
Site Address:	Land north of Oysters, Station Road, Hayling Island		
Proposal:	Outline application for erection of up to 29 dwelling units and associated highway works with all other matters reserved.		
Application Type:	Outline Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/21/01350	Expiry Date:	5 December 2025
Applicant:	Hayling Island Builders Ltd		
Agent:	BVA Planning	Case Officer:	Arleta Miszewska
Ward:	Hayling West		

Reason for Committee Consideration: Proposal raises important policy issues and is of significant public interest.

Development Manager Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

Executive Summary

The application site is located to the north of the existing development of Oysters and to the west of residential dwellings in Dances Way and Charleston Close. The site is a greenfield enclosed by trees and hedge planting.

In terms of planning policies, the site is located outside the urban area where policies prevent built development in principle. The site is also located within an area designated as a Secondary Support Area for Breent Geese and Wader feeding and roosting site.

Officers note that the single access road to Hayling Island, the A3023, is at risk of flooding, with significant increases expected in extent, depth and hazard in the future. In the event of flooding, the access to and egress from Hayling Island will be significantly compromised. There are currently no strategic plans or funding for the provision of sea defences.

The proposal is for up to 29 dwellings, including a policy compliant number of affordable houses. The application is in outline form with only access being considered. Further detail relevant to landscape, scale, design and appearance is reserved for a later submission of reserved matters.

Both the Highway Authority and National Highways did not object to the application, subject to conditions and legal agreements predominantly securing highways improvements. The Council's Ecologist also did not raise objection in principle and appropriate bird mitigation land would be provided. As shown on the Illustrative Masterplan, the development could be accommodated within the site without demonstrable visual and landscape harm. Subject to detailed design, residential amenities of existing and prospective residents would be respected.

However, Officers have concerns over the lack of detail of a compensatory reptile habitat, whether on-site or off-site. Such details would be required to be secured at an outline stage. Further concerns relate to the absence of sufficient and correct information to determine the land required to provide adequate surface water measures on site to facilitate the development and not to increase flood risk outside the site. This leads to a concern over the remaining land available for the proposed dwellings and any associated infrastructure, such as gardens, car parking spaces, roads, as well as ecological buffers, including reptile habitats.

Finally, Officers cannot ignore the fact that the single access road to Hayling Island, the A3023, is at risk of tidal flooding. The Council's own Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) states that:

“Tidal flood risk to the single access onto Hayling Island is significant. This would make voluntary movement of people on or off the island as well as emergency access by road at the time of a flood event impossible. The Council does not consider that this risk can be satisfactorily addressed by the development, or that the risk is outweighed by any notable sustainability benefits to the community, even when taking into account the contribution the site could make to meeting housing need.”

The SFRA further suggests that Havant Borough needs to be satisfied that proposals can be regarded as safe in the event that vehicular access to the mainland is not achievable. Officers cannot reasonably assume that access to the development would be safe in the event of flooding and the development itself, due to its scale, cannot be expected to provide the required mitigation. Therefore, Officers conclude that that application fails on the grounds of flood risk.

Drawing all considerations together, Officers recommend that the application is refused for the reasons discussed in the report.

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises 1.24 hectares of undeveloped arable land enclosed by trees and hedge planting. To the north of the site are areas of agricultural land. To the east are residential dwellings in Dances Way and Charleston Close as well as an attenuation pond constructed in association with the residential development of Oysters, which abuts the application site to the south. A row of industrial units also abut the site to the south. The western boundary adjoins a belt of trees.
- 1.2 Whilst the site comprises arable land, the Planning Statement confirms that the land is classed as Grade 3, therefore, it has a low productivity.
- 1.3 In terms of planning policy designations, the application site is located outside the urban boundary as defined by Policies CS17 and AL2. Policies CS11 and DM23 also define the land as an Uncertain Sites for Brent Geese and/or Waders. The site is also identified in the HBC Biodiversity Strategy (January 2019) as a Brent Goose and wader feeding and roosting site (Secondary Support Area).
- 1.4 According to the Council's SFRA, the site lies in Flood Zone 1 for both current and future flooding. Small areas near existing ditches are within a risk of surface water flooding.
- 1.5 The site is not located close to any designated heritage assets. There are no public rights of way crossing the site.

2. Planning History

APP/13/00639 - Outline planning permission for mixed-use development comprising up to 59 dwellings and 1,250sqm of light-industrial accommodation (Use Class B1). Off-site highway works including widening of footpath. Approved. 9 October 2014

APP/15/00919 - Mixed use development comprising 76 residential units (4No. 1bed, 22No. 2 bed, 31No. 3bed; and 19No. 4 bed dwellings; and 1000sqm of light-industrial accommodation (use Class B1) with associated parking, access, landscaping and surface water drainage. Approved. 23 December 2015.

Officer comment: *The applications listed above relate to the development of the existing Oysters estate which lies to the south of the application site.*

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Planning permission is sought for a development of up to 29 dwellings and a vehicular access onto Billy Road. The application is in an outline form and the only matter for consideration at this stage is access to the site.
- 3.2 The proposed vehicular and pedestrian access into the site would lead from Billy Road, as a continuation of the road directly into the application site. All other matters (i.e. scale, layout, appearance and landscaping) are to be determined through reserved matters application(s). Therefore, the following features of the proposed development, whilst addressed in the current submission, would be subject to any forthcoming reserved matters application(s).
- 3.3 The indicative masterplan indicates that the proposed vehicular and pedestrian access into the site would lead from Billy Road into the site and would terminate at a T-junction, with the internal road running horizontally west-east within the site and then turning further north within the eastern parts of the site. The plan demonstrates that the proposed dwellings would be arranged into a linear development within the southern part of the site and a perimeter block within the north-eastern part of the site, with one building being situated within the northernmost part in its own setting.
- 3.4 The submission clarifies that the proposal could include a mixture of 20 market and 9 social houses (which would equal just over 30% affordable housing provision), including 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings served by a total of 40 car parking spaces. The Planning Statement states that the units would be houses that could vary between 1.5, 2 and 2.5 storeys in height. The external appearance would likely be traditional to reflect the established local character.
- 3.5 The development would result in a loss of a number of Category 3 trees, however, replacement trees would be proposed to compensate for any losses. The final proposal would also need to meet the statutory requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain.

4. Policy Considerations

- 4.1 The Development Plan for Havant Borough consists of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy), the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations Plan) and the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan.
- 4.2 The following policies are particularly pertinent to the determination of this application:

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS1 Health and Wellbeing
CS7 (Community Support and Inclusion)
CS8 (Community Safety)
CS9 Housing
CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS13 (Green Infrastructure)
CS14 (Efficient Use of Resources)
CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS19 (Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
CS20 (Transport and Access Strategy)
DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)
DM10 (Pollution)
DM11 (Planning for More Sustainable Travel)

DM12 (Mitigating the Impacts of Travel)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

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

Supplementary Planning Documents

Borough Design Guide SPD (Adopted Dec 2011)
Housing SPD (Adopted July 2011)
Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD (Adopted July 2016, partially updated September 2019)
HBC Biodiversity Strategy (January 2019)

4.3 Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

4.4 Conservation Area: Not applicable.

Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Community Infrastructure Levy Team

Initial comments - Comments re CIL, S106, Affordable Housing, HBC & HCC Monitoring Fees, Management Company and Management Plan, SRMP, Nitrates, SUDs bond, Community worker, Education (HCC), Transport improvements.

Final comments – this application is not CIL liable, but any subsequent full or reserved matters application would be; sets out potential contributions.

Climate Change Coordinator

Policy CS13 supports the inclusion and enhancement of green infrastructure within development proposals. This can be from numerous mechanisms such as the creation of community gardens, green space, parks and gardens and green corridors etc but it can also be from the inclusion of green walls and roofs. Any planning application should be enhancing this provision where possible and outlining within the design where these measures will be incorporated through a sustainability statement, supporting information and plans that are submitted.

Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that any planning application provides adequate land for waste management, incorporates renewable energy, achieves higher levels of carbon reduction and for non-residential development achieves the BREEAM 'Very Good' standard, unless proven to be financially or technically unviable in line with Policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy.

This should be demonstrated through a sustainability statement outlining these requirements and it is noted that within the design and access statement that part of this information is highlighted but not specifically around the levels of carbon reduction nor where specifically and in what quantity the measures for renewables etc will be included.

The Councils Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan is striving to achieve a 68% reduction in emissions by 2030 with net zero targets agreed for the authority by 2035 and for the borough by 2045. Building sustainable development within the Borough is significantly important for achieving these targets and it is noted that within the Design and Access Statement point 10 provides some further detail regarding how the development is considering sustainability onsite. The D&A statements outlines some of the works proposed

which include:

- Passive solar design measures that optimise heat losses and gains and maximise natural light penetration.
- Natural ventilation and solar shading which helps prevent overheating and reduces cooling demand
- New and emerging technology, including heat recovery from waste heat, and façade design as well as using insulation, heat recovery and low energy systems.
- Winter gardens can be used to provide thermal buffering and, allow daylight penetration and allow the use of natural ventilation strategies.
- Construction details to be carefully considered to ensure thermal bridging and air permeability is minimised.
- New electric vehicle charging ports across the scheme

The statement goes on to explain provisions around open space, sustainable drainage, developing a water strategy and more which is positive to show and demonstrates that sustainability measures have been considered. However, there is a lack of detail in regards to the emissions this would reduce/remove and how these works would be specifically developed and designed out to ensure the lowest carbon outputs are considered.

The application does not contain a sustainability statement showing where and how low carbon measures would be included within the development and the detail around the chosen methods and technology. The plans do not demonstrate where and how this provision would be included and therefore without further information it is not able to be determined whether there is enough taking place onsite to justify the loss of the greenfield development outside of the urban area.

Conclusion:

The D&A statement goes some way in outlining where and how some sustainable measures could be included onsite and it is positive to see that some functions around solar design, ventilation, construction and EV technology has been considered. However, in order to be supported the applicant would need to demonstrate exactly where and how this was going to be incorporated within the design and at this stage this is not clear. The applicant should also be outlining where and how carbon emissions are being reduced/removed as a result of the works so that the authority can make an informed decision regarding how carbon intensive the development is.

It is also considered that there are additional methods that a site of this scale could achieve and these should be demonstrated throughout any planning application through a sustainability statements.

It should be noted that there will be refreshed approach to this consideration in the new Building A Better Future Local Plan. Depending on the timescales of any application submission the policy requirements may be subject to change.

Officers response – Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then a Sustainability Statement would have been secured with a planning condition to accompany any future reserved matters applications.

Coastal Partners

Initial response –holding objection on the grounds that insufficient information has been provided within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment to adequately assess tidal flood risk for the lifetime of the proposed development. In particular, the submitted FRA does not address:

- Acknowledgement of the extreme tidal flood levels which could impact the site over the lifetime of the development, using the most recent (UKCP18) climate change guidance;
- The proposed finished floor levels (FFLs) for all buildings to be re-developed, and evidence that these have been set with the extreme tidal flood levels in mind;
- Provision of a Flood

Warning and Evacuation Plan or similar, written in accordance with advice from the Environment Agency; and • Incorporation of flood resistance and resilience measures, where appropriate. The applicant should submit a revised FRA, addressing the above points; general comments regarding Brent Geese and Waders.

