
Site Address: Southleigh Park House, Eastleigh Road, Havant, PO9 2PE
Proposal: Hybrid Application comprising:

Full Application for change of use, alterations to and extension of existing buildings to 20 Residential units, (13 dwellings in the main house and 7 in other Listed Buildings) with associated landscaping parking and amenity space.

Outline Application (All Matters Reserved except means of access) for the demolition of 1983 office building and associated brick and glass corridor link and development of up to 70 residential units, associated landscaping, parking and infrastructure works.

Application No:	APP/17/00863	Expiry Date:	17/11/2017
Applicant:	Messrs Roderick, Snell, Wilcox, Manson Lyon & Hartleys SASS		
Agent:	Mrs J Hudson Terence O'Rourke Ltd	Case Officer:	Rachael McMurray
Ward:	St Faiths	DMC Lead Member	

Reason for Committee Consideration: The application constitutes a departure from the adopted Local Plan.

HDS Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

Executive Summary

The proposal is for the conversion of existing Listed Buildings into 20 homes, plus residential development of 70no. units on the remainder of this brownfield site of 3.22ha, located on the corner of Bartons Road and Horndean Road, close to the Borough boundary with West Sussex. The site currently lies outside of the defined urban boundary in the adopted Local Plan. The site contains a large former stately home, historic parkland and associated buildings which are all Grade II listed. The entire site has been used for commercial purposes since the 1960's.

The site has been identified as an urban extension site in the adopted Local Plan Housing Statement (LPHS) to include approximately 35units. It is also included in the Draft Local Plan under Policy H25. This policy states that the following requirement should be met for any development submitted:

- i. meets Guiding Principle 4 of the LPHS
- ii. includes an Infrastructure Delivery Statement (IDS)
- iii. retains and sympathetically reuses all the listed buildings
- iv. maintains a suitable setting for the listed buildings
- v. retains and integrates the protected trees
- vi. takes access to the site from Eastleigh Road
- vii. provides for the widening of the existing footway on the south side of Barton's Road to create a shared cycle / footway to the west and to the east around the junction of Barton's Road and Horndean Road.

In accordance with the adopted LPHS, the application is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Statement (IDS) together with specialist reports in respect to the key issues, including a heritage statement, landscape impact, ecology, highways, trees and drainage. Full publicity has been undertaken including consultation, notification of neighbours, site notices and an advert in the press. The site is within flood zone 1 and is not covered by any nature conservation designations but does contain many Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).

The proposal has been submitted as a Hybrid application comprising two parts – full planning permission for the conversion of the listed buildings to residential use and outline permission for the development of the land to the north and west of the main listed building for residential development, of mainly family dwellings. Access would be from Eastleigh Road, with a new pedestrian / cycleway along the north and north eastern boundaries. The proposal retains the setting of the listed building and creates new areas of open space to the south the listed building and to the east of the site.

The application would result in the loss of several protected trees on the site to accommodate the number of units proposed, which exceeds the amount advised in the draft Local Plan policy. However, a viability case has been put forward to justify that a certain number of units are required to make the proposed scheme viable. This is due to the high cost of the conversion of the listed buildings. If only 35 units were proposed, it is likely that the conversion of the listed buildings would/could not come forward. This potentially places the heritage assets at risk if they are left vacant and unable to attract any occupiers or developers. The overall residential density of the proposal for 90 units is 28 dwellings per hectare, which is relatively low.

Whilst it is very regrettable that the proposal would require significantly more tree loss than anticipated, this must be weighed with the facts that the scheme would meet the majority of the requirements as set in the draft policy for the site and would contribute to the Borough's pressing housing need numbers. Moreover, it would secure the long-term protection and maintenance of the group of important heritage assets within the site, whilst protecting the setting of the main house. Therefore, the proposal has been through a thorough assessment of whether the scheme represents sustainable development. Very much on balance, it is considered that the loss of trees on the site is outweighed by the benefits the scheme would bring to the Borough and as such can be recommended for planning permission, subject to the completion of a S106 agreement.

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site (3.22ha in total) comprises a number of historic buildings including the largest, Southleigh Park House, built in the mid-19th C for the site's original use as a stately home and its associated parkland. Since the 1960's the site has operated as an employment site and a further office block was built to the north of the main house in the 1980's. The main house has undergone a full restoration in phases during the late 1990's and early 2000s to address the serious deterioration which had occurred.
- 1.2 The site is located in the gap between Havant and Emsworth, being contained by Bartons Road, Horndean Road and Eastleigh Road and is located in a Flood Risk Zone 1.

Immediately to the south of the site is a large area of parkland which originally formed part of Southleigh Park's wider estate. This is now proposed to form part of a strategic site for housing in the Council's Draft Local Plan 2036. The Spire Hospital and The Oaks Crematorium are located to the immediate north of the site on Bartons Road. The entrance into the site is currently from Eastleigh Road although there are further access points further south which are currently not utilised. To the north west of the main building is a large car park associated with the office use.

- 1.3 The historic buildings and office extension are set in a wider area of parkland which also forms part of the application area. Immediately in front of the main house, a formal lawn area forms the setting and outlook for the main house. There is a small lake feature in the south western corner of the lawn, framed by trees. The remains of a smaller garden are located adjacent to the west wing of the main house. There are a number of mature, specimen mature trees within the site which form part of the historic parkland and garden and date back to the mid to late 19th C. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) applies to the site, principally to protect the ornamental specimen trees. There is also a large amount of overgrown vegetation as a result of the parkland being unmanaged since the office use has been in place. The southern boundary of the site which overlooks the proposed strategic site, includes a variety of individual trees extending 0.6km towards Southleigh Road.
- 1.4 Along with the main house, there are several listed buildings within the site including; the Main House West Wing, the Coach House, the Stable Block with Clock Tower, the Lodge, and the Dairy and Wood Store. The lodge is located in the north-west corner of the site and was provisionally a former gate house into the site.
- 1.5 The principal significance of the heritage assets at Southleigh Park is the architectural and aesthetic value of the appearance, design qualities and materials of the buildings, including the quality of the construction and the care taken in the recent restoration work, in particular the external flint work. Despite the loss of the whole of the northern part of the group of ancillary buildings and walled gardens in existence in the late 1960s, it is still legible as a deliberately composed group with a clear hierarchy reflected in the appearance of the buildings and use of materials. The interiors of the main house where historic features survive are of high value. There are large areas where interior spaces have been entirely remodelled or only the room layout remains.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 There is a detailed planning attached to the site with a large number of previous planning permissions and listed building consents on the site. The most relevant are listed below:

00/50183/026 - To demolish section of structurally unstable south wall to west wing of main house, and rebuild with existing flints to match existing elevation.
PERM,25/10/2000

00/50183/024 - Alterations to west wing of Listed Part of House and to 'Stable Block' ; extensions and works to north of Main Listed Building and east of 'Stable Block' and covered way to north of 'Stable Block', PERM,23/05/2000

00/50183/025 - Internal and External alterations to West wing of Listed Part of House and to 'Stable Block' extensions and works to north of Main Listed building and east of

'Stable Block' and covered way to north of 'Stable Block' PERM ,23/05/2000

98/50183/023 - New gates to visitor's entrance and boundary fences to perimeter (readvertisement) PERM,07/01/1999

96/50183/018 - Creation of new southern access and drive from Eastleigh Road for visitors use involving removal of trees covered by Tree Preservation Order 1068; reopen existing southern access for staff entry and alterations to northern access to provide exit; revision to parking layout permitted under 91/50183/11 - PERM,07/01/1999

96/50183/019 - Listed Building Application for creation of new southern access and drive from Eastleigh Road for visitors use involving removal of trees covered by Tree Preservation Order 1068; reopen existing southern access for staff entry and alterations to northern access to provide exit; revision to parking layout permitted under 91/50183/11, WD,21/02/1997

91/50183/011 - C/U from personal class B1(b) (research & development) to general class B1(a)(offices) & B1(b)(research & development) (Re-advertisement), PERM,09/07/1992

93/50183/015 - Change of use from personal, Class B1(b) (Research and Development) to General Class B1(a) (Offices) and B1(b) (Research and Development) for use by up to two occupiers., COMM,
93/50183/016 - Change of Use to Nursing Home/ Rest Home with associated facilities together with two residential units to be undertaken in two phases., PERM,

APP/11/01231 - Installation of CCTV system of 11No. cameras, consisting of 9No. wall mounted cameras and 2No. pole mounted cameras and associated speakers and detectors., PERM,02/04/2012

APP/11/01402 - Listed Building Consent for Installation of CCTV system of 11No. cameras, consisting of 9No. wall mounted cameras and 2No. pole mounted cameras and associated speakers and detectors., PERM,29/03/2012

APP/17/00864 - Listed Building Consent for alterations to and extension of existing buildings with associated landscaping, parking and amenity space to facilitate the change of use of the main house and other buildings to 20 residential units (13 in the main house and 7 in the other buildings). Undetermined.

