraph EE4: The boundary fencing to plots 5 – 17 has been adjusted to an 1100mm height timber post & rail fencing, which would afford natural surveillance across the new landscape buffer planting.

Paragraph LM1: It was recommended that the species mix be revised to comprise Field Maple (5%), Hazel (5%), Hawthorn (50%), Holly (5%), Blackthorn (25%), Buckthorn (5%), Guelder Rose (5%). Additionally, native tree planting (size 14-16cm girth EHS) Field Maple, Oak and Wild Cherry should also be introduced at 8m centres. We have amended the species mix as requested, please see the landscape proposal drawings for further detail.

Paragraph LM2: It was suggested that the western landscape buffer be adjustment to match the above species mix. This has been amended accordingly.

Paragraph LM3: It was suggested that given the visual sensitivity of the site location, it would be preferable for all trees to be increased to 14-16cm EHS. The amended landscape proposals now comply with this requirement.

Paragraph LM4: It was suggested that the remaining tree planting throughout the housing layout required general review:

- Several pairs of trees in close proximity require improved spacing or reduction to a single specimen.
- Increased species variation would be preferred – perhaps with some Cherry, Field Maple, and Callery Pear?

We have reduced the number of trees to improve spacing as requested. We have increased the species variation with Cherry and Callery Pear.

Design/Layout changes

The following changes have also been made to the layout, to address the comments set out in your letter dated 12th October 2015.

Parking Provision

The number of triple tandem parking spaces has been reduced from 20 to 14 units. This equates to only 18% of the development having triple tandem parking. Triple tandem parking has been permitted throughout the District, and the reduced number of units will not adversely affect highway safety.

Traffic

A Traffic Regulation Order requirement has now been incorporated into the draft Unilateral Undertaking. I have enclosed the draft agreement for your information. Please can you confirm whether the wording is acceptable to you?

Arboricultural

The units proposed along the southern boundary with the split gardens have been redesigned in terms of layout to ensure that there is a sustainable relationship with the two Oak trees along the southern boundary. I hope that this now satisfies Mr Gargett's requirements.

The number of units along the western boundary has been redesigned to allow for additional landscaping to the front of the properties. This has reduced the parking areas to front and allowed for additional tree planting. These properties have also been staggered to a degree, to allow for some variation along the street frontage.

Plots 1 and 2 have been set back to improve the relationship with the properties along Station Road. This amendment will not affect the amenity of No.76 Station Road, as there are no primary windows in their side elevation. The garages to units 1 and 2 have been deleted, and the garage to Plot 4 has been moved forward to allow for additional landscaping adjacent to the sub-station.

The single storey garages to Plots 17, 18, and 26 have been relocated within their plots so that they are adjacent to the northern boundary. This has allowed for the dwellings to be sited 10m off the northern boundary to reduce the impact on the open field beyond. Plot 17 and 18 have been designed with hipped roofs so that they slope away from the northern boundary. Plots 26 and 27 are both chalet style bungalows. It is considered that the development does not adversely affect the wider countryside

given the changes made to the scheme and the existing residential development in Dances Way that extends further north than the application site.

In your letter you have referred to the lack of tree planting for the employment development. Unfortunately, due to a sewer running under the southern portion of the site, no additional tree planting is possible in that area.

I hope that the proposed changes are now acceptable to you, and that you are now able to recommend that planning permission be granted. If you require any further information, then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Aaron Wright

Planning Manager

On behalf of Barratt Homes Southampton