Interim response – we remove our holding objection to the proposed development from a tidal flood risk perspective; a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), compiled Patrick Parsons and dated June 2022 has been submitted which sufficiently outlines how tidal flood risk at the site will be mitigated; where flood warning and evacuation are significant measures in contributing to managing flood risk, we expect local planning authorities to formally consider the emergency planning and rescue implications of any development in making their decisions.

Final response - Coastal Partners make comments only in relation to tidal flooding, and it is for the LPA to consider all other forms of flood risk; our comments regarding the FRA remain valid and do not require an update; in July 2025 the Environment Agency approved Coastal Partner's Hayling Island Coastal Management Strategy, following approval by Havant Borough Council. This strategy reviews in detail the flood and erosion risk to the whole of the island's coastline, the condition of the existing defences and the changes that are expected as a result of climate change. The Strategy identifies that without defences in place, safe access and egress on to and off the island would be severely compromised. The strategic intent for this area is to protect and maintain the viability of the A3023 into the future, as critical road infrastructure on the island, with the preferred option being to construct new defences which keep pace with sea level rise. At the present time, no funding has been identified to progress any defence works to protect the A3023 south of the bridge. We advise that the LPA should formally consider the emergency planning and rescue implications of new development in making their decision in light of the issues highlighted by the Hayling Island Coastal Management Strategy.

Communities Manager (Leisure)

Developments of 20 or more new homes will contribute towards a community officer, to help new residents in the development integrate into existing communities. The current rate of this S106 Contribution is: £265 per dwelling indexed in accordance with the CPI (for decisions on or after 1/4/22).

Ecology

Initial response – further information required before fully-detailed consultation advice can be provided (the feasibility of any proposed off-site winter bird refuge, the potential impacts on the Sinah Lane bird refuge, details of on-site biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are to be provided).

Interim response –the application is accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment (Tyler Grange, October 2021) and a Brent Goose and Wader Mitigation Strategy (Tyler Grange, April 2025); further information is required before fully-detailed consultation advice can be provided on ecological matters relating to habitats and species other than wintering birds; whilst the site is generally of limited ecological value in terms of semi-natural habitats and protected and notable species, there will certainly be a loss of biodiversity; the provision of new landscaping areas suitable for supporting the various species recorded on site is welcome, although no firm details are given due to the outline nature of the proposal; only outline mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are provided and, whilst it may be acceptable to require further (full) details of these matters at detailed design stage, I would rather have at least a more detailed outline of the range of measures to be provided so that we can establish a baseline expectation at outline stage.

The site is included in the current Solent Waders & Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) as Site H34E. The site is classified as a Secondary Support Area based on a history of supporting

significant numbers of foraging Brent Geese. The application site is therefore valuable supporting habitat for wintering birds and is functionally linked to the nearby Solent Special Protection Areas (SPAs). The proposal would result in the loss of the southern portion of SWBGS Site H34E. In order for this loss to be judged acceptable, an appropriate mitigation/compensation package will be required. In this instance, on-site mitigation options are not possible and therefore it is for the applicant to propose a suitable off-site option that acknowledges the impacts on supporting habitat from this proposed scheme. It should be noted that some aspects of mitigation for the Oysters scheme were not implemented at all and that there is a wholly understandable degree of scepticism around the subject of developer-led mitigation in this landscape.

The application site is also in close proximity to the recently approved permanent bird refuge off Sinah Lane. I am concerned that construction-phase activities will impact the refuge, and that once operational any increase in recreational pressure will also impact the refuge. Given the absence of any strategic-level compensatory scheme within Havant Borough or the wider Solent area, it is the responsibility of the applicant to identify and provide details of a suitable off-site compensatory habitat. The applicant has engaged with this matter, and detailed discussions have taken place over the previous two years on a specific off-site mitigation option.

The submitted Brent Goose and Wader Mitigation Strategy (Tyler Grange, April 2025) is essentially unchanged from that previously submitted and discussed in 2022 and 2023, and has been subject to detailed discussion with Natural England officers and I. The principle of utilising compensatory land at Mill Rythe as mitigation remains agreed in principle, and the strategy provides further details on what, in practice, is proposed in order to ensure the Mill Rythe land provides a functional off-site site for bird species.

In essence, the strategy entails the cessation of certain land use activities at the Mill Rythe site, alongside some enhancements. I consider the proposed management changes - cessation of dog walking activities, better grassland management, boundary strengthening - to be achievable mitigation and enhancement measures to Solent Waders & Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) Core Site H50C. I am confident that the proposed mitigation/enhancement measures would provide habitat attractive to Brent Geese in particular, in an area where they have traditionally occurred in significant numbers.

The principle of providing permanent habitat in key locations (as opposed to intermittently available habitat) is a central thread of the SWBGS. The current activities on the Site H50C are detailed, as are other factors that may render the site unattractive to wintering birds. There is an added complication in that the Mill Rythe mitigation site may be required to mitigate both this proposal and the nearby Land South of Saltmarsh Lane proposal. To this effect, the Mill Rythe proposal includes three scenarios based on three hypothetical planning outcomes – delivery of each development site alone or first, and then both concurrently. I recognise and acknowledge that these outcomes are reasonable assumptions in the context of the two concurrent applications.

I am of course supportive of a reasonable and pragmatic solution that acknowledges that mitigation should be provided proportionately to the impacts. The three proposed options seem reasonable to me, with those addressing the alone/first impacts still allowing for a degree of uplift on the remainder of the land (chiefly, the cessation of dog walking activity, provision of appropriate disturbance-free habitat, and securing of boundaries). In conclusion, I am in agreement that so called 'phased' approach is reasonable and proportionate and agree that the coast-adjacent portion would be the preference for delivery first.

Ultimately, some further detail would be welcome on exactly how the mitigation (and any 'remainder' not being necessary for bird mitigation) is to be managed to enhance habitat for wintering birds. The proposed management is a late summer hay cut but grazing after this would be a preferable option (low density cattle would provide ideal grassland structure,

poached muddy areas, and faeces would hopefully aid soil invertebrates for e.g. waders such as Curlew)? The applicant's ecologist (email dated 7 May 2025) has suggested that grazing is being considered.

I should also highlight that the Mill Rythe site, particularly if subject to some flooding in winter, may be of some botanical interest in terms of coastal/saline grassland – this wouldn't necessarily affect mitigation plans but it might influence the management techniques. For the 'both sites' option, a single shallow scrape is proposed and this is welcome in principle. I should highlight that, depending on the size of the scrape and volume of excavated material, separate planning permission may be required (it might be an engineering operation). In addition, excavations should be mindful of any archaeological impacts.

Final response – no objection subject to conditions (Landscape and Ecological Management Plan; Construction Environment Management Plan); I am content that the site conditions have remained consistent throughout the various years of assessment and that the potential ecological constraints are well understood; the site is not of exceptional ecological importance and contains a typical range of generally species-poor habitats found on farmland on Hayling Island; the key features are the various ditches as well as boundary hedgerows and scrub which support populations of protected and notable species, most notably common reptile species.

It is worth clarifying the status of the Solent Waders & Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) site H34E which encompasses the whole application site. In the current iteration of the SWBGS the site is classified as a Secondary Support Area, based on the presence of up to 200 feeding Dark-bellied Brent Geese in the period 2007-2012. Based on these records the Secondary Support Area classification is justified. I note and acknowledge the detailed winter bird survey works undertaken by the applicant in the period 2011- 2021. I am confident that the proposed mitigation/enhancement measures would provide habitat attractive to Brent Geese in particular, in an area where they have traditionally occurred in significant numbers; development design shall accord with the mitigation hierarchy and seek avoidance of ecologically valuable features first including the retention and buffering of identified features of the local ecological network such as hedgerows and ditches that provide connectivity for wildlife within the site and beyond its boundaries; Landscaping shall enhance the local ecological network through the use of, for example, sustainable drainage systems such as surface swales and the use of native-led planting schemes that reflect the local landscape and are likely to support the species found in the locale; Ecological enhancement features shall be embedded within any new development (such as bat and bird boxes and other species-specific features).

Environmental Health (noise and pollution)

Initial response - no objection in principle; requires further information: a further noise assessment to be provided, covering any potential noise issues arising from the commercial premises to the south of the site, with any relevant mitigation measures stated, if so required; recommends conditions (CEMP; full acoustic assessment for heat pumps; external lighting, internal noise levels).

Final response – no response received.

HCC Archaeology – no objection, subject to conditions.

HCC Crime Prevention – no response received.

HCC Local Education Authority

Initial response - contribution required; Contribution towards the expansion of Mengham Infant and Junior Schools is necessary as without an expansion they will not be able to

accommodate the children from the development. The level of contribution being sought is based on the number of additional classrooms required to accommodate these children at the schools and therefore is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. This information is supported by the County Council's 'Planning for School Places Guidance Document' which sets out the methodology for assessing the impact of development on education infrastructure.

No contribution will be sought to provide additional secondary school places owing to the surplus places within the existing schools.

The proposed development of 29 dwellings would usually be expected to generate a total of 9 additional primary age children. This is based on a figure of 0.3 primary age children per new dwelling which was derived by conducting demographic surveys of developments that have been completed within Hampshire and calculating the average number of primary age children on those developments.

The development site is served by Mill Rythe Infant and Junior Schools but there is pupil movement between these schools and Mengham Infant and Junior Schools. The schools are forecast to be at capacity by the start of the 2025 academic year and forecast to remain full after that date without this proposed housing being taken into account. Consequently, additional primary school places will be needed to cater for the additional 9 pupils and a contribution is sought from the developer to pay for this expansion. Details of the forecasting methodology used, along with the current pupil numbers in the Hayling Island primary schools can be found at Appendix A.

Similarly Hayling College serves the proposed development but it can be noted in Appendix A that there is a sufficient number of secondary school places available to accommodate the yield from the proposed development. The County Council has used previous extension projects to derive a cost for the proposed expansion, and this is estimated at £186,561. This is based on the provision of an additional classroom to accommodate the pupils from this development. Details of how these costs were derived can be found in Appendix B. This will go towards any expansion to Mengham Infant and Junior Schools.

Final response – no contribution required; the development would be expected to generate a total of nine additional primary age children and six additional secondary age pupils. This is based on a rounded figure of 0.3 primary age children per new dwelling and 0.21 secondary age children per dwelling which was derived by conducting demographic surveys of developments that have been completed within Hampshire and calculating the average number of primary age children on those developments. The development site is served by Mill Rythe Infant School, Mill Rythe Junior School and The Hayling College.

Mill Rythe Infant School is forecast to have capacity. Mill Rythe Junior School is forecast to have capacity. The Hayling College is forecast to have capacity. I will not be seeking contributions towards Primary or Secondary education provision.

HCC Highways

Initial response – underprovision of car parking (a contribution towards TRO would be required); further information required: revised WCHAR, assessment of possibility of a provision of a direct connection between the eastern corner of the site and Charleston Close, from the site onto the Hayling Billy Trail, to consider the Station Road footway improvement options, updated PIA data, the cumulative impact of the development at the Manor Road roundabout and the A27 Langstone roundabout, and traffic modelling).

Final response – no objection, subject to conditions (details of the connection points to the Hayling Billy; a construction method statement) and legal agreement (implementation of site access works; contribution to deliver onward connection outside the site boundary to the

existing Hayling Billy pedestrian and cycle provision; a transport contribution to mitigate impact on the A3023); agrees the principle of a pedestrian/cycle connection to Charleston Close and Hayling Billy Trail; a Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment agreed subject to conditions and a proportionate financial contribution towards improvements of crossing facilities and pedestrian access to the Hayling Billy Trail at Station Road including at the junction of Staunton Avenue; the Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed development will not adversely impact highway safety.