- 2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires the Authority to maintain a continuous five-year supply of deliverable sites to meet the present and future needs of the Borough. 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.
- 2.3 The Council is in the process of reviewing its Local Plan and adopted a Local Plan Housing Statement (LPHS) in December 2016 as an interim step following a Regulation 18 consultation on the Local Plan. The Statement is in response to the high need for housing in the borough and sets out the Council's position regarding the development of greenfield sites for residential purposes, ahead of adoption of the new Local Plan. The Statement relates specifically to sites which are not allocated in the adopted Local Plan, and it supports the principle of residential development on a number of urban extension sites. The site that is the subject of this application is one of the sites identified in Table 2. The LPHS identifies the capacity of the sites as 35 units. This proposal increases this number, but the Housing Statement yields are indicative only, and in principle a higher number may be appropriate subject to it satisfactorily meeting all other policy and material considerations. The Draft Local Plan 2036 further proposed the allocation of the site for housing.
- 2.4 A Development Consultation Forum was carried out in September 2016 to engage with Councillor's key stake holders and the public prior to the submission of this application.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The application has been submitted is a Hybrid application comprising two parts:
- a. Full Application for change of use, alterations to and extension of existing buildings to 20 Residential units, (13 dwellings in the main house and 7 in other listed buildings) with associated landscaping parking and amenity space.
 - b. Outline Application (All Matters Reserved except means of access) for the demolition of 1983 office building and associated brick and glass corridor link and development of up to 70 residential units, associated landscaping, parking and infrastructure works.
- 3.2 This 'hybrid' approach provides detail and certainty with respect to the listed buildings whilst offering some flexibility regarding the exact layout of the new development which will be brought forward by a site developer. There is also a separate listed building consent application APP/17/00864 which covers the specific works to the various listed buildings. This is currently under consideration.
- 3.3 Within the full element of the application, it is proposed to convert the listed buildings to provide new dwellings as follows:
- Main house converted to 9 apartments
 - Main house west wing converted to 4no. town houses with individual entrances
 - Coach house and former stable block converted to 5no. 2 bed townhouse units and 1no. 3bed unit
 - Former gate lodge converted to a 2no. bed house.
 - Total of 20 units.
- 3.4 Within the outline part of the application, only access is being applied for at this stage with layout, scale, appearance and landscaping being reserved matters. However,

some indicative information in terms of layout and housing numbers (up to 70 units) in relation to these matters are discussed in this report. The exact density would be confirmed as part of the reserved matters application, however based on the detailed proposals for the listed buildings and the indicative site layout, a density of 27.95dw/ha is achieved on the overall site. The indicative mix of housing on the outline layout includes 5no. 1 bed units, 22no. 2 bed units, 31no. 3 bed units and 12no. 4 bed units.

- 3.6 The development would be served by three vehicular accesses from Eastleigh Road. All three are already in situ but only one is utilised at present. The northern most entrance would serve the majority of the new build on the site, the central entrance would serve the listed buildings and courtyard and the southern entrance would serve the south western section of the site.
- 3.7 Proposals for off site highway works include a new 3m wide pedestrian / cycle route along the north and north eastern edge of the site frontage along Bartons Road and Horndean Road. 182no. allocated parking spaces are proposed, along with 24no. visitor spaces.
- 3.8 The illustrative plan shows permeable routes through the site for use by pedestrians and cycles across the site from Eastleigh Road out onto Horndean Road at the north east corner. Open space is proposed to the south of the west wing and on the eastern boundary and the existing south lawn which provides the setting for the listed building would be retained. This is in addition to private garden areas.
- 3.9 With regards to drainage, it is proposed that the development would drain into a geocellular storage tank to be located to the south of the site and then to the existing lake which would be extended to deal with higher water flows, with a controlled outfall from the lake onto Eastleigh Road. Foul flows from the site would discharge into the existing foul water main within the site boundary.
- 3.10 The planning application includes the following documents:
- Landscape Strategy
 - Ecological Assessment
 - Transport Statement and Travel Plan
 - Drainage Strategy and Flood Risk Assessment
 - Heritage Statement and Archaeological Assessment
 - Tree Survey and Arboricultural Assessment
 - GeoEnvironmental Investigation Report
 - Infrastructure Delivery Statement
 - Utilities and Servicing Statement
 - Landscape and Visual Appraisal
 - Lighting Assessment
 - Mineral Extraction Assessment
 - Noise Impact Assessment
 - History of Marketing Activity
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Local Lead Flood Authority Checklist

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS14	(Efficient Use of Resources)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS8	(Community Safety)
CS9	(Housing)
DM1	(Recreation and Open Space)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM6	(Coordination of Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20	(Historic Assets)
DM25	(Managing Flood Risk in Emsworth)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM24	(Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Havant Borough Council Housing SPD (July 2011)
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD (July 2016)
Borough Design Guide SPD 2011
Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan
Local Plan Housing Statement (7 December 2016)

Listed Building Grade: Grade II
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

Objection to the application on Arboricultural grounds.

Whilst there are many lower grade trees and invasive undergrowth species highlighted for removal, there are also a large number of quality trees shown for removal to facilitate the scheme.

If the number of trees shown for removal is implemented, then the site will lose its current verdant character and impact negatively on the surrounding area.

In addition to this a number of the new dwellings are planned without giving due regard to the size of adjacent trees, this will lead to future pressure to excessively prune or fell these trees.

On viewing the planting scheme, it would appear that many of the new trees will not have sufficient growing space and as such will not work as part of this scheme.

A plan is also required showing only the retained trees (with RPAs) and new trees as part of the topography for the scheme.

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

Consultation with Southern water as Public Sewer is within part of the site. Solid waste storage provisions as required under AD H have not been shown. Further information will be required when a Building Regulation application is submitted to show compliance with ALL AD's

Conservation Officer

House & Outbuildings

Southleigh Park House features the remains of an early 19th-century gentleman's estate. The main house, clock tower and lodge are Grade II listed. There is also a coach house, dairy and wall that are curtilage listed.

The estate was sold to the Plessey Company in 1969. A new entrance was cut from the Eastleigh Road, the kitchen gardens became a car park and a modern office block was built in the same area. In 1994 the estate, covering 15 acres, became the property of Snell & Wilcox and was developed into the headquarters of the business.

The site is now occupied by Snell Ltd and the main house overlooks what was the park, which includes several large oak trees, and is now grazing for Southleigh Farm.

Policy Context

Before proceeding to consider the policy context of the NPPF, it is of primary importance that the correct weight should be attributed to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building from the outset, in accordance with sections 16 & 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990:

“Section 16 requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building, its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest when considering whether to grant listed building consent.”

