

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address:	Land adjacent to 65 Andrew Crescent, Waterloo, PO7 6BG		
Proposal:	Erection of 1No. detached two bed dwelling to vacant land.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/25/00006	Expiry Date:	13/03/2025
Applicant:	Mr Libby		
Agent:	Mr Peters	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	ATP Architectural Design		
Ward:	Waterloo		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 **Site Description**

- 1.1 The application site relates to what was formerly the rear garden and parking area of 65 Andrew Crescent, but was sold off and physically separated by 2m high close boarding fencing in about mid 2021. As such the red lined application site comprises a vacant parcel of land measuring approximately 14m x 15m that has a road frontage to Margaret Close. The site is relatively level but currently has piles of rubble and is in an untidy and overgrown state.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached bungalows, of relatively uniform design and constructed of traditional materials. Some have dormer additions. There is a strong 'building line' within the area with the bungalows all set back with front gardens behind low frontage boundary walls. Most properties have side garages providing off-road parking. Overall, the area is relatively spacious with regular spacings and separations between dwellings.
- 1.3 65 Andrew Crescent is a detached bungalow fronting Andrew Crescent to the north-west and now has a truncated rear garden, measuring between about 5m and 7m in depth. It also lost its original on site parking (which was previously provided via a single garage and parking space located at the end of the rear garden, accessed off Margaret Close) but this has been replaced with a dropped kerb to onsite parking on the frontage. The original rear garage has been demolished (& is probably the rubble on the site).
- 1.4 To the south-east is number 2 Margaret Close, also another bungalow, which originally had a back-to-back separation with 65 Andrew Crescent of 30m, including intervening garages serving both dwellings. The garage of 2 Margaret Close remains and is built up to the shared boundary with the application site. There is an evergreen tree and some shrubs within the garden of 2 Margaret Close, close to the western corner that provides some screening.
- 1.5 To the south-west of the site, the rear garden of number 67 Andrew Crescent abuts the site. The application site is slightly higher than the garden level of number 67 and the boundary treatment is only 1.5m high.
- 1.6 Using the Environment Agency's recently updated maps the site lies outside any current or future flood zone, but there is known surface water flooding on part of the site.

2 Planning History

APP/21/00639 - Construction of 1No. one bedroom bungalow to rear of 65 Andrew Crescent

Refused 22/10/2021 for 4 reasons: 1/small plot results in a cramped & confined layout with proximity to boundaries resulting in poor living environment; 2/ overbearing & oppressive form of development resulting in noise, activity harmful to neighbours amenity; lack of drainage investigation & not adequately demonstrated that wouldn't lead to surface water flooding issues; 4/ lack of HRA AA & mitigation

Appeal Dismissed 1/3/2023- Inspector found harmful to character & appearance of the area; height, massing & proximity to rear boundary would be prominent & enclosing to neighbour at 2 Margaret Close; lack of adequate daylight in bedroom affecting living conditions for future occupiers; and cause of surface water flooding unidentified and no flood risk assessment demonstrating development has been directed away from areas at risk of flooding and not increased flood risk elsewhere.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Erection of 1No. detached two bed dwelling to vacant land.
- 3.2 This application seeks to address the reasons for refusal in APP/21/00639 and the subsequent Inspectors comments, and proposes a revised design and siting of a new dwelling on the same site. A Detailed Design & Access Statement, which also covers flood risk, accompanies the application.
- 3.3 The proposed dwelling would be chalet style, with single storey eaves line set at about 2.4m, with height to ridge of 5.5m. A flat roofed single storey projection is proposed off the rear south-western corner, and this would have a parapet height of 3m and include a green roof covering. A flat roofed car port supported on pillars is proposed for the south-east side elevation, which would also have a green roof covering. Two pitched roof dormers and one rooflight are proposed for the front elevation, with one pitched roof dormer and two rooflights in the rear elevation.
- 3.4 The dwelling would be sited such that it would be set back from the highway by 3.8m, with a separation to the south-eastern side boundary with 2 Margaret Close of 2.7m, although this area would be infilled with the car port. The rear garden would have a depth of 5m, with maximum separation to the north-western boundary with 65 Andrew Crescent of 4.15m. Materials are suggested as being white render with red brick plinth, clay tiles, and mid-grey windows and doors.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS9	(Housing)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

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)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control

None received

Councillor Gwen Robinson

None received

Councillor Peter Wade

None received

Councillor Ryan Brent

None received

Southern Water

Connection to sewer

Our investigations indicate that Southern Water can facilitate foul sewerage and surface water run off disposal to service the proposed development. Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. Advice on making application provided.