To assess the cumulative traffic impact of the 4 developments (Rook Farm, Oysters, Saltmarsh and Fathoms Reach sites), a microsimulation model update was commissioned by the applicants utilising the Hayling Island Paramics model, originally developed for the 2019 Hayling Island Transport Assessment. This model was previously used to support the withdrawn Havant Local Plan and has since been updated with more recent traffic data and account of the summer peak period. The updated neutral month Paramics base model remained fit for purpose, with the summer model prioritised to capture peak seasonal conditions. HCC also recommended that the microsimulation modelling be supplemented with standalone junction capacity assessments at key locations, including A3023 Havant Road/Church Road (Mill Rythe Roundabout), A3023 Langstone Road/Northney Lane, A27/Langstone Road/Park Road South (Langstone Roundabout) and site-specific junctions such as St Mary's Road/Church Road/Tournerbury Lane for Rook Farm.

Following a review of the presented outputs, the local highway authority notes that overall the traffic modelling for this proposed development does not indicate a severe impact in terms of overall network performance, however there are material impacts when considered cumulatively under future scenarios, particularly Scenario 4 and the Scenario 4 Sensitivity Test. This includes increased journey times during peak periods and summer months on the A3023 Havant Road and material impact at the A27 Langstone Roundabout, principally on the Park Road approach and the circulatory. The Highway Authority considers these significant and therefore trigger the requirement for mitigation.

The cumulative harm of the developments also adds further strain and delay to sections of the A3023 Havant Road, at particular key junctions. Mitigation is required and the principles of measures that reduce journey time delay by promoting and enabling active travel provides an appropriate position for the mitigation of these future development on Hayling Island. Key priorities are improvements to Langstone Roundabout and the Hayling Billy improvement scheme, which aligns with the principles of sustainable transport and network resilience. Financial contributions towards these schemes will support modal shift, reduce car dependency, improve connectivity and network resilience.

On this basis and to address the identified cumulative impacts, a financial contribution will be required from the applicant towards the delivery of reasonable and necessary transport improvements based on a similar approach to the contribution secured at Sinah Lane (APP/18/00724).

HCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Initial response – no objection, subject to conditions (a detailed surface water drainage scheme; details of condition of the existing watercourse/balancing pond/sewer and any works required; details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system).

Interim response - if the application is granted, the site layout and scale should not be fixed at this stage until further assessment on the surface water flood risk and surface water drainage design has been concluded; the submitted flood risk assessment and drainage strategy reports should not be considered as approved documents and a detailed drainage strategy for the site will be required at reserved matters stage; a change to the proposed development scale and or layout may be required to resolve our concerns; a viable drainage strategy is

available for this site but there are a number of concerns and uncertainties; we believe these can be addressed by condition but recommend that the submitted flood risk assessment and drainage strategy documents are not considered as approved documents and the planning conditions are applied (details of surface water drainage scheme including a technical summary of the surface water drainage design. detailed drainage layout plans, catchment areas, referenced drainage features, manhole cover and invert levels and pipe diameters, lengths and gradients should be included, detailed drainage calculations to demonstrate existing runoff rates are not exceeded and there is sufficient attenuation for storm events up to and including 1:100 + climate change, detailed hydraulic calculations for all rainfall events, evidence that 10 % urban creep allowance has been included within the calculations, confirmation on how impacts of high groundwater will be managed in the design of the proposed drainage system to ensure that storage capacity is not lost, and structural integrity is maintained, confirmation that sufficient water quality measures have been included to satisfy the methodology in the Ciria SuDS Manual C753, exceedance plans demonstrating the flow paths and areas of ponding in the event of blockages or storms exceeding design criteria; the condition of the existing watercourse/balancing pond/sewer, which will take surface water from the development site, should be investigated before any connection is made and any necessary improvement to its condition as reparation, remediation, restitution and replacement should be undertaken, evidence of this, including photographs should be submitted; if necessary, evidence that the asset owner has agreed to the discharge rate and connection should be submitted before any connection is made; details for the long term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system).

Final response – the submitted information did not address our concerns, our previous comments remain.

Housing

Initial response – This proposal would need to comply with Core Strategy policy CS9. 2 and provide 30-40% affordable housing onsite; this would equate to a minimum of 8.7 units. The applicants have confirmed within their Planning Statement that their affordable provision will number 9 units and consist of:

Bedroom size	Type	Number
2	Apartment	4
2	House	2
3	House	3
TOTAL		9

As they are proposing 20 market dwellings, including 5no 4-bedroom homes, I would like to see consideration given to providing at least one of these larger homes within their affordable provision. I would expect to see a final tenure split 70% / 30% in favour of rented units, either Affordable Rent or Social Rent, with the remainder of the new affordable homes offered as Shared Ownership. Confirm the location within the site of the affordable units, and Confirm the exact internal floor area of each apartment/house type.

Final response – no response received.

Landscape

Initial response - concerns with the footpath on the west of the site landing directly into Hayling dirt jumps, this could create a tension with pedestrian and cyclists; a pedestrian/cycle link that connect to Charleston Close would help aid east/west connections and encourage sustainable transportation in line with HBC policies; HBC design guides must be adhered to in relation to the natural surveillance of the open space and the back to back distancing; soft landscaping should be utilised to create focal points within the site layout, UK native legacy trees should be used to when approaching north from Billy Road.

Final response – no response received.

Langstone Harbour Board - no objection

National Highways

A series of initial responses recommending that the application should not be approved for a period of 56 days from the date of the recommendation until such time as we have resolved the outstanding matters.

Final response – no objection; we were content with the Paramics base model and its use for forecasting, despite some identified limitations (e.g., MOVA not simulated at A27/Langstone Rd.). Strategic model runs (using Paramics) were undertaken to assess the impact of the four Hayling Island Applications cumulatively on both the SRN and local road network. Linsig models were also provided of the Langstone Interchange for NH's review, these used flows extracted from the strategic modelling.

We have reviewed both the Paramics and Linsig files and we are satisfied that the presented models demonstrate there will be no adverse impacts on the SRN or on the LRN that could impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. Scenario 4 of the modelling contained all the live Hayling Island Apps cumulatively.

Natural England

Initial response - further information required (a comprehensive mitigation package to address the partial loss of Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) Secondary Support Area H34E and the loss of previously secured mitigation measures for the approved The Oysters development, and details of how the mitigation will be secured for the lifetime of the development; an assessment of indirect and in-combination impacts to H34E and details of further mitigation measures where impacts are identified) once the above information is obtained, please consult Natural England on any appropriate assessment your authority may decide to make.

Final response - as submitted, the application could have potential significant effects on Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, Langstone Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); further information required in order to determine the significance of these impacts and the scope for mitigation (A Habitats Regulations Assessment; A Management and Monitoring Plan for the proposed overwintering bird mitigation strategy).

NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight Integrated Care Board (ICB)

A contribution of £19,952 towards increasing primary care infrastructure is necessary to make the application acceptable in planning terms; it is envisaged that the residents of the proposed development will register as patients with the Elms Practice and the Waterside Medical Practice; the current combined medical centres providing primary care have insufficient capacity and will not be able to absorb the increased patients arising from the proposed development; the Elms and Waterside Practices are currently oversubscribed and have recently taken on an additional 51.68m² of space within the health centre; there are further short-term options being considered to refurbish space into more fit for purpose facilities, which will help to accommodate anticipated population growth; medium term options would be to expand the health centre footprint into the car park; long terms options would be to relocate to a new site and new building; to account for other proposals that may come forward to increase primary care infrastructure in the affected geography, the contribution should be ringfenced for a future expansion project(s) relating to the practices and their PCNs, which can be drawn down once projects are viable, deliverable, and affordable to the practices.

Nutrient Team

Initial response - The applicant needs to submit a nutrient budget based on the 2022 Natural England methodology and guidance.

Final response – an up-to-date nutrient budget excel spreadsheet required.

Planning Policy

Initial comments – objection in principle, site outside urban boundary, comments regarding policy status, principle of development, Summertime transport implications of development on Hayling Island, Development Quality, Brent Geese and Waders.

Final comments - the proposal runs contrary to relevant NPPF policies in relation to areas at risk of flooding and coastal change, in particular because the proposal does not take account of the need to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change and does not avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change; comments regarding Emerging Development Plan and updated Evidence Base, the site lies outside the urban area as defined by policies CS17 and AL2 of the Development Plan restricting development in this location, except in exceptional circumstances.

The Council's Five Year Housing Land Supply Update (December 2024) indicates the Council has 1.8 years supply with a 20% buffer applied; even in the context of the 5-year supply position, a number of matters will have to be carefully addressed to support a departure from the development plan; comments in respect of Brent Geese and Waders and Tidal Flood Risk

On-site risk: the site lies in present day Flood Zone 1 (low risk). However, the National Flood Map for Planning indicates that in the future, with climate change taken into account, the site will be at risk. Although the Environment Agency publish the National Flood Map, they have indicated to the Council that the PfSH 2024 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides the most accurate picture of future risk. The SFRA indicates no increase in future tidal risk on the site. On this basis it has been agreed with the applicant that the sequential and exception tests are not required. A Flood Risk Assessment is required and has been provided. It is noted that Coastal Partners have found the FRA to be acceptable in showing how flood risk on the site will be mitigated.

Off-site risk: both the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the National Flood Map for Planning show that the single access road to Hayling Island, the A3023, is at risk of flooding, with significant increases expected in extent, depth and hazard in the future (see Part 4 – Havant Report, paragraphs 3.2.20- 3.2.24, and Appendix B maps). The SFRA (Part 4 – Havant Report, paragraph 6.11.8) recommends that this information should be taken into account in considering the suitability of further development on Hayling Island, with respect to tidal flood risk. It suggests that Havant Borough needs to be satisfied that proposals can be regarded as safe in the event that vehicular access to the mainland is not achievable. While a Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for Hayling Island has been developed by the Council's Coastal Partners and has been approved by the Environment Agency, it must be noted that funding for the schemes within it, which may mitigate the risk discussed above, has yet to be identified.

Paragraphs 163 and 164 of the NPPF are clear that the need to mitigate and adapt to climate change should be considered in preparing and assessing planning applications, taking into account the full range of potential climate change impacts. New development should be planned for in ways that avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change, and when new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures. Under these circumstances, the strategy for the emerging Local Plan is

to make no development allocations on Hayling Island. While that plan and the strategy within it hold limited weight in the determination of planning applications at this time and therefore should not be relied upon in the determination of this application, it is considered that the evidence and the recommendations within the evidence base, including the SFRA, are a material consideration. There is no information within the applicant's submission, nor evidence that the Council holds, which indicates that the risks identified by the SFRA have been considered or mitigated, and it is considered unlikely that this scheme in isolation could address those risks.

Portsmouth Water

No objection, the Catchment Management Team have reviewed this application, no adverse comment from a groundwater quality protection perspective.

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds – no response received.

Southern Water

Initial response – no objection; can provide foul sewage disposal to service the proposed development; requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul sewage; general comments re surface water connection; surface water: proposal to connect to the public sewer and SUDs; Informatives re surface water connection

Final response - no further comment at this time.

Traffic Team

Car parking underprovision would require financial contribution to secure TROs in the nearby area.

Trees

Initial response – no objection subject to conditions; Arb Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan will need to be provided.