“Section 66 requires local planning authorities when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”

The need for the decision taker to attach considerable or special weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings has been reinforced through two

recent high court decisions of: Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Limited vs. East Northamptonshire District Council et al (2014); and North Norfolk District Council vs. DCLG and Mack (2014).

The above statute and its subsequent and consistent interpretation in recent high court decisions emphasises the need for the policies of the NPPF to be implemented whilst always having regard to the need to give special or greater weight to the preservation of the setting of a listed building.

Where the impact on the setting of a listed building has been assessed in accordance with paragraphs 128 to 132 of the Framework, and has been found to fall within the category of 'less than substantial harm' (i.e. paragraph 134), then it is still important that when considering the balance exercise, and therefore the public benefits of any such proposal, that from the outset this is consciously weighed in favour of the need to preserve the setting of the listed building.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and sets down the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications. This supersedes PPS 5, however, English Heritage (web-site 23 April 2012) advises that the Practice Guide (HEPPG) remains a valid and Government endorsed document pending Government's review of guidance supporting national planning policy as set out in its response to the select Committee".

The NPPF sets out, in paragraph 17, the 12 core planning principles that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions. One of these core principles relates directly to conserving heritage assets, as follows

"Planning should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations;"

Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It also goes on to state that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 133 provides guidance in relation to development proposals that cause 'substantial harm'. While, paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy states that where a development will lead to 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Paragraph 64 (Section 7 – Requiring Good Design) is also particularly relevant to this case in that development should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

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

Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to

conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest.

Policy CP16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design: Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site.

Policy DM20 of the Allocations Plan states that development proposals must conserve and enhance the historic assets of Havant.

Significance

The areas of particular historic significance are:

- The architectural detail of the house, clock tower, lodge, coach house and dairy
- The remnants of an original boundary wall to the north of the site.
- The southern aspect from the main house is particularly significant as it allows for appreciation and outlook on what would have been the former Parkland. The house was also built on the elevated position for views south towards the sea.
- Surrounding landscape and trees
- The main house's character is defined by its polite architecture, status and the large spacious rooms. In contrast the interior of the western wing has seen a series of changes and is comparatively plain.

In Heritage terms there are two aspects to the scheme.

1. The suitability of the conversion to residential and its resulting impact on the building's special architectural/historic interest.
2. The impact of the proposed development, in particular the new housing within the grounds, on the setting provided for the listed building

Impact of conversion works

Main House and western wing

The conversion is well conceived. From my recent detailed inspection I am satisfied the main house can fairly readily be split into 13 units. The resulting changes to the exterior are minimal. The internal works are more radical in places – insertion of floors, new stud walls, replacement stairs etc. However, in the main, the proposals have been designed to fit the natural building grain. In general, where a conflict arises I am satisfied any loss of significance is limited, and more than outweighed by the benefit of bringing the building into full use and creating the environment for investment to secure its long term future.

Coach House and Clock House

Again the conversions are well conceived working with the grain of the buildings. Incongruous modern additions are to be removed from the buildings which will enhance their appearance. The extensions proposed to the Clock house in principle are acceptable. It will be down to the detail of the extensions that will determine their success. The re- instatement of the courtyard appearance will enhance the appearance

of the buildings and the main house. This can also provide some car parking which is necessary.

The Lodge and Wall

The Lodge is to be converted back into a single dwelling house. This is the best use for the building as it is what it was originally designed for. A small extension is proposed which will increase the accommodation. Subject to detail this appears to be entirely appropriate for the building. Some minor alterations are also proposed to the eastern elevation to provide more light. Again this is not something that would be contentious. The fine flint work and the proportions of the rooms are all to be maintained which is particularly positive.

Following suggestions it now appears that the original boundary wall to the north of the site is to be substantially retained. This includes the pier which would have formed the original entrance to the site. A small opening is to be formed in the wall but this is considered to be an acceptable compromise to allow entrance to the new apartment blocks.

New Housing Development in Grounds

The area of land where development is likely to have the least impact on the setting of the listed building is that to the north. While I have reservations about the amount of new development, the proposed location is basically correct in terms of limiting harm.

The proposed new development is significant and will impact on the setting of Southleigh House. It is inevitable that the scale and number of the new buildings will make them a prominent feature within the site. However, this has to be balanced up with the fact that the current office buildings on site are incongruous features and that a number of dwellings are needed to make the refurbishment of the existing heritage assets viable. The applicant has also worked very hard to ensure the significant views to the south are maintained and a courtyard is re-instated to the north.

In this particular instance it is therefore considered that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the architectural significance of the listed buildings or their setting. Although it is acknowledged that the setting of this building contributes to its significance, the new scheme allows for this setting to be substantially maintained.

Section 106

Due to the sensitivity of the site I believe a section 106 agreement should be considered to control the phasing of development. Without an agreement to phase the works (in favour of the listed building) I have concerns that the new residential units could be developed, and listed building could be undeveloped and mothballed. As the conversion and refurbishment of the listed building is such an important consideration in terms of the principle of the development I would consider some control is required.

Design Code

Again, due to the sensitivity of the site I believe a design code should be sought (either by condition on during this application). This would agree details of the built form of key character areas and hard and soft landscaping, in order to ensure a high-quality design within the setting of a number of listed buildings. Please see below an example of a

condition that could be used.

Prior to the submission of the reserved matters application, a Design Code document for the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Design Code document shall substantially accord with the principles of the Design and Access Statement (July 2017) and shall include the following details;

(a) Principles for the built form of key character areas within the Site to be informed by local character, having particular regard to:

- (i) building form and depth,
- (ii) roofscape, including ridge lines and pitches,
- (iii) building heights (not to exceed two storeys in height),
- (iv) building elements such as chimneys, eaves, openings (windows / doors) and porches,
- (v) external materials,
- (vi) boundary treatment, and
- (vii) Parking principles (including cycle parking / storage).
- (viii) Details of Car Barns including materials, roofscape and building heights

(b) Principles for hard and soft landscaping within the site

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Design Code document.

Reason - To ensure a satisfactory design for the development, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

County Archaeologist, Strategic Environmental Delivery Group, HCC

The combination of a low level of previous archaeological finds in the immediate area and modern impacts across the site, combined with the small amount of undeveloped land and the relatively small scale of the development itself, means that no archaeological issues are raised in this instance.

County Ecologist

The application is accompanied by an Ecological Assessment (ECOSA, July 2017).

The site overall is of limited ecological value in terms of its habitats: the site is dominated by buildings and associated mature plantings, including much non-native tall scrub. There is an area of managed lawn within the south of the site, bordering an extensive area of parkland.

A considerable amount of survey work has been carried out at this site, focussing mostly on bats but also including great crested newt surveys. I am satisfied that the suite of surveys carried out is likely to have provided a robust picture of the site's ecological value (although please see comments below on buildings).

In terms of protected species, GCN are considered absent and the site is considered to offer negligible potential for supporting reptiles and hazel dormouse. The scrub and trees are likely to support a range of 'garden' bird species.

The most significant ecological constraint is the confirmed presence of the rare

Bechstein's bat, with three individuals captured on site. The grounds of the buildings therefore constitute confirmed foraging/commuting habitat for this rare bat, although I do accept that the site likely only forms a very small percentage of the available habitat in the surrounding landscape. The site has also been shown to support a number of other bat species, including western barbastelle, another uncommon species, as well as Nathusius' pipistrelle an uncommon migratory species.

The proposals will entail the loss of considerable vegetation cover from the site. This includes areas of non-native shrubs as well as large, mature trees and low scrub. Whilst the loss of trees in particular is unfortunate, in terms of impacts to protected species sufficient survey effort has been employed (with the exception of buildings and bats) to have a good degree of certainty that impacts will be minimal. Several of the buildings have been assessed as offering bat roosting potential and requiring additional survey effort. I am unsure as to whether these surveys have been carried out: clearly if not then we cannot be certain of the potential impacts. I would request clarification on this issue.