If permission granted request an Informative about foul and surface water disposal to be agreed by SW.

Build over - close

Plan indicated within 3m of a public sewer - an investigation required to confirm its size, depth etc and whether can be built close. If sewer less than 225mm diameter and no deeper than 3m then may be allowed subject to no works within 500mm and where within 3m foundation levels 150mm below sewer;

Require condition to protect drainage apparatus

Officer Note – SW's indicative plan shows a surface sewer in Margaret Close, and a truncated foul sewer at the rear of 67 Andrew Crescent, and both likely to be more than 3m away from proposed dwelling. Neither should fundamentally alter layout and precautionary protection condition considered appropriate.

Ecologist

On Initial submission:

The application is accompanied by a Biodiversity Net Gain Small Sites Metric (Tom Peters - ATP Architectural Design, December 2024). The Metric is completed mostly correctly and the applicant is proposing an overall gain of 13.96% (or 0.121 habitat units). This will be achieved through the installation of a green roof and ground-level planters. I would request clarification on a couple of points relating to the metric.

Firstly, there is an error message in the Metric at the bottom line of the Habitats to be Created table is an error message requesting that Area of habitat creation must match area lost. This needs correcting please. Secondly, the submitted site photos show a small fruit tree within the site this needs to be included within the Metric.

Following submission of amended details:

The application is accompanied by a newly amended Biodiversity Net Gain Small Sites Metric (Tom Peters - ATP Architectural Design, 26 March 2025). The applicant is proposing an overall gain of 24.33% (or an increase of 0.180 habitat units). The Metric is now completed and acceptable.

The development is required to accord with the BNG deemed condition at 13 (1) and (2) of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. In practical terms this requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan and that the development is not commenced until that Biodiversity Gain Plan is approved by the Local Planning Authority.

As the proposed BNG is within the curtilage of private dwellings it is not possible to secure this through legal agreement for 30 years. In order to ensure that the proposed BNG is implemented and secured for a reasonable period, I would suggest that a Landscape Management Plan is secured by condition.

see full comments for 2 conditions recommended.

Hampshire Highways

Can advise that as the application is for a single dwelling and onwards there is no proposed change of vehicle access onto the highway as confirmed in the application form, HCC's Highway Standing Advice should be referred to in the first instance.

However, the Highway Authority would confirm that if any changes to the existing dropped kerb to Margaret Close are required a further approval from the Highway Authority would be required and therefore the developer should be made aware that subject to any planning permission that may be granted by the Local Planning Authority, a subsequent permission will need to be granted by HCC as Highways Authority to undertake the dropped kerb works on the highway. Details of this procedure can be found via the following link:

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/parking/droppedkerbs>

Natural England

NO OBJECTION - SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATE MITIGATION BEING SECURED

Natural England considers that without appropriate mitigation the application would have an adverse effect on the integrity of European designated sites.

Your authority has measures in place to manage potential impacts through contributions to an agreed strategic solution(s) which we consider to be ecologically sound. Natural England is of the view that if these measures, including contributions to them, are implemented, they will be effective and reliable in preventing harmful effects on the Habitats Site(s) for the duration of the proposed development. Mitigation measure(s) to offset any positive nutrient budget should be provided within the relevant catchment area(s).

We advise that an appropriate planning condition or obligation is attached to any planning permission to secure these measures.

A lack of objection does not mean that there are no significant environmental impacts. Natural England advises that all environmental impacts and opportunities are fully considered, and relevant local bodies are consulted.