Final response – no response received.

Waste (Norse) – 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: 33 (initial consultation: 22 March 2022), 122 (second consultation: 17 September 2025)

Number of site notices: 5

Statutory advertisement: Press Notice: 25 March 2022

As a result of two rounds of public consultation and during the course of the application, 146 objections have been received. Members should note that some residents commented more than once, and some households provided multiple representations.

Matters raised are as follows:

First consultation (2022)

Loss of countryside

Loss of productive agricultural land, loss of open space, urban sprawl, Hayling Island is overpopulated; Building on open land is not acceptable in times of climate change

Will negatively affect the identify, character and atmosphere of the Oysters development,

Infrastructure

Bridge over capacity for safety; increased use of bridge and the need for repair
Insufficient services (schools, doctor's surgeries, etc.), employment opportunities, inadequate water, waste and drainage infrastructure

Existing infrastructure already does not support local residents, businesses and tourist, further demand on the infrastructure will result in more inadequacy that will drive tourists and businesses away from Haying Island

No proposal for children's play area on site,

Highways and car parking

Traffic surveys were conducted during the pandemic when residents were at their homes most of the time and are not a true reflection of the situation

Traffic increase, emergency vehicles will get stuck in traffic jam, nearby roads experience traffic speeds higher than the speed limits,

Increase in traffic will increase air pollution,

Access roads are not adequate for the proposed volume of traffic, impact of additional traffic on the condition of Billy Road which is a private road maintained at the cost of the residents of Oysters development (so is the balancing pond),

Congestion in Havant is often caused by the traffic trying to get onto the island

Charleston Close cannot take any more on-street car parking

A breakdown / accident recovery service based on island is needed and should be funded by developers,

Access roads are within flood zones

Danger to pedestrians, cyclists, horseriders and horses

Cumulative impacts with other developments

Ecology

Impact on natural environment, impact on wildlife (bats, hedgehog, reptiles, there is a large population of slow worms), green spaces, light pollution,

Impact on nationally and internationally important sites and species, would reduce foraging and roosting resources for over-wintering Brent Geese and Waders, insufficient mitigation

proposed

Will reduce the Hayling Billy Nature Reserve,

Flooding and drainage

Building on open land will increase the risk of flooding, increase of flooding of existing properties in the area,

Connection to existing balancing pond inappropriate

Increased amount of stormwater being discharged into the harbours with negative effects on eutrophication

Insufficient Southern Water infrastructure to process waste water

Residential amenities

The site is in the middle of existing houses

Loss of privacy and outlook from neighbouring dwellings

Construction phase would cause anti-social behaviour, noise, dust and fume disruption to nearby residents, construction traffic would cause danger to children living in the Oysters development, contractor parking will be in Billy Road,

Impact on surrounding communities, loss of open space and wildlife will affect mental health of local residents,

Other

Inaccurate information provided in Design and Access Statement (incorrect planning policy reference, distances to local facilities and services)

A solar farm would be a better use of the site

Concerns over the ways the application was publicised

Re-consultation (2025)

Will take away the charm of Oyster estate.

Just down the road is a huge estate which is still being built. (Why build more)

The residents on this estate pay a service charge to the upkeep of road and landscaping. How will that work with the lorries and additional traffic?

Flood Risk

Any additional development will increase surface water runoff

Further pressure on existing flood defences. Of particular concern is the vulnerability of the island's sole access point, the bridge. In the event of flooding, this vital connection could be compromised, placing residents, businesses, and emergency services at serious risk.

Traffic Congestion, Access and Impact on the A27

The island suffers from significant traffic congestion, particularly at peak times and during holiday seasons. With only one road on and off the island, further housing development will worsen this situation.

The Highways Agency has already raised serious concerns about the junction with the A27 and the impact Hayling/Havant traffic has on this major route. Any extra cars generated by this development would exacerbate an already severe problem, reducing safety and network resilience.

This application must also be considered in the round with other pending developments at Fathoms Reach, Rook Farm, and Phase 2 of Pebble Walk. The cumulative effect of these applications will add unsustainable pressure to both local roads and the strategic road network.

Road Safety – Station Road

Station Road is already hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists. Between Jewsons and The West Town Inn, pavements are extremely narrow on both sides of the road, and there is a blind corner that reduces visibility for drivers and road users. My own children have both fallen into the road from their bikes at this location on separate occasions, which demonstrates how unsafe the current conditions are. An increase in traffic flow would significantly heighten these dangers, putting children and vulnerable road users at even greater risk.

Sewage Infrastructure

The existing sewage infrastructure on Hayling Island is already under strain and outdated; concerns about discharges into the surrounding waters; additional housing will exacerbate these problems, with negative consequences for both residents and the marine environment.

Healthcare Capacity

Local health services, particularly the doctors' surgery, are already stretched beyond capacity. Additional residents will place unsustainable pressure on an already overburdened system, making it harder for current and future residents to access essential healthcare.

Schools and services are already stretched

How will the ditches be maintained?

Environmental Impact – Brent Geese

The island and its surrounding habitats are an important feeding and roosting area for the internationally important population of Brent geese. Further development will threaten this protected species by disturbing their habitats and reducing available feeding grounds, in direct conflict with conservation priorities.

Legal right of access via Billy Road - Billy Road is a private road with no legal easements for additional development or through traffic. To date, our management company has not been formally approached about this matter, which suggests the applicant has not secured the necessary legal access rights. This is a critical omission that must be addressed.

Access to the site should be taken via adopted roads

Traffic impact on Billy Road - the document provides an estimate of 138 daily vehicular trips for the 29 dwellings, a substantial increase that would place a significant and unsustainable burden on Billy Road. This is particularly concerning as the document's own analysis of traffic impact is limited to the wider Hayling Island road network and does not consider the localised effect on Billy Road. Would result in increase in maintenance and repair fees to the existing resident responsible for the road.

Impact on safety of children leaving in Oyster Development

Parking

There are already vehicle parking problems along Billy Road, with many residents forced to park along the narrow road. It will be impossible for construction and delivery vehicles to safely use Billy Road as a thoroughfare, particularly during the construction period as the width is substantially inadequate. There is a probability that residents of the proposed new development and even members of the public would also park in Billy Road, should it be designated as the access road to the new development, thus exacerbating the existing parking problems.

The proposed plan goes beyond the boundary of the current Oysters estate (I have a document that shows the Oysters site extends beyond the residents fencing). It includes properties over the site of the drainage ditch and right up to the fence of current residents. This is land that is maintained by residents of the Oysters.

The plans also detail drainage into the pond which again the Oysters residents maintain.

Havant Local Plan does not contemplate or provide for any further residential development on Hayling Island due to flood risk to infrastructure and roads

Lack of Housing Demand

Recent changes to council tax rules have contributed to a dip in the housing market, leading to reduced local demand. The most recent new-build estate on the island remains incomplete, with properties still vacant. It would be both tragic and irresponsible to destroy another valuable green space for houses that may not even be sold. Development should only proceed where there is clear and proven need, which is not the case at present.

Will affect property prices

Insufficient time given for submitting public comments

7. Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan, the planning history of the site and all other material considerations, it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- 7.2
- (i) Principle of development and off-site tidal flood risk
 - (ii) Design and landscape
 - (iii) Impact on residential amenities
 - (iv) Impact on ecology and nature conservation sites
 - (v) Impact on highways
 - (vi) Drainage and flood risk
 - (vi) Other considerations

(i) Principle of development and off-site tidal flood risk

Development Plan

- 7.3 The Local Plan (Core Strategy) and the Local Plan (Allocations), together with the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan provide the development plan for the Borough.

Emerging Development Plan and updated evidence base

- 7.4 The Draft Building a Better Future Plan was subject to consultation in the Summer of 2025, supported by a number of evidence base studies which have updated the position on development requirements, land supply and constraints. Of particular relevance to this application are:

- The 5-year housing land supply update
- The development strategy in the Building a Better Future Plan
- The Sustainability Appraisal of the Building a Better Future Plan
- The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)
- The Council's Local Plan Sites SFRA.

Principle of development

- 7.5 The site lies outside the urban area as defined by policies CS17 and AL2 of the Development Plan. These policies seek to restrict development in these locations, except in exceptional circumstances. It is not considered that any of the exceptions for housing would apply here. Therefore, the residential proposal is a departure from the Development Plan.

Five Year Housing Land Supply

- 7.6 The Council's Five Year Housing Land Supply Update (December 2024) indicates the Council has 1.8 years supply with a 20% buffer applied. This is notably below the five year supply threshold. The proposed scheme is not in the five year supply in whole or part. A permission would therefore result in a gain of 29 units or 0.03 years towards the five-year housing supply requirement, as shown below.

Five year requirement with 20% buffer = 5,352 dwellings
Divided by 5 years = 1070.4 dwellings a year
29 dwellings / 1070.4 dwellings = 0.027 years

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) explains that planning applications should be granted in these circumstances, unless:

- policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so.

Noting this, even in the context of the 5-year supply position, a number of matters have to be carefully addressed to support a departure from the development plan. Key points are discussed below, focussing on the areas defined in footnote 7 to paragraph 11 of the NPPF as assets of particular importance.

- 7.7 *Off-site tidal flood risk*

- 7.8 Both the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the National Flood Map for Planning show that the single access road to Hayling Island, the A3023, is at risk of flooding, with significant increases expected in extent, depth and hazard in the future (see Part 4 – Havant Report, paragraphs 3.2.20- 3.2.24, and Appendix B maps). The SFRA

(Part 4 – Havant Report, paragraph 6.11.8) recommends that this information should be taken into account in considering the suitability of further development on Hayling Island, with respect to tidal flood risk. It suggests that the Council needs to be satisfied that proposals can be regarded as safe in the event that vehicular access to the mainland is not achievable.

- 7.9 While a Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for Hayling Island has been developed by the Council's Coastal Partners and has been approved by the Environment Agency, it must be noted that funding for the schemes within it, which may mitigate the risk discussed above, has yet to be identified.
- 7.10 Paragraphs 163 and 164 of the NPPF are clear that the need to mitigate and adapt to climate change should be considered in preparing and assessing planning applications, taking into account the full range of potential climate change impacts.
- 7.11 New development should be planned for in ways that avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change, and when new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures.
- 7.12 This is considered in more detail in the "*Off-site tidal flood risk*" section of this report (paragraphs 7.112 to 7.121).
- 7.13 *Conclusion on the principle of development*
- 7.14 The Council's substantial shortfall in 5-year housing land supply is not disputed and is a significant consideration. Notably, however, the caveats in paragraph 11d i) and ii) of the NPPF must be carefully weighed up in the planning balance, together with all other relevant material considerations.
- 7.15 Footnote 7 of the NPPF specifically identifies categories of development which benefit from the caveat at 11di) - 'areas at risk of flooding and coastal change' are one such category. Flood risk therefore represents a special consideration when applying the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. In light of this, the Local Planning Authority considers that tilted balance in favour of sustainable development is therefore disengaged in this case.
- 7.16 In relation to flood risk it is considered that the proposal runs contrary to relevant NPPF policies in relation to areas at risk of flooding and coastal change, in particular because the proposal does not take account of the need to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change and does not avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change [in this case climate change related flood risk to Hayling Island]. (NPPF 163/164).