Once this issue has been clarified (if possible) I would be willing to recommend that ecological mitigation measures are secured by condition. The most important factor here is to ensure that site lighting is absolutely minimal, with darkened corridors available for flying bats.

Officer Note – This issue has been clarified and the Ecologist has been further consulted and has advised the following condition:

Development shall proceed in strict accordance with the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed within the Ecological Assessment (ECOSA, March 2018) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement features shall be permanently retained and maintained as befits their purpose.

Reason: *to protect biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, the NERC Act (2006), NPPF and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.*

County Minerals

No objection.

Crime Prevention -Major Apps

- Plans show two pedestrian only access points one to the northeast corner of the site the other to the northwest corner of the site. The access to the northwest is via a small area of open space. There is very little natural surveillance of this footpath which provides access to the rear of the nearby dwellings and parked motor vehicles. To reduce the opportunities for crime I recommend greater overlooking of the footpath from the nearby dwellings.
- Footpaths / cycle ways should be overlooked from the nearby dwellings and should not run to the rear of any dwellings.
- To reduce the vulnerability of the dwellings to crime I recommend that all rear access garden gates are fitted with a key operated lock that can be operated from either side of the gate.

- To reduce the vulnerability of these areas I recommend that all parking spaces have natural surveillance from the nearby dwellings.
- I would advise that structures such as carports and car barns do not improve the security of the vehicle within; indeed they restrict natural surveillance of the vehicle. Therefore, to reduce the opportunities for crime I recommend that such structures only erected within curtilage of the associated of the dwelling.
- To provide for the safety and security of residents and visitors. Lighting throughout the development should conform to the relevant sections of BS5489:2013.

Developer Services, Southern Water

No development or new tree planting should be located within 3 metres either side of the centreline of the public sewer and all existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.

No new soakaways should be located within 5 metres of a public sewer.

Furthermore, due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site.

The applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk”.

Our initial investigations indicate that Southern Water can provide foul sewage disposal to service the proposed development. Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent:

“A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk”.

The planning application form makes reference to drainage using Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). Under current legislation and guidance SUDS rely upon facilities which are not adoptable by sewerage undertakers. Therefore, the applicant will need to ensure that arrangements exist for the long term maintenance of the SUDS facilities. It is critical that the effectiveness of these systems is maintained in perpetuity. Good management will avoid flooding from the proposed surface water system, which may result in the inundation of the foul sewerage system.

Thus, where a SUDS scheme is to be implemented, the drainage details submitted to the Local Planning Authority should:

- Specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SUDS scheme
- Specify a timetable for implementation
- Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

This should include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The application details for this development indicate that the proposed means of surface water drainage for the site is via a watercourse. The Council's technical staff and the relevant authority for land drainage consent should comment on the adequacy of the proposals to discharge surface water to the local watercourse. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following condition is attached to the consent: "Construction of the development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul and surface water sewerage disposal have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water."

This initial assessment does not prejudice any future assessment or commit to any adoption agreements under Section 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991. Please note that noncompliance with Sewers for Adoption standards will preclude future adoption of the foul and surface water sewerage network on site. The design of drainage should ensure that no groundwater or land drainage is to enter public sewers. If the applicant or developer proposes an on-site foul sewerage pumping station, this would have to be designed and constructed to the specification of Southern Water Services Ltd. A secure compound would be required, to which access for large vehicles would need to be possible at all times. The compound will be required to be 100 square metres in area, or of some such approved lesser area as would provide an operationally satisfactory layout. No habitable rooms should be located less than 15 metres from the pumping station compound boundary, in order to protect the amenity of prospective residents.

No new soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses or any other surface water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5 metres of a public gravity sewer, rising main or water main.

The proposed development would lie within a Source Protection Zone as defined under the Environment Agency's Groundwater Protection Policy. Southern Water will rely on your consultations with the Environment Agency to ensure the protection of the water supply source.

East Hants District Council

No comments provided.

Education Department

No contribution is sought from this development because, as stated, if the MDA (the strategic site to the south as allocated in the Draft Local Plan) does not come forward for 10-15 years it could not be claimed that the pupil yield from this development will add to the need for additional school places as they would already be in the system.

Consequently the requirement for a contribution from this development towards

Education facilities is formally retracted. Following an updated forecast, there should be sufficient primary places to accommodate the pupils arising from the development.

Engineering Services, Havant Council

See comments for Listed Building Consent application

Environment Agency

Still awaiting final response. Members will be updated prior to the committee meeting.

Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

Acoustic report. - no objections

Please include informatives relating to permitted noisy hours, no bonfires and dust mitigations on any planning permission.

Contamination

FRA and Drainage - the proposals are adequate in principal however, there are changes in the presented methodology which could in principle leave the development under provisioned in terms of pollution attenuation capacity.

Transport Statement / Travel Plan

No objections.

Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report

There is an elevated possibility of on site contamination than is presently identified in the desk top study.

Conditions should be included on any decision notice for approval as follows:

- 1 - Contamination Assessment
- 2 - Verification
- 3 - UXO & UXB (Desk Study and Watching Brief)

Hampshire Fire & Rescue

No objections. Please adhere to specific advice contained with the full consultation response.

Highways England

No objections.

Hampshire Highways

Please refer to Council's Highways Engineer for this scale of development.

Highways Engineer, Development Engineer

Summited Plan160720-200 REV E shows a redesigned Bartons Road/Horndean Road/Emsworth Common Road with the provision of a 3m cycleway within the existing carriageway on the west side of Horndean Road and the widening of the existing footway on the north side of Bartons road to a 3m cycleway.

This plan also shows with crossing points at Bartons and Horndean road. In principle this is acceptable to the Highway Authority and this plan should be included in a planning 106 Agreement ultimately leading to construction by means of a Highway 278

Agreement. The works must be completed before the first occupation of an any new residential unit.

In order to insure the accessibility and permeability of this site the applicant should enter into a planning 106 Agreement allowing its connection with future developments to the south by means of a pedestrian and/or cycleway.

Historic England

No comments - refer to LPA Conservation Officer

Housing Needs Manager, Havant Borough Council

Housing: The proposal is for a residential development of 90 units comprising of a mix of 1, 2, 3, and 4 bedroom homes:

Current planning policy requirements Core Strategy policy CS9. 2 mean that this proposal would need to provide 30-40% affordable housing on site; this would equate to a minimum of 27 units with a tenure split of around 70/30 Affordable rented/ Shared Ownership; these units would be secured via a section 106 agreement.

I note that the applicants have submitted a viability assessment which states that in their opinion there is no opportunity to provide affordable housing due to the costs of developing the site. This assessment has been referred to a third party for scrutiny at the developers cost and negotiations around affordable housing will be informed by the subsequent report.

Demand for affordable housing remains high in the Havant borough; currently there are 1711 households registered on Hampshire Home Choice seeking accommodation in our area and of these 839 are waiting for a one bedroom home, 596 for two bedrooms, 212 for 3 bedrooms.

Principle of Development: Housing would support the principle of this development pending future confirmation of the affordable provision either by way of on site units or a financial contribution following negotiations based on the findings of the third party assessment.

Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council

Although there is no Landscape Team objection to the principle of either application, there are a number of landscape concerns with the submission. It is entirely feasible that some of these concerns can be resolved by additional information or by minor layout adjustments (whether by appropriate planning condition or pursuant to Reserved Matters).

The indicative masterplan layout currently demonstrates there is insufficient space to accommodate 70no dwellings with enough parking, access and space for appropriate landscape (ecological and arboricultural) mitigation. Further layout adaptation and adjustment is required to address some key outstanding issues.

Parking

- The shared surface principle is both accepted and appropriate. The material

selection and arrangement for the wider site will also be important given the context.

