

Supplementary Planning Information

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
20 October 2016

The following supplementary planning information was unavailable when the agenda for the Development Management Committee held on 20 October 2016 was,

Agenda No Item

5 **Site Viewing Working Party Minutes (Pages 1 - 2)**

10 APP/16/00568 - 117 Elm Grove, Hayling Island, PO11 9ED (Pages 3 - 4)

Proposal: Erection of 33No. retirement apartments (Category II type) with communal facilities and car parking accessed from St Marys Road.

Associated papers:

<http://tinyurl.com/zs8akbs>

This page is intentionally left blank

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 13 October 2016

Present:

Councillors: Keast, Patrick, Guest (Standing Deputy), Davis (Standing Deputy), Hughes and Quantrill

Officers: Steve Weaver was present for item 14
Heather Lealan was present for item 14 & 15
Jamie Gargett was present for item 15.

11 Apologies

Apologies for the meeting were received from Cllrs Buckley, Perry and Satchwell.

12 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 June were received.

13 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest relating to matters on the agenda.

14 117 Elm Grove, Hayling Island PO11 9ED - APP/16/00568

Proposal: Erection of 33No. Retirement apartments (category II types) with communal facilities and car parking accessed from St Mary's Road.

The site was viewed, given a request by a ward councillor that this application be determined by the Development Management Committee.

The Working Party received a written report from the Head of Planning Services which identified the following key considerations:

- i. Principle of Development
- ii. Loss of community building
- iii. Impact upon the character of the area and trees
- iv. Impact upon residential amenity
- v. Highway and Parking considerations
- vi. Other issues

The Working Party viewed the site, the subject of the application, to assess whether there were additional matters that should be considered by the Development Management Committee.

RESOLVED that based on the site inspection and information available at the time, the following additional information be provided to the Development Management Committee:

1. Arborist's report regarding the impact of development on the trees onsite.
2. Information relating to the affordable housing contribution
3. Havant Borough Council's policy on the allocation of affordable housing contributions.

15 Hall Place Cottage, South Street, Havant, PO9 1DA - APP/16/00933

Proposal: Fell 1No. Holm Oak (T1), subject to TPO 1973

The site was viewed, given a request by a ward councillor that this application be determined by the Development Management Committee.

The Working Party received a written report from the Head of Planning Services which identified the following key considerations:

- i. Amenity value and condition
- ii. The basis for proposed removal.

The Working Party viewed the site from both the street scene and driveway of the property.

RESOLVED that based on the site inspection and information available at the time, no additional information be provided to the Development Management Committee.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 2.45 pm

.....
Chairman

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Tree officer

My concerns regarding the close proximity of the proposed building to the trees on this site combined with the potential pressure to prune / fell remain a concern and are not ideal.

However should approval be given then I suggest that the following is conditioned - in addition to the AIA, AMS and TPP.

- i) Revised drainage proposals to avoid any requirement for excavation with tree root protection areas to be submitted prior to commencement of any construction on site.
- ii) Submission of the building foundation design prior to commencement of any construction on site.
- iii) Demolition works adjacent to T1, T2 & T3 to be supervised by the Arboricultural consultant and submitted to the LPA.

If permission is granted it is important that works do not commence before a pre commencement meeting is undertaken with the Site Manager, Arboricultural Consultant and myself in attendance.

Landscape Officer

Having reviewed the updated Tree Protection Plan (9030/02 Revision C), I note the provision for a new service corridor remote from root protection areas and the identified extents of 'no dig construction' for proposed paving within root protection areas.

Despite the drawing note mention of a piled foundation, there is no assurance elsewhere that this method will be utilised.

I remain concerned that conflicts between proposed drainage runs and tree protection areas have not been resolved by the updated Tree Protection Plan or the Method Statement.

Officer Comment – The comments of both consultees have been considered on balance with the other planning merits of the scheme and the provision of housing. Requested condition (i) is covered by recommended condition 5 off the published officer report. Conditions (ii) and (iii) are recommended to be added to a planning consent.

7 Planning Considerations

Para 7.4 – The final conclusion on the submitted viability report has been received from the Independent Assessor; they consider that there is a £21,000 surplus in the scheme. Accordingly, the applicant's solicitors have drafted a S106 agreement including this sum as an affordable housing contribution.

Para 7.16 – Amended plans as published within the agenda papers included the setting back of the substation into the site in order to improve the relationship with the adjoining dwelling; this resulted in the loss of 1 parking space from 23 to 22. The parking ratio therefore slightly reduced from 0.69 to 0.67 per flat. However, this is still greater than the ratio suggested as acceptable by the Appeal Inspector at the former Pullinger site on the opposite side of Elm Grove. The agent has also pointed out that the scheme does include a buggy store which can accommodate 12 vehicles.

Site Visit Working Party – Response to Member questions.

Q - Are the S106 affordable housing contributions spent in the ward that they are collected?

A – The affordable housing contributions form a single pot that is spent across the Borough. There is a risk that if the contributions could only be spent within the ward in which they were collected that the accrued sum may not be large enough to implement a scheme; the collected sums have to be paid back to applicants if they are not spent by the Local Authority within a 5 year period.