(ii) Design and landscape

- 7.17 The application site is an undeveloped arable field enclosed by trees and hedge planting on its western boundary beyond which is the Hayling Billy Coastal Path. To the north of the site are areas of agricultural land, beyond which are dwellings in Saltmarsh Lane. To the east are residential dwellings in Dances Way and Charleston Close as well as an attenuation pond constructed in association with the residential development of Oysters, which abuts the application site to the south. A small proportion of the southern boundary is adjacent to the Furniss Business Park which houses light industry businesses. The topography of the site is generally flat with a subtle land slope towards the east.
- 7.18 Whilst the Hayling Billy Coastal Path offers more dense boundary planting, there are

gaps in the vegetation which provide clear views into the site and beyond, including the views of the existing dwellings in Saltmarsh Lane and West Lane, Glebe Close and Charleston Close. Due to the topography of the site and the limited vegetation within it and within the fields to the north, the application site is also visible from the existing dwellings mentioned above.

- 7.19 It is noted that the existing dwellings surrounding the application site are predominantly detached and semi-detached, two storey dwellings. The Oysters development also consists of some terraced dwellings.
- 7.20 The dwellings in Charleston Close are situated in relatively generous plots offering ample frontages accommodating off-street car parking, planting and limited boundary enclosures. The sizes of the rear gardens vary, however, they are mostly of generous size. The dwellings in the nearby area are predominantly of traditional proportions and appearance. The above features create an attractive, verdant residential environment characterized by a feel of spaciousness.
- 7.21 As explained above, the only part of the proposed development that is under consideration under this application is the access onto the application site. Other elements of the proposed development are shown in illustrative form to indicate how a development of up to 29 dwellings, together with associated infrastructure, could be accommodated within the application site. These proposals provide an overview of the possible layout, scale, landscape strategy, etc. however, the detailed assessment of these features is reserved to a later, reserved matters stage and are not considered under this submission.
- 7.21 The indicative masterplan indicates that the proposed vehicular and pedestrian access into the site would lead from Billy Road into the site and would terminate at a T-junction, with the internal road running horizontally west-east within the site and then turning further north within the eastern parts of the site. The plan demonstrates that the proposed dwellings would be arranged into a linear development within the southern part of the site and a perimeter block within the north-eastern part of the site, with one building being situated within the northernmost part in its own setting.
- 7.22 The submission clarifies that the proposal could include 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings served by a total of 40 car parking spaces. The Planning Statement states that the units would be houses varying between 1.5, 2 and 2.5 storeys in height. The dwellings would be served by off-street car parking spaces, modest frontages and rear gardens. The external appearance would likely be traditional to reflect the established local character.
- 7.23 The development would result in a loss of a number of Category 3 trees, however, replacement trees would be proposed to compensate for any losses. Additional planting together with pedestrian footpaths are indicated on the northern, eastern and western boundaries, including a pedestrian link with the Hayling Billy Coastal Path. Water attenuation features and a pumping station would be located in the north-eastern parts of the site.
- 7.24 In light of the above considerations, it is considered that the proposed development would bring a significant change to the character and landscape of the site. Both landscape and visual impacts would be significant due to the proposed development, including its features such as buildings, gardens and roads, replacing a rural, greenfield landscape pattern. This significant change in the character of the site and the intrinsic beauty of the undeveloped, countryside site would be eroded to some extent. However, it is noted that the site is not covered by any statutory or non-statutory landscape designations, which receive a greater degree of protection in the NPPF and, whilst the urbanisation of the site would not contribute positively to the landscape setting, there are existing characteristics of the site and its surroundings which would mitigate this

harm and also measures could be taken to limit the degree of harm.

- 7.25 It is noted that the proposed development would be adjacent to the northern edge of the Oysters development and residential streets of Dances Way and Charleston Close to the east, rather than being an isolated development. The resultant urban grain of the proposed development would be comparable to the urban grain of the existing nearby areas.
- 7.26 Whilst it would normally be expected for the edges of a proposed development meeting the countryside to be characterised by looser density with higher proportion of soft landscaping appropriate for an urban fringe location, it is noted that the proposal would sufficiently resemble in this regard the above existing developments, which currently forms the edge of the built form.
- 7.27 The internal roads serving the proposed development would not be different to those in the existing settlement. There is no reason to believe that, at a reserved matters stage, a detailed design of dwellings could not be agreed to be in keeping with the predominant character of the existing dwellings. Therefore, the proposed development would not appear out of character or fundamentally different to its immediate surroundings.
- 7.28 The proposal would provide additional tree and hedgerow planting across and on the northern, western and eastern edges of the site. A robust planting scheme would be expected on the western boundary to reduce views into the site and maintain the character of the Hayling Billy Coastal Path. In light of the above, Officers conclude that the proposal as shown on the indicative plans could achieve a verdant appearance with appropriate mitigation measures, that would soften its impact on and satisfactorily integrate with the surrounding landscape.
- 7.29 Visually, being located adjacent to the existing development in Saltmarsh Lane and West Lane, the proposed development would not appear to be isolated or remote from the settlement. From many vantage points, it would appear in the context of the existing housing. The retention of boundary screening with further planting would also limit visual effects of the proposal.
- 7.30 Overall, Officers conclude that, whilst the character of the site would change, subject to appropriate boundary screening, this would be largely confined to the site area itself and not the wider countryside, in particular in light of the application site being already adjacent to existing housing. The localised visual and landscape effects of the proposal would reduce the degree of harm to an acceptable level. The existing agricultural fields to the north would remain contributing towards the wider landscape setting.
- 7.31 In light of the absence of objection from the Council's Tree and Landscape Officers and subject to planning conditions relevant to detailed design, external materials, lighting scheme, trees, soft and hard landscaping, Officers conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area, including the landscape setting.
- 7.32 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to approve this application then the above detail would have been secured with planning conditions and a legal agreement.

(iii) Impact on residential amenities

- 7.33 The proposed Illustrative Masterplan indicates that properties within the southern part of the site would be positioned in a linear arrangement with residential gardens abutting the southern boundary. The dwellings would be located at least 10m away from the rear boundaries which would be in line with the requirements of the Design SPD. The

existing properties abutting this boundary benefit from no windows directly facing the proposed development or are set away a sufficient distance away to achieve required separation distances required to avoid any harmful loss of privacy or overlooking.

- 7.34 The properties within the northern part of the site would be arranged within a perimeter block with 10m gardens. Internal layout and associated fenestration would be expected to be designed to avoid any harmful loss of privacy or overlooking.
- 7.35 It has been indicated on the Illustrative Masterplan that the northernmost part of the site would accommodate an apartment block, however, no information has been provided at this stage on the scale of the dwelling. At reserved matters stage, it would be expected to be designed to avoid any harmful loss of privacy or overlooking in relation to the existing dwelling at 26 Charleston Close.
- 7.36 In terms of other impacts such as upon light or outlook, the layout has been designed to avoid any harmful impacts to existing properties as well as the properties within the site.
- 7.37 Any forthcoming submission of reserved matters application would be expected to demonstrate that the proposed dwellings meet, as a minimum, the national technical guidance for internal space standards.
- 7.38 In terms of noise impacts, the Environmental Health Officer reviewed this submission and raised no objection. It has been noted that the submitted noise assessment makes no reference to the potential noise impacts from the Furniss Way Business Centre and the other commercial properties opposite this centre, especially on the proposed dwellings within the south-western parts of the site.
- 7.39 However, Officers note that there are already residential dwellings located close to the potential noise source, including those within the relatively recently completed Oysters development. No comments have been made in relation to any noise disturbance complaints received by the Environmental Health Team from the adjacent dwellings. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that the proposed development could not provide appropriate noise attenuation measures, if required, at the detailed design stage (reserved matters). It is noted that no objection has been raised on this basis. Therefore, had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then a planning condition would have been imposed to ensure that details of noise attenuation measures have been provided for approval.
- 7.40 In addition the Environmental Health Officer has recommended conditions securing details of external lighting across the site, the requirement for any potential on-site air source heat pump proposals to be accompanied by an acoustic assessment alongside relevant mitigation measures to ensure no impact on existing and new neighbouring residential receptors, and the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan providing details including but not limited to working hours, deliveries and removal of plant, machinery and waste, control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants, noise and lighting. Finally, a condition has been recommended specifying expected standards for indoor ambient noise levels, especially in living rooms and bedrooms during the day and night, as well as for external amenity areas, such as gardens and patios.
- 7.41 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then these requirements would have been secured with appropriately worded planning conditions.

(iv) Impact on ecology and nature conservation sites

- 7.42 During the course of the application, the application site has been subject to desk-

based and field-based ecological assessments in 2020/21, with surveys for overwintering birds undertaken and supplemented by survey information arising from the adjacent Oysters development to the south. Climbed tree inspections, walked transects and automated monitoring have also been undertaken.

- 7.43 The application is accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment (Tyler Grange, July 2025) and a Brent Goose and Wader Mitigation Strategy (Tyler Grange, April 2025) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (Tyler Grange, July 2025).

- 7.44 The site comprises an area of arable-dominated land with associated semi-improved grassland, hedgerows, trees, scrub and ditches.

On-site habitats

- 7.45 The Council's Ecologist has reviewed the submission and confirmed that the on-site habitats are of relatively low ecological value. The bulk of the site comprises arable farmland and is of limited ecological value. There is a small area of species-poor grassland at the arable margins. There are typical agricultural hedgerows with trees in various boundary locations, and drainage ditches present in the site's centre and southern boundaries. Furthermore, the Ecologist has confirmed that the site conditions have remained consistent through the various years of assessment and that the potential ecological constraints are well understood. The site is not of exceptional ecological importance and contains a typical range of generally species-poor habitats found on farmland on Hayling Island. The key features are the various ditches as well as boundary hedgerows and scrub. These habitats do support populations of protected and notable species, most notably common reptile species.
- 7.46 The indicative proposals include the retention of boundary vegetation, with mature trees and hedgerows retained and an area of SuDS and apparent semi-natural habitat in the northern central section of the site. The outline nature of the application means that there are minimal details on landscaping or trees. At reserved matters stage, the development would be expected to be designed to accord with the mitigation hierarchy and seek avoidance of ecologically valuable features first, including the retention and buffering of identified features of the local ecological network such as hedgerows and ditches that provide connectivity for wildlife within the site and beyond its boundaries.
- 7.47 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then appropriate planning conditions setting out parameters for the detailed development would be imposed, including requirements for landscaping to enhance the local ecological network through the use of, for example, sustainable drainage systems such as surface swales and the use of native-led planting schemes that reflect the local landscape and are likely to support the species found in the locale.
- 7.48 In respect of species on site, surveys have been carried out for roosting bats, bat activity, Great Crested Newt, Badgers and wintering birds. Walked bat transect and automated surveys have highlighted the presence of several bat species within the site, with activity unsurprisingly dominated by Pipistrelle species. There is no evidence of roosting on site, with two trees offering roosting potential and surveys of these recording no roost evidence. Bat activity in general is typically concentrated around structured linear features. The Council's Ecologist is content that sufficient bat survey information is presented.
- 7.49 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then a suitable lighting strategy would have been secured with a planning condition to ensure that habitats likely to be used by bats would not be subject to artificial illumination. In addition, ecological enhancements such as integral bat roosting units within new dwellings and ambitious levels of enhancement would have been secured with planning

conditions.