- Parking provision in the upper site area (rear of units 8 / 18) appears far too dominant? the outlook for units 19 / 22 will require further consideration.
- Parking bay for unit 18 is inaccessible for a vehicle and in direct conflict with the pedestrian /cycle access.
- Parking bay overhang for unit 33 and the unit 36 driveway requires adjustment.
- Triple tandem arrangements are not deemed practical.
- The swept path analysis demonstrates a very restricted access width between the Main House and Coach House - the vehicle does appear to clip the wall? Even with deflector stones, there is very little margin for error. Recommend some further detailed review of this area, particularly as this is the only means of vehicular access to several proposed dwellings.

Cycling and walking

- The site is not a particularly sustainable location, hence the application must demonstrate a clear commitment to sustainable transport.
- Site access points for pedestrians and cyclists need to comprise an adequate width (3 metres), which then connect to through the site for access to dwellings. Carefully considered, secure and accessible provision is required for cycles for each dwelling.
- There must also be adequate provision made to ensure this development appropriately connects with the wider sustainable transport network. There will be a requirement for shared cycleway / footway crossings and route upgrades within the application site locality.
- The north-west corner requires widening to 3m (acknowledging this will require a non-dig permeable surface detail to minimise impact of tree root protection areas).
- Access through the site for cyclists is as important for pedestrian movement. The route to the east of units 37 and 58 could be widened to facilitate access.
- Access from the south-eastern corner of the site would benefit pedestrians and cyclists (via a crossing on Horndean Road) - a key desire line towards Emsworth. Ideally, this should connect through the southern part of the site towards the Eastleigh Rd access in the south-western site corner. The route width requires increase, the 'mown path' upgraded to a more robust hard surface to facilitate usage in all seasons.

Landscape / layout

- The landscape setting provision for the development squeezed in between the dwellings and northern site boundary (along Bartons Rd) is wholly inadequate. There is insufficient space to establish trees within the margin indicated (let alone afford them sufficient space to grow in the future). Left as currently proposed, there is a likelihood that these 'trees' would be specified as oversize shrubs, affording very little in the way of mitigation for the much larger scale (high bat potential) trees removed from this northern site location.
- A number of trees are shown in close proximity to proposed dwellings. The foundation depths will require careful consideration relative to species selection.
- Units 53/54 directly face Eastleigh Road? it will be important that the exposed facades are carefully detailed to fit in with the local vernacular and rural lane character.

Materials indicated for areas in close proximity to the Listed Buildings are considered

appropriate. We recommend landscape conditions pursuant to further, more detailed information to include planting plans, construction details, associated schedules and specifications for:

- Soft landscape
- Hard landscape
- Boundary treatments
- Landscape management and maintenance

Officer response:

Further to these response, additional plans have been submitted which proposed a pedestrian / cycle way of 3m in width along the northern boundary and north east boundary and connection to the north side of Bartons Road to make the site more sustainable to other modes of transport i.e walking and cycling.

Comments on the parking layout are noted however, further details of this would be subject to a reserved matters application. It should be noted that as there is no housebuilder/developer currently onboard with the scheme all details except access are reserved. The Outline aspect of the application is largely establishing the principle of the type and scale of development and no more.

The point between the main house and coach house has been widened to allow increase access. The relevant conditions would be included.

Local Lead Flood Authority HCC

We have reviewed the following information in relation to the planning application:

- Ardent Consulting Engineers Clarification letter dated 16th November 2017

The proposals for surface water drainage meet the current standards/best practice in relation to surface water drainage.

Planning Policy, PPUD

Policy Status

The Local Plan (Core Strategy) and the Local Plan (Allocations), together with the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan form the development plan for the borough. Also relevant to this application is the Local Plan Housing Statement, a policy statement adopted by the Borough Council on 7 December 2016, which is a material consideration in determining planning applications. All of the above documents are available at www.havant.gov.uk/localplan

Principle of Development:

The site currently lies outside the urban area, as defined by policy AL2 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) and Policy CS17 (Core Strategy). These policies seek to concentrate development in the defined urban area. The proposal for residential development is therefore contrary to the policies of the adopted Local Plan.

However, the council is in the process of reviewing its Local Plan, and has adopted a

Local Plan Housing Statement as an interim step following a Regulation 18 consultation on the Local Plan. The statement is in response to the high need for housing in the borough and sets out the council's position regarding the development of sites for residential purposes, ahead of adoption of the new Local Plan. The statement relates specifically to sites which are not allocated in the adopted Local Plan, and it supports the principle of residential development on a number of urban extension sites. The site that is the subject of this application is one of the sites identified in Guiding Principle 4 of the Housing Statement (Site Reference UE55). Overall, therefore the principle of development of this site is accepted.

It is noted that the current proposal increases the proposed number of dwellings substantially (from 35 in the Housing Statement to 90 now proposed). This will need to be considered in detail, having particular regard to heritage considerations (see below).

Detailed policy considerations

The following policies and documents are of particular relevance to this proposal:

- CS9 Housing
- CS11 Protecting and Enhancing Special Environment and Heritage
(note surveys have indicated presence of Bechstein's Bats on the site)
- CS17 Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas
- CS21 Developer Requirements
- DM6 Coordination of Development
- DM8 Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features
- DM13 Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development
- DM20 Historic Assets
- DM24 Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development
- AL2 Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements
- Guiding Principle 4, Local Plan Housing Statement
- Havant Borough Council Housing SPD (July 2011)
- Havant Borough Council Parking SPD (July 2016)

Strategic Site to the South

It should be noted that as part of the Local Plan Housing Statement a Strategic Site delivering at least 1,650 dwellings is proposed immediately to the south and west of the application site. Given that both sites are acknowledged in the Housing Statement, and the application site has been taken into account in the emerging master planning work for the strategic site, it is not considered that the development of the application site would undermine the ability to deliver the strategic site. It should, however, be noted that improvements to the Bartons Road / Horndean Road junction are likely to be needed in the context of the significant number of dwellings planned for the area. Any off-site highway works required to facilitate the application scheme should take this into account.

Minerals & Waste

The site overlies identified minerals resource, and as such is in the Minerals Consultation Area for Hampshire County Council. According to the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Safeguarding SPD, proposals on sites overlying resource in the MCAS with an areas of over 3ha should be referred to the County Council.

Developer Contributions

Community Infrastructure Levy and SRMP contributions will be payable in accordance with the Council's adopted CIL charging schedule and policy DM24 of the Allocations Plan.

Conclusion

The principle of this development, while not supported by the adopted Local Plan, is supported by the Local Plan Housing Statement, a material consideration. However, the more detailed policies relating to matters such as impact on the listed building, design and layout, access etc need to be sufficiently addressed in order for the overall scheme to be acceptable.

Traffic Management, HBC

No adverse comments.

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: 01/09/2017

Number of representations received: 6

A total of 6no. representations were received. A summary of the points made is provided below:

- The density is too high for this site and will affect the setting of the listed building.

Officer comment – This is considered in detail in Section 7 of the report. The setting of the main listed building in terms of the front lawn would be preserved.

- Any application should be deferred until the layout of major road in conjunction with the strategic development site is determined.

Officer comment – The Council cannot delay applications coming forward for determination. They need to be determined on the existing highway network at the time of the application. The strategic site is still in the development stages.

- Eastleigh Road is already used as a rat run and the development would exacerbate existing issues.

Officer comment – The Development Engineer has not raised any concerns with regards to highway safety issues on Eastleigh Road. Please see Section 7 of the report for further consideration of highway issues.

- The increase in traffic on Eastleigh Road would affect the character of the road and its dwellings.

Officer comment – Please see above comment.

- The development would have an adverse impact on the wildlife on the site including the protected bats.