Portsmouth Water Company

have reviewed and have no concerns regarding impacts to groundwater quality. Therefore, we do not recommend any planning conditions

Waste Services Manager

None 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: 12

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Original dwelling was to be a one bedroom bungalow and this has now changed to a two bedroom house. Access opposite other drives where access already limited due to badly parked cars; will become worse with additional cars of occupants of the new dwelling	Current proposal a chalet bungalow - See section 7 below No yellow lines in area - see Highways & Parking section below
Previous application was rejected for a single storey property, with concerns for drainage in the area. New plans appear to show a 2 storey property. This is not in keeping with the area, as properties on Margaret Close are single storey bungalows. A two storey property will make the already existing house opposite very overlooked. Also the garden to Andrew Crescent, which is already very small, will have a 2 storey wall close to it's boundary.	Current proposal a chalet bungalow - See section 7 below

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 area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highways and Parking
- (v) Flood Risk and Drainage
- (vi) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (vii) Compliance with Habitats Regulations
- (viii) CIL

(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 Council's Five-Year Housing Land Supply, updated December 2024, indicates the Borough's

housing land supply position as 1.8 years with a 20% buffer applied. This shortfall engages Paragraph 11d) of the NPPF with its presumption in favour of granting permission unless there are any adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against policies in the framework taken as whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places etc. It is accepted that the proposal would result in a net gain of 1 residential unit within the main urban area of Waterloooville, which is a sustainable location, would make more effective use of the land, and the proposal would make a modest contribution to housing supply. These benefits of the proposal must be afforded weight in the overall planning balance.

- 7.3 Current policies AL2 and CS17 direct development towards the built up urban areas, and encourage making the most effective use of land; and policy CS9 supports housing that achieves a suitable density that respects the surrounding landscape, character and built form. Policy CS15 directs development to areas at least risk of flooding and requires development to be safe from flooding, whilst Policy CS16 seeks High Quality Design that respects its local context. These policies align with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and should therefore be afforded weight in the determination of the application, as detailed below.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

- 7.4 As noted by the previous Inspector the surrounding properties have a strong sense of consistency with similar roof pitches and front gable features providing a distinctive and unifying characteristic. The proposed dwelling would have a roof pitch and height to respect this local characteristic, and whilst no front gable feature is proposed, the two pitched roof gable styled front dormers would reflect this feature. Many of the surrounding properties have dormers on either side or front roof slopes, although most are flat roofed. Pitched roof dormers are considered a high-quality design feature and not inappropriate to the wider area. It is considered that the external design of the proposed dwelling would, in street scene visual terms, outwardly adhere to the general design and appearance of the locality.
- 7.5 In terms of pattern of surrounding development it is noted that most have deeper plots with a more traditional rear garden layout. The previous refused scheme was sited in the corner of the plot, close to the side boundary with 2 Margaret Close and the rear boundary with 67 Andrew Close. The Inspector noted this lack of space to these two boundaries resulted in a cramped appearance that eroded the sense of space associated with the site and surroundings. To overcome this, the now proposed dwelling has been more centrally sited in the plot, with a side separation to 2 Margaret Close of 2.7m. This side space would be used as a side drive for the parking of cars, with setback car port roof over. The use of side drives to create side separation and space about dwellings is a common feature of the area and as such the proposed siting away from 2 Margaret Close is now considered to be more respectful of the spacious pattern and character of the area.
- 7.6 The proposed siting also pulls the development away from the rear boundary with 67 Andrew Crescent and creates a more traditional rear garden, albeit a very small one having a depth of only between 3.5m and 5m. The adequacy of the rear space for amenity purposes will be discussed below, but in terms of siting, the layout is now less cramped to boundaries and more respectful of the pattern of development in the area. It is acknowledged that the plot as truncated from 65 Andrew Crescent is smaller than others in the area, nevertheless this is now an unused parcel of land and this proposal would make better use of that land without causing harm to the character and appearance of the area.