- 7.50 The Council's Ecologist has noted that the site supports a population of Slow-worms and Common Lizard, recorded within grassy margins. The proposed development would remove the vast majority of reptile habitat and therefore a suitable alternative compensatory habitat would be required on or off-site. At this stage, no firm detail has been provided to clarify the size of any compensatory reptile habitats needed to be accommodated within the site.
- 7.51 In terms of the options available to accommodate such habitats, the Illustrative Masterplan indicates narrow strips of land on the edges of the site to remain undeveloped with only ditches/swales running within the northern parts of the site. The residential element of the proposal is dense with the garden lengths only meeting (and not exceeding) the required garden length. The Masterplan, at this stage, does not indicate the size of the proposed dwellings in order to estimate the required car parking provision and to provide clarity how much land this would require. At this outline stage, the Highways Authority does not comment on the internal road network, in terms of required road and footpath widths, turning places etc. Therefore, there is no certainty that the final built development can be contained within its current extent.
- 7.52 Overall, the proposed site layout is compact and the only open spaces within the site that could act as potential reptile habitats are on the northern, eastern and western edges of the site. If the built element of the proposed development needed to be shifted towards those edges, for example in order to create more space to accommodate appropriate widths of roads and/or car parking provision, this would further reduce available land for reptile habitat. Therefore, due to the compact nature of the proposed layout, there is no sufficient certainty at this stage that the proposed site can satisfactorily accommodate the proposed number of dwellings, together with associated infrastructure, and the potential reptile habitats.
- 7.53 Subject to appropriate detail, off-site habitats could be considered acceptable, however, at this stage no such detail has been provided. As off-site mitigation, including long-term maintenance, would have to be secure with a legal agreement, the relevant detail would have to be agreed at this outline stage.

Waders and Brent Geese

- 7.54 The site is included in the current Solent Waders & Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) as Site H34E. The site is classified as a Secondary Support Area, based on the presence of up to 200 feeding Dark-bellied Brent Geese in the period 2007-2012. The application site is therefore valuable supporting habitat for wintering birds and is functionally linked to the nearby Solent Special Protection Areas (SPAs).
- 7.55 The proposal would result in the loss of the southern portion of SWBGS Site H34E. In order for this loss to be judged acceptable, an appropriate mitigation/compensation package would be required.
- 7.56 In line with previous consultation comments, the submitted Brent Goose and Wader Mitigation Strategy (Tyler Grange, April 2025) is essentially unchanged from that previously submitted and discussed in 2022, 2023 and 2025, and has been subject to detailed discussion with Natural England officers and the Council's Ecologist. The principle of utilising 4.21ha of land to the south and east of Mill Rythe Junior School as mitigation remains agreed in principle, and the strategy provides further details on what, in practice, is proposed in order to ensure the Mill Rythe land provides a functional off-site habitat for bird species. In essence, the strategy entails the cessation of certain land use activities at the Mill Rythe site, alongside some enhancements.

- 7.57 It is also noted that the Mill Rytte site, particularly if subject to some flooding in winter, may be of some botanical interest in terms of coastal/saline grassland – this would not affect mitigation plans but it could influence the management techniques.
- 7.58 Overall, the Council's Ecologist considers the proposed management changes - cessation of dog walking activities, better grassland management, boundary strengthening - to be achievable mitigation and enhancement measures to Solent Waders & Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) Core Site H50C. The proposed mitigation/enhancement measures would provide habitat attractive to Brent Geese in particular, in an area where they have traditionally occurred in significant numbers. The principle of providing permanent habitat in key locations (as opposed to intermittently available habitat) is a central thread of the SWBGS. The current activities on Site H50C are detailed, as are other factors that may render the site unattractive to wintering birds.
- 7.59 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then a Habitat Regulations Assessment/Appropriate Assessment (HRA/AA) would have been carried out by the Local Planning Authority as the competent authority in respect of likely significant effects on nature designated sites, which would include a review of proposed mitigation measures designed to off-set any significant impacts. A legal agreement with the applicant would have been required to secure the submission of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan detailing ecological avoidance, mitigation, enhancement and management measures as detailed in the Ecological Impact Assessment (Tyler Grange, July 2025) and including full details of all on-site and off-site ecological avoidance and mitigation measures, to include timings, methods and responsibilities; full details of all ecological compensation and enhancement measures, including location, area, composition, establishment and ongoing management, monitoring and responsibilities.
- 7.60 In terms of construction-phase activities impacting the refuge, had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then a pre-commencement planning condition would have been required to secure the submission of a Construction Environment Management Plan detailing specific measures to avoid or mitigate potential impact pathways affecting ecological features and especially the adjacent Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site and their interest features and also including roles, responsibilities and methods.

Impact on nature designated sites and nutrient neutrality

- 7.61 Natural England as a statutory consultee has confirmed that the proposed development could have a likely significant effect on:
- Solent and Dorset Coast SPA
 - Portsmouth Harbour SPA and Ramsar Site
 - Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA
 - Solent Maritime SAC
 - Solent and Southampton Water SPA
- 7.62 The proposal would result in the net gain of 29 dwellings which need 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 29 dwellings.

- 7.63 Using Natural England's updated Methodology, the planning application requires two packages of avoidance and mitigation. 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.
- 7.64 Appropriate information has been submitted with the application when it was first submitted in 2022 to demonstrate that the applicant would be willing to provide an adequate mitigation package in respect of nutrient neutrality and recreational disturbance. Whilst no updated nutrient budget calculator was submitted with the recent resubmission, there is no reason to believe that the applicant would not be willing to provide the required information.
- 7.65 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then this information would have been requested. Any mitigation package would have been a subject to an HRA/AA in consultation with Natural England, and would have been secured with a legal agreement and planning conditions.

(v) Impact on highways

Site Access

- 7.66 The submission clarifies that vehicular access onto the site is to be provided from Billy Road, which is an unadopted road. The existing 5.5m carriageway would be extended and 2m footways would be provided for pedestrian connections into the site.
- 7.67 The Highway Authority has reviewed the proposal and confirmed that appropriate visibility splays would be achievable, subject to acceptable internal layout being proposed at reserved matters stage.
- 7.68 Third party concerns have been raised over connection onto Billy Road which is an unadopted road, maintained at an expense of the residents of Oysters development. The planning agent confirmed that the applicant, namely Hayling Island Builders, who also developed the existing Oysters development, retained appropriate rights within the existing development to enable the proposed development. This includes rights to connect the proposed access onto Billy Road as well as to provide a drainage connection to the existing pond.
- 7.69 Similar, in respect of refuse/servicing, specific details would be assessed at reserved matters stage.

Sustainable Access

- 7.70 In addressing the Highway Authority's original comments, the applicant has confirmed that a pedestrian/cycle connection up to the site boundary between the eastern corner of the site and Charleston Close and on the western boundary towards the Hayling Billy would be possible. Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then the principle of such connections would have been secured with a legal agreement and specific detail conditioned to be submitted at reserved matters stage.
- 7.71 *Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review*
- 7.72 In response to original comments from the Highway Authority, the applicant submitted a Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review (WCHAR) concluding that existing infrastructure is sufficient to support sustainable travel for prospective occupiers of the proposed development. The applicant has proposed to provide a

proportionate financial contribution towards improvements of crossing facilities and pedestrian access to the Hayling Billy Trail at Station Road including at the junction of Staunton Avenue. The Highway Authority considers this matter to be acceptably addressed and recommends that the contribution is secured with a legal agreement.

- 7.73 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then an appropriate financial contribution would have been secured with a legal agreement.

Personal Injury Accidents (PIA)

- 7.74 The application is accompanied by an updated 5-year personal injury data for the period from 2019-2023. Based on the reviewed accident history the Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely impact highway safety.

Trip Generation

- 7.75 The Highway Authority agrees that Beech Grove development trip rates are appropriate to be used on this site, which is consistent with other assessment within Hayling Island. The trip rates would be as shown below:

	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)			PM Peak (17:00-18:00)			12- Hour Total
	Arr.	Dept.	Total	Arr.	Dept.	Total.	
Trip Rate (1 dwelling)	0.14 9	0.305	0.454	0.32 0	0.230	0.550	4.77 0
Trip Generation (29 dwellings)	4	9	14	10	7	17	143

Traffic Distribution/Assignment & Junction Modelling

- 7.77 In terms of Traffic Distribution/Assignment, the submission sets out that 6.4% of trips would stay on Hayling Island, 17.2% of trips would direct onto Park Road North/South, 7.8% of trips would direct onto A27 East, 43.2% of trips would direct onto A27 West and 25.4% of trips would direct onto the A3(M). It is noted that the 93.6% of trips that would leave Hayling Island would use the A3023 towards the A27 roundabout.
- 7.78 Furthermore, the submission provides details of the Billy Road/Station Road junction modelling, including future traffic forecast, suggesting that the junction would operate well within capacity considering the addition of development traffic. The Highway Authority has agreed the methodology and the findings of the modelling.

Summertime Traffic and Strategic Highway Modelling

- 7.79 The Highway Authority has requested in 2022 further information in relation to impacts on the strategic road network, in particular at the Manor Road roundabout and the A27 Langstone Roundabout. The Inspector examining the emerging Local Plan at that time also highlighted the need to assess impacts during seasonal peak hours. Other outstanding applications (Rook Farm, Fathoms Reach and Saltmarsh Lane) also needed to be included in this assessment. Since then, the Highway Authority, Havant Borough Council (HBC) and National Highways have been actively engaged in order to agree an appropriate methodology for undertaking traffic modelling using the Hayling Island microsimulation model in order to assess the cumulative impacts of the four live planning applications.
- 7.80 The applicants commissioned an update to the microsimulation model which was

based on the Hayling Island Paramics model (a 3D traffic simulation software used by transport professionals to design, evaluate, and present solutions for traffic and road networks), originally developed for the 2019 Hayling Island Transport Assessment used to support the withdrawn Havant Local Plan. The Model has been updated with more recent traffic data and account of the summer peak period.

- 7.81 During the course of the application, the Highway Authority confirmed that the updated neutral month Paramics base model remained fit for purpose, with the summer model prioritised to capture peak seasonal conditions.
- 7.82 It was also requested that the microsimulation modelling be supplemented with standalone junction capacity assessments, including A3023 Havant Road/Church Road (Mill Rythe Roundabout), A3023 Langstone Road/Northney Lane, A27/Langstone Road/Park Road South (Langstone Roundabout).
- 7.83 The Highway Authority has reviewed the outputs from the agreed model and noted that the traffic modelling for this proposed development does not indicate a severe impact in terms of overall network performance. There are material traffic impacts when considering future scenarios including the impacts of the four applications together, whereby increased journey times have been identified during peak periods and summer months on the A3023 Havant Road and material impact at the A27 Langstone Roundabout. The Highway Authority confirmed that these impacts would require mitigation. It was noted that the cumulative harm of the four developments would add further strain and delay to sections of the A3023 Havant Road, at particular key junctions.
- 7.84 The Highway Authority has concluded that, in order to address the identified cumulative impacts, financial contributions towards schemes supporting modal shift, reduce car dependency, improve connectivity and network resilience would be required.
- 7.85 Therefore, in order to make this proposal acceptable in highways terms, the Highway Authority have requested that a contribution is secured towards measures that reduce journey time delay by promoting and enabling active travel. Improvements to the Langstone Roundabout (focusing on bus and capacity improvements for access to the strategic network as well as crossings improvements/additional crossings and surface/route improvements) and the Hayling Billy improvement scheme have been identified as the key focus areas.
- 7.86 In conclusion on general highways matters, the Highway Authority has raised no objection to the application subject to conditions and a legal agreement securing, among other matters, a provision of connection points to the Hayling Billy trail and a contribution towards provision of onward connection outside the site boundary to the existing Hayling Billy pedestrian and cycle provision; and a transport contribution arising from the cumulative harm of the development to mitigate its impact on the A3023 with the monies secured towards:
- Delivery of the Hayling Billy Improvement Study Work
 - Measures at Langstone Roundabout to reduce delay
 - Other measures along the A3023 corridor which seek to reduce car dependence and manage journey time reliability along the corridor.