Officer comment – The application is accompanied by an Ecological Assessment which has been assessed by the County Ecologist. This is further considered in Section 7 of the officer’s report.

7 Planning Considerations

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

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Viability position
- (iii) Nature of development
- (iv) Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- (v) Residential and neighbouring amenity
- (vi) Access and highway implications
- (vii) Flooding and drainage
- (viii) Impact on ecology
- (ix) Impact on trees
- (x) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), construction requirements and legal agreement.

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was adopted by National Government Framework on 27th March. The primary objective of the NPPF is to increase the delivery of sustainable growth and development. It is about delivering growth that is not to the detriment of future generations. This positive growth should perform an economic, social and environmental role and should be allowed to go ahead without delay. The NPPF requires local development plans to take local circumstances into account and meet the objectively assessed development needs of an area.

7.3 The Council’s Adopted Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011 and Allocations Plan 2014) covers the period until 2026 and continues to form the basis for determining planning applications in the Borough. However, the Core Strategy was adopted prior to the NPPF and the housing target was based on the now revoked South East Plan. National guidance sets out that it is a key requirement for the Council to prepare a Local Plan that will meet the full, objectively assessed need (OAN) for housing in its area. In response the Council has therefore adopted the Local Plan Housing Statement in December 2016. The Statement is in response to the high need for housing in the Borough and sets out the Council’s position regarding the development of greenfield sites for residential purposes, ahead of the adoption of the new Local Plan. The statement relates specifically to sites which are not allocated in the current Local Plan and it supports the principle of residential development on a number of urban extension sites.

7.4 A robust assessment took place of land in the Borough to inform the Local Plan Housing Statement. This showed that there was only a finite amount of available land which could be used for housing, which is not sufficient to meet the Borough’s housing need. This includes a strategic site in the area between Denvilles and Emsworth, to the north of the A27 and sharing a southern boundary with the application site. However, strategic sites

such as this take a reasonable long time to appropriately plan and bring forward comprehensively with the necessary infrastructure. As a result, the strategic site will not contribute to the housing supply in the short-medium term. It was necessary when assessing the land suitable for future housing delivery to consider whether any sites could contribute to the housing supply in the short term, given the identified housing need and the lack of a five-year housing land supply. The application site was considered to be one which could deliver housing in the short term and did not have any constraints which could not be mitigated. The allocation of the site for housing has been carried forward into the Draft Local Plan 2036 which went out for consultation between 8th January and 16th February 2018.

7.5 While the site lies outside the urban area as defined by Policy AL2 of the Local Plan (Allocations) and Policy CS17 (Core Strategy), it is nonetheless one of the sites identified for early release (Policy H25 in the Draft Local Plan 2036). The scheme has been submitted in response to the inclusion of the site within the Council's Local Plan Housing Statement. This identified the capacity of the site to deliver 35 dwellings on a brownfield site. The proposal increases this number to up to 90 units including the conversion of the listed building (Southleigh Park House) to 20 units. The LPHS yields are indicative only and subject to satisfactorily meeting all other policy and material considerations, a higher number of units is acceptable in principle given the need for housing in the Borough.

7.6 The LPHS Guiding Principle 4 states:

The principle of residential development on Table 2 sites will be considered favourably in order to contribute towards the objectively assessed housing need and to significantly boost housing supply in the Borough. This material consideration means that there is sufficient weight to justify a departure from Policies CS17 and AL2. Proposals coming forward for Table 2 sites will be expected to continue to meet the remaining requirements of the Adopted Local Plan. Such sites will only be agreed in principle if accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Statement, produced as agreed by and in collaboration with the Local Planning Authority.

7.7 An Infrastructure Delivery Statement (IDS) in the format suggested in the Council's guidance has been submitted to cover the topics suggested in the Council's IDS guidance. Specialist reports have been submitted to identify the specific measures to address the development impacts, such as flooding, and highways, and these matters are considered further on in this report.

(ii) Viability position

7.8 A viability assessment was submitted with the application. It was established at the outset that viability was a major challenge for the delivery of a scheme on the site as there are significant costs associated with the ongoing restoration and maintenance of the listed building assets, together with a number of necessary infrastructure costs and abnormal mains services costs. The assessment concluded that the development is unable to deliver an affordable housing contribution in either provision of on-site delivery, or any other contribution other than the provision of offsite highway works and the required Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL.)

7.9 As per advice set out in Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy 2011, the applicant's viability assessment has been reviewed by an independent third party. In this case, the Council used the DVS who are property specialists for the public sector. The findings of their review are summarised below:

a. The proposed development cannot viably support the policy level of affordable housing contribution on top of CIL contributions already reflected in the assessment, as it is borderline viable.

b. A major factor affecting the viability of the proposed scheme is the abnormal site development costs. This is due to the site being a brownfield site with existing occupied buildings in place and therefore the value of the site is underpinned by its existing use as an office and premises.

c. By virtue of the protections under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954, the compensation payable (approximately £354,000) to the existing tenants also have bearing on the viability of the scheme.

d. Another major factor affecting the viability is the necessity to retain and preserve the existing Grade II listed buildings on the site. When converting historic buildings, refurbishment costs can often be greater than if the site were to be cleared and replaced with new-build properties.

e. The applicant should enter into an agreement to build the site to core and shell within 18 months and if not achieved, a second viability assessment should take place giving the Council an opportunity to achieve a higher commuted sum if sales prices had improved.

- 7.10 With regards to point (e) above, this is often referred to as a viability review mechanism (VRM) and is generally included as an obligation of the S106 legal agreement. The applicant has submitted a request not to include this mechanism in the S106. The reason being provided is that this is a high-risk development, particularly because of the challenges of converting the listed buildings, but also of it being an 'untried' area for sale of properties of the type proposed. It is not a 'traditional' scheme and will require a specialist skill set and therefore the pool of developers would be relatively small. Also, the viability challenges of the site are a serious consideration and the requirement for a viability review is likely to put off potential developers even further. Furthermore, viability reviews are more appropriate for longer-term / multi-phased schemes and should be undertaken prior to the implementation of a scheme or phase. Such a mechanism is inappropriate for the development at Southleigh Park House which would need to be committed to as a whole, in terms of funding and construction.
- 7.11 Given the above justification, the Local Planning Authority is of the view that the inclusion of a VRM would bring a significant element of uncertainty into the future value of the land potential discourage investors, particularly given the complexities of the site with the historic building conversions. This would be working against the principle of allocating the site for housing to contribute to the Council's housing targets as set out in the LPHS and the Draft Local Plan 2036. The LPA also concurs with the view that the VRM has a role to play to where a development is likely to be delivered in one single phase. It is therefore considered reasonable that a VRM in the case of this application should not be a requirement of the legal agreement.
- 7.12 Further to the assessment of the viability appraisal, further costs have been incurred by the development. Those being the offsite highway works as detailed in the proposal section of the report which were originally unaccounted for. Also, the increased CIL liability with the 2018 indexation applied and the increase in cost of the Solent

Recreation Mitigation Project following the adoption of the Definitive Strategy which is in force from April 2018. It is therefore clear that if an affordable housing contribution were to be sought, the scheme would be unviable and therefore unlikely to ever come forward. This potentially places the historic buildings on the site at risk if the current tenant vacates which presents a serious issue for the Council which seeks to retain and protect its important heritage assets.

(iii) Nature of Development

- 7.13 The current application is for both full and outline planning permission. With regards to the outline planning application, this is for access only with all other matters reserved. There is a layout plan submitted which shows up to 70 dwellings positioned to the north and west of the main listed building however, this is indicative only and any detailed layout considerations would be subject to a reserved matters application.