- 7.7 Policy CS16 requires new development to respect local context and specifically at 1.c) requires the characteristics of the locality, including heights, building lines, plot widths and depths, to inform design. It is considered that this revised design for a chalet bungalow on the site does now respect these features of the locality and would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality. Whilst a palette of materials has been suggested within the supporting Design & Access statement, precise details of, in particular the roof tile, are not provided, and as such a materials sample condition is recommended.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.8 With respect to the impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties, the previous scheme introduced a lengthy pitched roof parallel to, and close to the boundary of the small rear garden of 2 Margaret Close, that the Inspector found to be prominent and enclosing, harming their outlook and amenity. The current proposal re-orientates the proposed dwelling such that there would be a side gable set 2.7m from the shared boundary, which would only cover approximately half the depth of the plot. Being a gable end the silhouette of the property would be reduced, and with increased separation would not be so enclosing and have less impact on the outlook from 2 Margaret Close.
- 7.9 There would be a long narrow window in the side gable facing 2 Margaret Close, but this would serve a landing and not a habitable room, and the plans indicate this to be obscure glazed. Any direct overlooking or loss of privacy towards 2 Margaret Close would therefore be negligible. Overall, it is considered that the siting and design would have an acceptable relationship with 2 Margaret Close and not be harmful to their outlook or amenity.
- 7.10 The rear of the site shares a boundary with number 67 Andrew Crescent and the Inspector noted that this garden was much larger and the outlook from which already includes several outbuildings and bungalows. It was also noted that the difference in levels was not so significant as to make the bungalow markedly more prominent. Overall, the Inspector found the previous scheme not to be inherently harmful to the occupiers of number 67.
- 7.11 The current revised scheme pulls the development away from the shared boundary with number 67 significantly, such that the rear elevation would be 5m away. It would however be a longer development, covering more of the width of the plot than previously, and include a rear dormer and two rooflights in the roof slope facing the garden of number 67. There is no doubt that the presence of the proposed dwelling would be highly visible in the outlook from number 67, and the roof slope with windows would add to a perception of being overlooked. The agent has agreed that these windows could be conditioned as fixed closed and obscure glazed (the bathroom would have mechanical ventilation but the dormer is required for headroom) so any actual overlooking or loss of privacy would be avoided. Given the comments and conclusion of the Inspector on the previous scheme, and increased separation, it is considered hard to justify a reason for refusal based on harm to outlook and the amenity of occupiers of number 67 Andrew Crescent.
- 7.12 With respect to living conditions for future occupiers, it is noted that the development complies with the Nationally Described Space standards for a 2 bed 3 person unit (it is 71.7sqm and the standards require 70 sqm). The adopted Borough Design Guide SPD normally requires garden lengths of 10m. This proposal does not meet this requirement, having a rear garden length of only 5m. However, it is noted that the garden has a width of 14m wide, and as such would overall provide sufficient amenity space for future occupiers. It is also noted that the garden area would have a westerly aspect and not be overshadowed by other buildings, so would provide a pleasant well-lit sitting out area for future occupiers. The previous scheme also had windows very close to boundaries limiting light to those rooms and outlook from. However, the more central siting has

overcome this issue and all rooms would have sufficient light and outlook to provide an adequate standard of living for future occupiers.

- 7.13 Overall, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Highways and parking

- 7.14 To meet the adopted Parking SPD, 2 on site spaces are required to serve the proposed 2 bedroom dwelling, in addition to secure cycle storage. These has been provided via 2 tandem spaces located adjacent the southern boundary with 2 Margaret Close. The rear space would be a covered car port, including flat green roof. The plans show secure cycle storage for 3 bikes in the rear garden. The parking arrangements would therefore meet policy DM13 and the Parking SPD.
- 7.15 One of the third-party comments note access to driveways being an issue with poorly parked vehicles, but there are no parking restrictions in the area and the re-use of an existing access point would not result in any change to access arrangements. Clearly the additional dwelling would generate some additional traffic and visitors but with no parking restrictions in the area on-street parking can meet that demand. The increase in traffic from just 1 additional dwelling would not cause substantial harm to the highway network detrimental to highway safety. It is noted that Hampshire Highways raised no objection to the proposal. Overall, there is no highways or parking objection to the proposal.

(v) Flood Risk & Drainage

- 7.16 Using the updated National Flood Map, the adjacent dwelling at number 65 lies within a patch identified at 1:30 high risk of surface water flooding, but this only marginally extends into the northern strip of the application site. The 1:100 and 1:1000 risk extends slightly further into the site but doesn't completely cover it. HBC's stance on such patchy surface water coverage is not to require a formal sequential test but to take a sequential approach on site i.e. avoid new built form on the areas at risk where possible.
- 7.17 In this case the siting of the new dwelling itself would largely be beyond the areas identified at risk from surface water flooding, which mainly covers the garden, i.e. the built form is sequentially located within the site. Additionally, it is noted that the site currently features large areas of hardstanding with no dedicated drainage. The application proposal includes SuDs measures including soft landscaping/green roof, permeable hardstanding, provision of sealed attenuation tanks etc. A drainage plan has been provided demonstrating how these would be achieved on site.
- 7.18 Overall it is considered that the siting of the proposed dwelling is the sequentially preferable location within the site, and the supporting drainage details would mean that the development would not increase the risk of flooding on the site or elsewhere. As such the proposal is considered to comply with policy CS15 and the NPPF.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.19 The application is accompanied by a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Metric which has been updated during the course of determining this application. The Council's Ecologist is content that the BNG process has been followed correctly, and the amended Metric now correct. The latest metric calculations estimate that an increase in 24.33% (or an increase of 0.180 habitat units) would be achieved as a result of this development.
- 7.20 The BNG must be secured through planning conditions requiring submission of a