In separate correspondence the Highway Authority clarified that a connection with Charleston Close is also requested to be secured with a legal agreement and a planning condition. Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then this recommendation would have been followed. In addition, any binding arrangements would have to be secured in respect of the fact that the connection onto Hayling Billy would be provided across the Council's owned land.

These arrangements would include any requirements for ecological assessment and mitigation.

- 7.87 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then the recommended conditions and developers' obligations would have been recommended to be secured with appropriately worded planning conditions and a legal agreement.

- 7.88 In respect of the impacts on the strategic highway network, in particular the A27/Langstone Road/Park Road South junction, the National Highways has confirmed that:

- 7.89 *"we were content with the Paramics base model and its use for forecasting, despite some identified limitations (e.g., MOVA not simulated at A27/Langstone Rd.). Strategic model runs (using Paramics) were undertaken to assess the impact of the four Hayling Island Applications cumulatively on both the SRN and local road network. Linsig models were also provided of the Langstone Interchange for NH's review, these used flows extracted from the strategic modelling.*

We have reviewed both the Paramics and Linsig files and we are satisfied that the presented models demonstrate there will be no adverse impacts on the SRN or on the LRN that could impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. Scenario 4 of the modelling contained all the live Hayling Island Apps cumulatively. Therefore, on this basis, National Highways offer 'No Objection to application APP/21/01351.'

- 7.90 Considering the above position, Officers conclude that, in the absence of objection from the National Highways, refusing the application on the basis of impact on the strategic road network would not be sustainable.

(v) Drainage and flood risk

Flood Risk on site

7. 91 The site lies in present day Flood Zone 1 (low risk). However, the National Flood Map for Planning indicates that in the future, with climate change taken into account, the site will be at risk of tidal flooding. Although the Environment Agency publish the National Flood Map, they have indicated to the Council that the PfSH 2024 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides the most accurate picture of future risk. The SFRA indicates no increase in future tidal risk on the site.
- 7.92 There are also small areas under surface water flood risk. These are mainly on the edges of the site.
- 7.93 On this basis it has been agreed with the applicant that the sequential and exception tests are not required.
- 7.94 A Flood Risk Assessment is required and has been provided. It is noted that Coastal Partners have found the FRA to be acceptable in showing how flood risk on the site will be mitigated.

Surface water flooding: drainage proposals

- 7.95 In respect of surface water flooding, the applicant has provided a number of revised versions of a Flood Risk Assessment and a Drainage Strategy. In principle, the drainage strategy for the site includes a new attenuation pond and a swale within the application site. The attenuated surface water would be then discharged at a reduced run off rate to the existing watercourse or to the attenuation pond located within the existing Oysters development. All rainwater would be treated before entering the watercourse. Surface

water would be further reduced through the use of porous surfacing within parking bays and private drives. Rainwater from roof areas would be discharged directly onto porous surfacing or via diffusers into the clean stone beneath the porous surfacing.

- 7.96 The final outfall would be into either the adjacent watercourse or into the existing attenuation pond. The existing watercourse would be improved and any sections within the site that are already culverted would be improved and pipework replaced, if necessary.
- 7.97 It is intended to culvert the existing watercourse on the southern boundary of the site due to secure by design constraints on the proposed dwellings. If this was not possible, the watercourse could be diverted to the front of the properties.
- 7.98 At reserved matters stage, the drainage strategy would also be required to include measures to deal with any exceedance flows to improve resilience and minimise risk.
- 7.99 The foul water for the development would be discharged into the existing public sewer.
- 7.100 In terms of connection to the Southern Water network, Southern Water commented on the application and confirmed that there would be adequate capacity in the local sewerage network to accommodate foul flows from the proposed development.
- 7.101 In terms of surface water discharge, Southern Water requires the applicant to consider SUDs options starting from dealing with water on site, only then considering a connection to a watercourse, then to a storm sewer and, as the last resort, to a combined sewer.
- 7.102 Therefore, the applicant would be expected to engage with Southern Water before designing the final details of the drainage strategy on the site.

Surface water flooding: Lead Local Flood Authority assessment of the proposed drainage proposals

- 7.103 In respect of surface water drainage, the application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (1140 Rev 4.0 CGV Transport Consultants Ltd 21 July 2025) and a Drainage Strategy (1140 Rev 2.0 CGV Transport Consultants Ltd 24 July 2025) which were subject to revisions since their original submission.
- 7.104 The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) was consulted on the submission. In their final comments, the LLFA have noted that the submitted flood risk assessment included updated flood risk mapping following publication of the EA NaFRA2 data earlier this year. Although the areas of identified surface water flood risk changed, the assessment within the FRA did not. Review of the EA surface water flood maps indicated areas of the site that are subject to low risk of surface water flooding. This flood risk did not appear to have been taken into account and should be considered when determining the site layout.
- 7.105 In respect of the existing pond outside the site boundary, the drainage layout plan in the above drainage strategy document still indicated the outfall into the existing pond. This raised some concerns as the balancing pond is outside the application boundary, it was unclear whether the pond is currently receiving surface water from the site, and the applicant did not submit any information on the existing pond and local watercourses to demonstrate that the proposed discharge rates could be managed.
- 7.106 Furthermore, hydraulic calculations did not consider the possible effect of flood locking as a result of a submerged outfall. There did not appear to be space in the current proposed site layout to accommodate larger surface water storage features if required.

- 7.107 The application proposes to pipe or divert the existing watercourse. The LLFA did not consider this to be acceptable based on initial review. The existing connections into the watercourse identified by the topographic survey were not considered.
- 7.108 Following review of the existing greenfield runoff calculation and the proposed post development causeway flow hydraulic calculations the LLFA have concluded that the proposed discharge rate for the site was not acceptable. The greenfield runoff calculation used the site area of 1.1ha whereas the hydraulic calculations use an estimated total impermeable area of 0.189ha. As the areas used in the calculations differed, the pre and post development discharge rates were not comparable and therefore the applicant did not demonstrate that the discharge rate from the site would not be increased as a result of the development. The LLFA has confirmed that the drainage design was not in accordance with best practice or the National Standard for SuDS referenced in paragraph 7.2.7 of the above drainage strategy report in that only runoff from impermeable areas was considered in the hydraulic calculations. A catchment based approach to drainage design in which all areas that are likely to contribute to the flow in the drainage network were expected to be considered. Runoff from permeable areas including gardens, shared green spaces and SuDS features should not be ignored.
- 7.109 The LLFA has further noted that the allowance for urban creep was reduced from 10% (as previously proposed) to 5%. No justification was provided for this change in value.
- 7.110 In light of the above, the LLFA has advised that, if the application is granted planning permission, the site layout and scale should not be fixed at this stage until further assessment on the surface water flood risk and surface water drainage design has been concluded. Furthermore, the LLFA has also advised that, if the application is approved, the submitted flood risk assessment and drainage strategy reports should not be considered as approved documents and a detailed drainage strategy for the site would be required at reserved matters stage. The LLFA consider that a change to the proposed development scale and/or layout may be required to resolve the above concerns.
- 7.111 In response to these comments, a revised Drainage Strategy (1139 Rev 3.0 CGV Transport Consultants Ltd October 2025) and a Flood Risk Assessment (1139 Rev 5.0 CGV Transport Consultants Ltd October 2025) were submitted. However, the LLFA commented that the revised information did not address their previous concerns and their recommendation remain unchanged.
The LLFA did not raise an objection, however, recommended that the number of dwellings is not approved at this stage due to the fact that an acceptable drainage strategy may require additional land. Therefore, Officers conclude that the submission does not successfully demonstrate that up to 60 dwellings together with associated, policy compliant infrastructure, can be satisfactorily accommodated on the application site. Therefore, the application is not considered acceptable in terms of surface water drainage.

Off-site tidal flood risk

- 7.112 Both the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the National Flood Map for Planning show that the single access road to Hayling Island, the A3023, is at risk of flooding, with significant increases expected in extent, depth and hazard in the future (see Part 4 – Havant Report, paragraphs 3.2.20- 3.2.24, and Appendix B maps). The Coastal Partner's Hayling Island Coastal Management Strategy (Option Development Unit, ODU16 which covers the area from Langstone Bridge Carpark to Langstone Bridge and includes the northern part of the A3023 access road onto the island) has identified that without defences in place the flood cell could merge with adjacent flood cells to the

east and west during larger return period events. In this scenario, safe access and egress on to and off the island would be severely compromised.

- 7.113 The SFRA (Part 4 – Havant Report, paragraph 6.11.8) recommends that this information should be taken into account in considering the suitability of further development on Hayling Island, with respect to tidal flood risk.
- 7.114 It suggests that Havant Borough needs to be satisfied that proposals can be regarded as safe in the event that vehicular access to the mainland is not achievable.
- 7.115 While a Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for Hayling Island has been developed by the Council's Coastal Partners and has been approved by the Environment Agency, it must be noted that funding for the schemes within it, which may mitigate the risk discussed above, has yet to be identified and is not guaranteed.
- 7.116 Paragraphs 163 and 164 of the NPPF are clear that the need to mitigate and adapt to climate change should be considered in preparing and assessing planning applications, taking into account the full range of potential climate change impacts.
- 7.117 New development should be planned for in ways that avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change, and when new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures.
- 7.118 The application site was amongst the sites reviewed in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Local Plan Sites), which was prepared to consider the flood risk to sites being considered for allocation in the emerging Local Plan. For the application site, the Sites SFRA notes that *'Tidal flood risk to the single access onto Hayling Island is significant. This would make voluntary movement of people on or off the island as well as emergency access by road at the time of a flood event impossible. The Council does not consider that this risk can be satisfactorily addressed by the development, or that the risk is outweighed by any notable sustainability benefits to the community, even when taking into account the contribution the site could make to meeting housing need.'*
- 7.119 Under these circumstances, the strategy for the emerging Local Plan is to make no development allocations on Hayling Island. While that plan and the strategy within it hold limited weight in the determination of planning applications at this time and therefore should not be relied upon in the determination of this application, it is considered that the evidence and the recommendations within the evidence base, including the SFRA, are a material consideration. There is no information within the applicant's submission, nor evidence that the Council holds which indicates that the risks identified by the SFRA have been considered or mitigated, and it is considered unlikely that this scheme in isolation could address those risks.
- 7.120 Coastal Partners Officers have recommended that the LPA should formally consider the emergency planning and rescue implications of new development in making their decision in light of the issues highlighted by the Hayling Island Coastal Management Strategy.
- 7.121 In light of the above considerations, in particular the fact that there is no guarantee that a sea defence scheme can be provided to protect the A3023 from flooding and to maintain safe access to and egress from Hayling Island in the near future, and the inability of the proposed development to provide measures to ensure that the development and its residents are safe in the event that vehicular access to and from the mainland is not achievable, the application fails on the grounds of flood risk. This is considered further in the Planning Balance section of this report.