The density of residential development

- 7.14 This hybrid application seeks 90no. units which equates to 28 dwellings per hectare on the overall site and 32dph on the outline application area. Core Strategy policy CS9 states that planning permission will be granted for housing proposals which (amongst other matters) '*Achieve a suitable density of development for the location, taking account accessibility to public transport and proximity to employment, shops and services in addition to respecting the surrounding landscape, character and built form*'.
7.15 The supporting text of the Core Strategy paragraph 6.21 provides further guidance stating that:

"The density of new housing will depend on its design and appropriateness to its location. As a guide the following minimum density thresholds have been developed using the Havant Borough Townscape, Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment and the levels of accessibility to a range of facilities:

*High Density – Minimum of 60 dwellings per hectare
Medium Density – Minimum of 45 dwellings per hectare
Low Density – Up to 45 dwellings per hectare."*

Under this assessment, the density of development can be considered to be within the Low-Density Category.

- 7.16 Paragraph 6.23 makes it clear that 'It is not intended that density requirements should be too prescriptive as it is often a difficult balance between maximising the use of land and reflecting surrounding built character and the amenity of neighbouring residents. This is therefore best assessed through individual planning proposals through the development management process.

The mix of dwelling sizes and tenures

- 7.17 Whilst the mix of dwelling types for the outline area would be agreed at the reserved matters stage, the indicative layout shows that a good range of dwelling types are

proposed in principle. Given the character of the area, mainly dwellings are proposed with some flats above garages, as opposed to flatted blocks of development.

The design and layout of the development

- 7.18 A master plan has been submitted as part of the hybrid application which indicates the overall layout of the whole site. Notwithstanding this layout, only the conversion of the listed buildings is for detailed consideration at this stage, whilst the layout for new residential development remains illustrative only.
- 7.19 The layout for the scheme has been informed by the position of the listed buildings and the setting, along with the urban edge, existing access positions, on site trees, drainage and ecology mitigation measures requirements over the site. New development is generally arranged in perimeter block form. Active frontages facing the majority of routes, amenity areas and entrances ensures a high level of natural surveillance. The site would include a number of open amenity spaces and linked pedestrian corridors and paths, which seek to maintain the setting of the main listed building and achieve permeability through the site. The main shared open space is the area south of the main house including the lawn and lake. There would also be a new formal lawn in front of the west wing.
- 7.20 Whilst appearance is a matter for a reserved matters application, it is proposed that new buildings would be constructed using materials and architectural forms which are complementary to the listed buildings. This is to ensure that the development has an integrated appearance, whilst at the same time ensuring that the new works will not detract from the qualities of the listed buildings.

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

- 7.21 The application site is fairly isolated being enclosed on three sides by the highway network and given its location in the north of the Borough close to the boundaries with East Hampshire and West Sussex. It currently sits in the undeveloped gap between Havant and Emsworth and lies to the north of a strategic development site as identified in the Draft Local Plan. As a result of its history as a stately home with historic parkland, the site has a strong verdant character with a strong established tree line on all boundaries except to the south which is mainly open to the parkland further south.
- 7.22 The site is currently closed off to the public realm and the proposed development would provide the opportunity to open up the site and its heritage assets to the public realm. Whilst, the properties themselves would be private, the open space could be enjoyed where at present it is restricted.
- 7.23 The proposed development, by reasons of the number of housing units proposed, would result in the loss of several trees across the site. The application proposes a landscape strategy to retain the strong verdant and rural appearance which forms the character of the site. Trees on the outer edges of the site have been identified as important for bat and bird foraging and commuting and most of these are to be retained. Key groups of trees are to be retained including those on the corner of Eastleigh Road and Bartons Road, those forming the background to the lodge and some on the boundary with Horndean Road. A number of landscape measures are proposed on the Landscape Strategy Plan however, a number of these measures fall within the outline permission and would therefore be subject to a reserved matters application. Furthermore, the full element of the application would require a condition for a detailed soft landscaping

scheme. On balance, it is considered that whilst there would be a loss of trees on the site (further discussed in Section (viii) below), the development would seek to retain the character and appearance of the site and therefore accords with Policy CS11 of the Local Plan.

(v) Residential and neighbouring amenity

- 7.24 Given its separation from other established urban dwellings, the development would have a limited visual impact on the closest neighbouring properties located in Emsworth Common Road or further south on Eastleigh Road.
- 7.25 A relatively low level of representations were received against the application with the main points being summarised in Section 5 of this report. Officer's comments to the main points raised are also included in this section.

(vi) Access and highway considerations

- 7.26 The application has been submitted with a Transport Assessment which has assessed the impact of the proposed development on the adjoining highway network, whilst also considering the internal road layout and parking provision. The existing three vehicular accesses into the site, from Eastleigh Road, would be utilised for the development (two of these accesses are redundant at present). Eastleigh Road is subject to a 40mph speed limit and a weight restriction. There are no parking restrictions and it is not lit, other than the short section on the approach to the Barton's Road junction.
- 7.27 The northernmost access would provide vehicular access to the northern part of the site only and the central access would provide vehicular access to the central portion of the site only. Use of the southern point of access would be limited to with fewer dwellings accessed from the point, which by extension will act to limit vehicular traffic associated with the southern junction. The arrangement would spread vehicle movements between the access junctions.
- 7.28 The proposed access junctions would incorporate a 5.5m wide carriageway which would feed into shared internal arrangements. The northernmost access junction would incorporate a footway that will tie into the recently constructed footway provided on the eastern side of Eastleigh Road and thereby provide an improved pedestrian link to Bartons Road.
- 7.29 The forecast change in trip generation resulting from the proposed redevelopment of the site demonstrates that the scheme is expected to result in a reduction in trips by all modes of travel in the week day am and pm peak hours when compared with the potential associated with office use of the site. The assessment concluded that the changes would be immaterial to the operation of the local road network as a result.
- 7.30 The Council's Development Engineer (DE) has assessed the application and has raised no objection to the proposed accesses into the site or the internal road layout (albeit this is partly indicative at this stage), or the change in traffic generation resulting from the redevelopment of the site.
- 7.31 The DE has advised in his response that the site is in a fairly unsustainable part of the Borough with limited public transport, but easily accessible by road. It is therefore imperative that the site is made as sustainable as possible for accessing the site by means other than a car. The locality of the application of the site includes other major

residential development sites, including three sites on Barton's Road. The original scheme as submitted did not propose any off-site highway works to provide cycleways and footpaths out of and into the site. However, following discussions with the planning officers and the DE, additional plans were submitted to include such works.

- 7.32 The DE has advised that the additional plan (Appendix G) shows the provision of a 3m cycleway within the existing carriageway on the west side of Horndean Road and the widening of the existing footway on the north side of Bartons road to a 3m cycleway. This plan also shows with crossing points at Bartons and Horndean road. In principle this is acceptable to the Highway Authority and the DE has advised that should be included in a planning S106 Agreement ultimately leading to construction by means of a Highway 278 Agreement. The works must be completed before the first occupation of any new residential unit.
- 7.33 Parking on the site would be in the form of both allocated spaces for residents and unallocated spaces for visitors. There would be allocated parking for each property with a total number of 182 spaces across the development. Parking would be provided in the form of car barns, open spaces and garages. The detailed design of these would be subject to a reserved matters application. The number of allocated parking spaces accords with the Council's adopted parking standards SPD.
- 7.34 There is also a requirement for the development to provide visitor parking. The requirement in the adopted standards is for 20% of additional parking spaces to be provided for visitors. Therefore, for the overall scheme of 90 units, 36no. visitor spaces are required. However, only 24no. spaces (or 15%) have been provided for visitor parking on the overall scheme. This meets the adopted standard for the full element of the application (i.e. the listed building conversions) which requires 7.5no. spaces for visitor parking but falls short for the outline element of the which requires 29no. spaces. There is a shortfall of 12.5 spaces for the outline element. Again the Outline application only deals with the access and all other matters are reserved, therefore the parking could change as the reserve matters come forward.
- 7.35 The application has justified this by advising that as the shortfall is only in visitor parking, un-utilised resident spaces would be able to accommodate some visitor demand should this arise. The application also includes a Residential Travel Plan which promotes the use of sustainable and active modes of travel for journeys to / from the site and promotes actives modes such as walking and cycling as well public transport amongst residents. This would subject to annual monitoring. A balance needs to be made against the shortfall of visitor parking (12.5 spaces) and the harm this may cause such as on road parking, against the benefits of the scheme which are the provision of well needed housing and future protection of the heritage assets on the site. Overall it is considered that the latter outweigh the under provision of visitor parking for this application.