Biodiversity Gain Plan prior to commencement, and in this case, because it is within the curtilage of a private dwelling and a S106 Agreement would be inappropriate, provision of a landscape management plan is required instead. These conditions can be applied to make the proposal comply with the BNG legislation and policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

(vii) Compliance with Habitats Regulations

- 7.21 The proposal would result in the net gain of one, two bedroom dwelling which needs to comply with the Habitats Regulations. The Council has conducted a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), including Appropriate Assessment (AA), of the proposed development under Regulation 63 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. The Council's assessment as competent Authority under those regulations is included in the case file. The screening under Regulation 63(1)(a) found that there was likely to be a significant effect on several Solent European Sites due to both the increase in recreation and the decrease in water quality that would result from the proposed development resulting in the gain of 1 additional 2 bedroom dwelling.
- 7.22 Using Natural England's updated Methodology in January 2024, the planning application was then subject to Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63. This included two packages of avoidance and mitigation packages. The first is a package of measures based on the suggested scale of mitigation in the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy. The second is a package of measures based on the Position Statement on Nutrient Neutral Development.
- 7.23 With respect to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy the applicant has entered into a Unilateral Undertaking and paid the appropriate sum of £755.80 to address the potential recreational harm from the new development. Therefore, it is considered that the recreational element of the impacts of development have been adequately mitigated against. With respect to the water quality issue and the Council's updated Position Statement, April 2023, the applicant has been able to also enter into the mitigation scheme at Warblington Farm to offset the nitrogen from the development. A Unilateral Undertaking has been received, together with the appropriate contribution of £2,544.42 as nutrient mitigation. This is based on the development achieving a water efficiency of 110 l/p/p/d and to ensure these measures are provided as part of the development, and for ongoing compliance, it is necessary to add 2 conditions.
- 7.24 The Appropriate Assessment concluded that this is sufficient to remove the significant effect on the SPAs which would otherwise have been likely to occur. The HRA was subject to consultation with Natural England as the appropriate nature conservation body under Regulation 63(3) who have confirmed that they agree with the findings of the assessment and raise no further objection. The Council's assessment as competent Authority under those regulations is included in the case file.

(viii) CIL

- 7.25 The development is CIL liable for the net additional internal floor space which amounts to 71.7sqm. The Havant Borough Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule was adopted by the council on the 20th February 2013 and the levy charged for this development would be £80 + indexation per square metre of new floor space. The net gain in floorspace results in a Liability of £10,012.39 and the Draft Liability Notice has been sent to the agent.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 Due to the Borough's current housing supply position, paragraph 11d) of the NPPF is engaged with its presumption in favour of granting permission unless there are any adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against policies in the framework taken as whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places etc. The proposal would make better use of this underused small site in this urban and sustainable location, and the provision of 1 additional dwelling would contribute to the Borough's housing need and represents a modest benefit. There would also be economic benefits arising from the construction and future spend of occupants; and a social benefit from the provision of a new household in an established residential area in a sustainable location.
- 8.2 Notwithstanding the planning history of the site, it is considered that this revised siting and design has overcome the previous reasons for refusals and would provide a new dwelling of appropriate design and scale for the character of the area that would not have any harmful impact on neighbouring amenity. Any limited harm to the outlook of neighbouring properties would be marginal and insufficient to outweigh the benefits. Therefore, the tilted balance benefit of this development prevails.
- 8.3 The proposal meets the Habitats Regulations with recreational and water quality impacts adequately mitigated against and provides for the required 10% gain in BNG. Overall, the proposal is therefore considered acceptable and recommended for conditional permission
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/25/00006 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:

1:1250 Location Plan
Amended Proposed Site Plan – Drawing Number 24324-102-FUL Rev B
Proposed Floor Plans - Drawing Number 24324-101-FUL
Proposed Elevations – Drawing Number 24324-201-FUL
Site Sections – Drawing Number 24324-301-FUL
Proposed Drainage Plan - Drawing Number 24324-103
Street Scene Visual
Existing and Proposed Street Scene – Drawing Number 24324-202
Design & Access Statement
Amended Biodiversity Metric Calculator Rev A
Nutrient Calculator
Havant Occupancy Calculator

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or a full

specification of the materials to be used externally on the hereby approved dwelling and garage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory 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 A Biodiversity Gain Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the Biodiversity Net Gain Small Sites Metric (Tom Peters - ATP Architectural Design, 26 March 2025) and must include:

(1) information about the steps taken or to be taken to minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the on-site habitat and any other habitat;

(2) the pre-development biodiversity value of the on-site habitat;

(3) the post-development biodiversity value of the on-site habitat;

(4) any registered off-site biodiversity gain allocated to the development and the value of that gain in relation to the development;

(5) any biodiversity credits purchased for the development; and

(6) any such other matters as the Secretary of State may by regulations specify.

The development shall not commence until a Landscape Management Plan (LMP), prepared in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The LMP shall include:

(7) a non-technical summary;

(8) the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the LMP;

(9) the planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan;

(10) the management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan for a period of 30 years from the completion of development; and

(11) the monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the created or enhanced habitat.

Notice in writing shall be given to the Council when the:

(12) LMP has been implemented; and

(13) habitat creation and enhancement works as set out in the LMP have been completed.

The created and/or enhanced habitat specified in the approved LMP shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved LMP.

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the hereby permitted dwelling, the bathroom window in the rear dormer; the 2 rear rooflights; and the landing window in the side elevation shall all 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.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order, no enlargement of the dwellinghouse, or additions to the roof, permitted by Part 1, Classes A and B of the 2015 Order, as amended, shall be constructed within the curtilage of the site without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To protect neighbouring amenity from any further development on this small site, having regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until:
(a) A water efficiency calculation in accordance with the Government's National Calculation Methodology for assessing water efficiency in new dwellings has been undertaken which demonstrates that no more than 110 litres of water per person per day shall be consumed within the development, and this calculation has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority; and
(b) All measures necessary to meet the approved water efficiency calculation have been installed.
Reason: There is existing evidence of high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus in the water environment with evidence of eutrophication at some European designated nature conservation sites in the Solent catchment. The PUSH Integrated Water Management Strategy has identified that there is uncertainty as to whether new housing development can be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the designated sites within the Solent. Further detail regarding this can be found in the appropriate assessment that was carried out regarding this planning application. In compliance with Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, the local planning authority has a duty to ensure that sufficient mitigation is provided against any impacts which might arise upon the designated sites. In coming to this decision, the Council has also had regard to Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

8. At all times following occupation of the development hereby approved, all measures for water usage within the submitted nutrient budget shall be maintained in the development in perpetuity.
Reason: There is existing evidence of high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus in the water environment with evidence of eutrophication at some European designated nature conservation sites in the Solent catchment. The PUSH Integrated Water Management Strategy has identified that there is uncertainty as to whether new housing development can be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the designated sites within the Solent. Further detail regarding this can be found in the appropriate assessment that was carried out regarding this planning application. In compliance with Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, the local planning authority has a duty to ensure that sufficient mitigation is provided against any impacts which might arise upon the designated sites. In coming to this decision, the Council has also had regard to Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

9. Prior to the commencement of development, the necessary Build-Over/Close-to a public sewer agreement with Southern Water shall first be secured. The details of the measures to protect the public sewers shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Southern Water. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the public sewers, having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework. This is a pre-commencement condition as such details need to be taken into account in the construction of the development and thus go to the heart of the planning permission.

10. The car parking, including cycle storage, 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.

INFORMATIVES:

1. In accordance with paragraphs 38-50 of the NPPF Havant Borough Council (HBC) takes a positive and proactive approach and works with applicants/agents on development proposals in a manner focused on solutions by:
Offering a pre-application advice service, and
Updating you of any issues that may arise in the processing of your application and where possible suggesting solutions, and,

In this instance:

You were updated about issues after the initial site visit, additional and amended details required and submitted, making your proposal acceptable.

2. A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. Please read Southern Water's New Connections Services Charging Arrangements documents which is available on Southern Water's website via the following link [southernwater.co.uk/infrastructure-charges](https://www.southernwater.co.uk/infrastructure-charges)