- 7.122 Referring back to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the NPPF is clear in Footnote 7 that “areas at risk of flooding and coastal change” are a special consideration that disengages the “tilted balance” in relation to the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Officers note that there is no mitigation in place to off-set the identified risk, therefore it is concluded that “tilted balance” is disengaged in this case.

(vi) Other considerations

Provision of affordable housing

- 7.123 The submitted planning statement confirms that the proposed development would provide a total of 9 affordable homes, equating to 30%. The affordable homes would be spread throughout the site and be integrated with the private units.
- 7.124 The Council’s Housing Manager commented on the proposal and agreed with the proposed number of affordable homes proposed on site. It has been noted that the final provision would be expected to include a tenure split 70% / 30% in favour of rented units, either Affordable Rent or Social Rent, with the remainder of the new affordable homes offered as Shared Ownership. Whilst concern has been raised over the lack of provision of 4-bedroom dwellings, this could be addressed at reserved matters stage. However, given the pressing need for all forms of social housing, the absence of 4-bedroom units would not in itself justify a refusal of the application.
- 7.125 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then the appropriate provision of affordable housing on site would have been recommended to be secured with a legal agreement.

Provision of education

- 7.126 The HCC Children’s Services were consulted on the application and commented that the proposal would be expected to generate a total of 9 additional primary age children and 6 additional secondary age pupils (based on a rounded figure of 0.3 primary age children per new dwelling and 0.21 secondary age children per dwelling, as derived by conducting demographic surveys of developments that have been completed within Hampshire and calculating the average number of primary age children on those developments).
- 7.127 The HCC Children’s Services noted that the development site would be served by Mill Rythe Infant School, Mill Rythe Junior School and The Hayling College. Contrary to third party comments HCC Children’s Services have confirmed that all three schools are forecast to have capacity, therefore the HCC does not require contributions towards Primary or Secondary education provision.

Provision of health care

- 7.128 The NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight Integrated Care Board (ICB) was consulted on the application and have commented that the proposal would create an estimated population of 66 new residents within the development based an average household size of 2.28. The prospective residents would most likely wish to register with the Elms Practice and Waterside Medical Practice due to their proximity to the site.
- 7.129 The ICB have confirmed that the current combined medical centres providing primary care have insufficient capacity to absorb the increased patients arising from the proposed development, without a planned increase in patient infrastructure, for example by refurbishing space into more fit for purpose facilities, which would help to accommodate anticipated population growth. A medium-term option would be to expand

the health centre footprint and a long-term option would be to relocate to a new site and new building. Therefore, a contribution of £19,952 towards increasing primary care infrastructure would be necessary to make the application acceptable in planning terms.

- 7.130 Without the contribution to increase the physical capacity, the proposed development will put too much strain on the said health infrastructure, putting people at risk. Waiting times would increase and access to adequate health service would decline, resulting in poorer health outcomes and prolonged health problems. Such an outcome is not sustainable as it will have a detrimental socio-economic impact.
- 7.131 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission then this financial contribution would have been recommended to be secured with a legal agreement.

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 7.132 Relevant CIL rates are set out in the Havant Borough Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, which was adopted by the council on the 20 February 2013. This followed two public consultation exercises and an Examination into the Charging Schedule by an independent Examiner. The Examiners Report concluded that the Havant Borough Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule provided an appropriate basis for the collection of the levy in the borough.
- 7.133 The CIL Team have confirmed that this application would not be CIL liable, but any subsequent full or reserved matters application would be.

8. Planning balance and conclusion

- 8.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 8.2 The site is a greenfield site where planning policies restrict built development in principle. Whilst the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 housing land supply and the policies in its Local Plan relevant to the delivery of housing can be considered out of date, the site is located within an area at risk of flooding and coastal change. On this basis, the tilted balance is disengaged.
- 8.3 The scheme would deliver 29 dwellings which would make a meaningful contribution towards meeting the current shortfall in housing supply in Havant.
- 8.4 The development could also provide a policy compliant mix of social housing, with 9 affordable units. This would need to be secured within a legal agreement. There is a particular need for social housing in the Borough, thus this attracts substantial weight. Construction works would create a significant level of employment, both locally and beyond. Therefore, provision of new housing would result in a significant social and economic benefit in favour of the application.
- 8.5 Officers conclude that the countryside location of the development would result in a transformation from a rural to built-up setting that would have an impact on the character and appearance of the site and the area. This would be largely mitigated with on-site and boundary planting and no key views would be affected. Thus, the overall impact would be localised and therefore only moderately harmful.
- 8.6 Furthermore, the Highways Authority and National Highways do not object to the application on the basis of material harm in relation to highway safety or the capacity of local road network, including cumulative highways impacts on the strategic road network.

Instead, financial contributions are requested to offset development impacts on the local and strategic road network by providing a suite of highways improvements. Some of the improvements would go beyond offsetting the development impacts and benefitting the prospective residents but would also benefit existing residents and the users of the road network. Therefore, these improvements would be considered to be a public social benefit and would attract a moderate weight in favour of the application.

- 8.7 The proposed development could provide acceptable mitigation for Brent Geese and Waders in a form of a functional habitat for bird species on the land at Mill Rytte, which is supported by the Council's Ecologist. As this provision is necessary to off-set the impacts of the development itself, only a limited weight in favour of the development can be attached to it. However, the proposal would also result in the loss of existing reptile habitats, in particular for Common Lizard and Slow-worms, and, given the compact layout of the development with little green open space, there is insufficient information to demonstrate that an appropriate compensatory habitat could be accommodated within the site together with the 29 dwellings and associated infrastructure (or that alternative off-site provision is available to the development). The uncompensated loss of protected species loss of habitat attracts substantial weight against the development.

- 8.8 In terms of foul and surface water, a drainage strategy has been provided for the site.

The Lead Local Flood Authority have commented that, given the available detail, the layout and number of dwellings should not be approved as the drainage strategy for the site requires further refinement which may trigger the need to reduce the number of dwellings. On this basis, Officers conclude that the submission does not sufficiently demonstrate that the site can satisfactorily accommodate 29 dwellings together with an associated, policy compliant, infrastructure. This attracts a moderate weight against the development.

- 8.9 In terms of tidal flood risk, whilst the site itself is not designated to be at such a risk, the relevant evidence base for the emerging Local Plan is clear, without appropriate sea defences, access to and egress from Hayling Island will be severely compromised. Currently, there are no plans to develop a strategy to provide the required sea defences. There is also no funding to start any initial work. The development itself cannot provide appropriate mitigation to address this risk. Consequently, the development cannot be regarded as safe in the event that vehicular access to the mainland is not achievable. This weighs heavily against the development.

Conclusion

- 8.10 Drawing the above considerations together, Officers recognise that the proposed development raises conflicting issues. On one hand, it would make a modest but important contribution towards the Council's much needed housing supply, at the time when the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. The construction phase would provide an opportunity to boost the local construction industry, and the prospective residents would likely contribute to the vitality and viability of local centres.
- 8.11 On the other hand, there is a great concern over the safety of the prospective residents of the development due to significant tidal flood risk which would restrict access to and egress from Hayling Island, in particular there is great concern over access for emergency vehicles. At this time, there are no plans to provide appropriate sea defences and there is no certainty that this development could be made safe in the future. There is also concern as to the uncertainty over the actual land required to accommodate an acceptable drainage strategy and the developable land left that could accommodate the proposed number of houses without harmful visual and landscape impacts. Finally, there is also a concern over the uncompensated loss of protected species habitats.

- 8.12 Planning decisions must be balanced. Officers conclude that the consequence of the unmitigated flood risk, coupled with the uncertainty of achieving an acceptable drainage strategy and the uncompensated loss of habitat would be such as to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Development Manager be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/21/01350 for the following reasons:

- 1 The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the National Flood Map for Planning show that the single access road to Hayling Island, the A3023, is at risk of flooding, with significant increases expected in extent, depth and hazard in the future. Currently, there are no plans and no guarantee that funding will be available to provide a sea defence scheme to protect the A3023 from flooding and to maintain safe access to and egress from Hayling Island in the near future. The proposed development cannot provide measures to ensure that its residents are safe in the event that vehicular access to and from the mainland is not achievable. Therefore, the proposal cannot be regarded as safe in the event that vehicular access to the mainland is not achievable and is considered contrary to Policy CS 15 of the adopted Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) (March 2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development can be satisfactorily accommodated on site without harm to protected species. In particular, the proposed development would remove the vast majority of reptile habitat, and no details of a suitable alternative compensatory habitat has been provided, consequently there is no clarity over the size of any compensatory reptile habitats needed to be accommodated within the site. Whilst the Illustrative Masterplan indicates narrow strips of land on the edges of the site, the remainder of the site accommodates a compact built form. At this outline stage, there is insufficient information to determine the exact car parking provision, widths of roads, footpaths and associated road layout features, such as turning places. Therefore, there is no certainty that the final built development could be contained within its current extent without the need for more land. As a result, the submission has not demonstrated that the application site could satisfactorily accommodate the proposed number of dwellings, together with associated infrastructure, and the compensatory reptile habitat. Whilst off-site habitat could be considered acceptable, no details of such provision have been provided. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of Policies CS 11 and DM8 of the adopted Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) (March 2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3 Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development could be satisfactorily accommodated on site without causing unacceptably harmful visual and landscape impacts. In the absence of sufficient detail demonstrating the necessary surface water drainage measures required on the site, it is not possible to conclude that the remainder of the site would be able to acceptably accommodate the proposed number of dwellings together with policy compliant associated infrastructure. Given the sensitive, rural-edge location and the urban grain and building heights surrounding the application site, increased densities or building heights (to compensate for the land loss to accommodate drainage features) would not be considered in accordance with the provisions of Policy CS 16 of the adopted Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) (March 2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 Binding arrangements are not in place to secure the following aspects of the

development, as a result of which it is not considered that the development could be undertaken in a satisfactory manner:

1. Affordable Housing
2. S106 monitoring fee
3. Nitrates mitigation
4. Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy contribution;
5. Payment towards provision of Community Worker;
6. SUDS bond;
7. A contribution towards Health of £19,952;
8. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Waders and Brent Geese);
9. Common Parts Management;
10. Management Company and Management Plan;
11. Pedestrian and cycle connection between the eastern corner of the site and Charleston Close and on the western boundary towards the Hayling Billy;
12. Highways:
 - (a) a proportionate financial contribution towards improvements of crossing facilities and pedestrian access to the Hayling Billy Trail at Station Road including at the junction of Staunton Avenue;
 - (b) Strategic Highway improvements - a transport contribution towards the cumulative harm of the development to mitigate its impact on the A3023 with the monies secured towards:
 - Delivery of the Hayling Billy Improvement Study Work;
 - Measures at Langstone Roundabout to reduce delay; and
 - Other measures along the A3023 corridor which seek to reduce car dependence and manage journey time reliability along the corridor.
13. Binding access arrangement for works on the Havant Borough Council's land to provide a connection onto the Hayling Billy trail (including any ecological assessments and subsequent mitigation).

The carrying out of the development in the absence of such provision would result in an unsatisfactory and unsustainable form of development having due regard to Policies CS1, CS7, CS8, CS9, CS11, CS13, CS15, CS16, CS19, CS20, CS21, DM13 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011; Policies DM20, DM23 and DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014; the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended); and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendices:

- | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| (A) | Site Location Plan |
| (B) | Illustrative Masterplan |
| (C) | Parameters Plan |
| (D) | Access Arrangements |
| (E) | Brent Geese & Wader Strategy plans |
| (F) | Flood Risk Mapping |