(vi) Flooding and drainage

- 7.36 The Environment Agency's indicative flooding map shows that the site is located in a Flood Zone 1. This is land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1000 (lowest risk) annual probability of flooding from a river or stream in any year and not within an area. The NPPF guidance states that Planning Authorities should complete a risk based 'Sequential Test at all stages of the planning process to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Under the requirements of the 'sequential test' and as the proposed development is already located within flood zone 1, there are

no more suitable, developable and deliverable sites, better located from a flood risk perspective, which would accommodate the proposed development.

7.37 A flood risk and drainage assessment has been submitted with the application. This advises that foul water from the site is intended to drain via new foul water drainage system to the existing 150mm Southern Water Sewer at the south of the site. A management company would be appointed to maintain the roads, landscaping and shared SuDS through the development. The proposed drainage system would be capable of managing runoff from all rainfall events up to and including the critical duration of a 1 in 100-year storm event plus 40% allowable for climate change. Residual surface water runoff would be wholly stored on-site by means of a series of SuDS features. Discharge of surface water would mimic existing surface water runoff rates and offer the requisite treatment of surface water.

7.38 The County Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) have been consulted on the application and advise that following further clarification submitted by the agent, the proposals for surface water drainage meet the current standards/best practice in relation to surface water drainage.

(vii) Impact on ecology

7.39 The application is accompanied by an Ecological Assessment carried out by ECOSA and comprised ecological surveys carried out in 2015-2016. Additional bat surveys were subsequently carried out during the 2016 season. This concluded that bat activity on the site is fairly low.

7.40 The County Ecologist has been consulted and has advised that the site overall is of limited ecological value in terms of its habitats: the site is dominated by buildings and associated mature plantings, including much non-native tall scrub. There is an area of managed lawn within the south of the site, bordering an extensive area of parkland. A considerable amount of survey work has been carried out at this site, focussing mostly on bats but also including great crested newt surveys. The Ecologist is satisfied that the suite of surveys carried out is likely to have provided a robust picture of the site's ecological value (although please see comments below on buildings).

7.41 In terms of protected species, GCN are considered absent and the site is considered to offer negligible potential for supporting reptiles and hazel dormouse. The scrub and trees are likely to support a range of 'garden' bird species. The most significant ecological constraint is the confirmed presence of the rare Bechstein's bat, with three individuals captured on site. The grounds of the buildings therefore constitute confirmed foraging/commuting habitat for this rare bat, although it is accepted that the site likely only forms a very small percentage of the available habitat in the surrounding landscape. The site has also been shown to support a number of other bat species, including western barbastelle, another uncommon species, as well as Nathusius' pipistrelle an uncommon migratory species.

7.42 The proposals will entail the loss of considerable vegetation cover from the site. This includes areas of non-native shrubs as well as large, mature trees and low scrub. Whilst the loss of trees in particular is unfortunate, in terms of impacts to protected species sufficient survey effort has been employed (with the exception of buildings and bats) to have a good degree of certainty that impacts will be minimal. Several of the buildings have been assessed as offering bat roosting potential and requiring additional survey

effort. It has been confirmed by the applicant that additional survey work was carried and found...

- 7.43 As such, all ecological mitigation measures are secured by condition. The most important factor here is to ensure that site lighting is absolutely minimal, with darkened corridors available for flying bats.

(viii) Impact on trees

- 7.44 There are a high number of specimen trees which formed part of the historic parkland and garden. There is also a large amount of overgrown vegetation, including self-seeded trees as a result of the grounds being unmanaged since the 1960's. Overall the trees make a strong contribution to the verdant and rural character of the site and provide a high level of screening from the adjoining road network.
- 7.45 The Design and Access Statement submitted with the application advises that there is no evidence that any significant tree management has been carried out during recent decades. The density of the original planting has been exacerbated by self-seeded trees which have crowded out some of the original specimen trees. The site requires major arboricultural work to address the years of neglect and ensure that the key trees have sufficient space to thrive.
- 7.46 The proposed number of units on the site would require the removal of a large number of trees across the whole site, including several original parkland trees. The Council's Tree Officer has been consulted and carried out a detailed visit of the site. The Tree Officer raised an objection to the scheme on arboricultural grounds. The reason being that if the number of trees shown for removal is implemented then the site will lose its current verdant character and impact negatively on the surrounding area. In addition to this a number of the new dwellings are planned without giving due regard to the size of adjacent trees, this will lead to future pressure to excessively prune or fell these trees. It would also appear that many of the new trees will not have sufficient growing space and as such will not work as part of this scheme.
- 7.47 Based on the response of the Council's Tree Officer, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DM8 and CS11. However, the number of housing units proposed is required to make the scheme viable given the high costs of converting the listed buildings on the site. As such there is a clear need here to weigh up the harmful loss of trees across the site, against the benefits the scheme would bring in terms of the provision of housing and the future protection of the listed buildings.
- 7.48 The site is allocated for housing albeit for 35no units in the LPHS and the Draft Local Plan 2036. The draft policy for the site requires that any development meets the following requirements:
- i. meets Guiding Principle 4 of the LPHS
 - ii. includes an IDS
 - iii. retains and sympathetically reuses all the listed buildings
 - iv. maintains a suitable setting for the listed buildings
 - v. retains and integrates the protected trees
 - vi. takes access to the site from Eastleigh Road
 - vii. provides for the widening of the existing footway on the south side of Barton's Road to create a shared cycle / footway to the west and to the east around the junction of Barton's Road and Horndean Road.

7.49 The proposed development meets all of the requirements other than (v) which is to retain and integrate protected trees. Some of the protected trees are retained on the site but given that the application is for 70 new residential units (not including those in the listed buildings), the tree loss is far more significant than it would have been if only 35 dwellings were being proposed as per the draft allocation. However, as the viability case is justified, the number of units proposed is required to offset the high costs of converting the listed buildings on the site. If only 35 units were proposed, it is likely that the conversion of the listed buildings would/could not come forward. This potentially places the heritage assets at risk if they are left vacant and unable to attract any occupiers or developers.

7.50 Whilst it is very regrettable that the proposal would require more tree loss than anticipated, the scheme would meet the majority of requirements as set in the draft policy for the site and would contribute well to the Borough's housing numbers. Moreover, it would secure the long-term protection and maintenance of the group of important heritage assets within the site, whilst protecting the setting of the main house. Therefore, on balance, it is considered that the loss of trees on the site is outweighed by the benefits the scheme would bring to the Borough.

(ix) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), contribution requirements and legal

agre

7.51 The impacts of the proposed development on key infrastructure have been assessed and an Infrastructure Delivery Statement has been submitted in accordance with Guiding Principle 4 of the LPHS. The infrastructure provision in respect of highways, education, flood risk/ drainage, health, open space, leisure and utilities has been considered and mitigation for the potential impacts on infrastructure which would be the subject of a legal agreement as set in para 7.45.

7.52 The CIL liability for the site currently stands at £492,162.93. Based on the figures set out in the CIL Additional Information Form.

7.53 Additionally a S106 will be required in respect of the following matters:-

1. Payment of a Travel Plan Monitoring Fee, Monitoring Fee and Approval Fee
2. S106 Monitoring Fee
3. Management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development for all unadopted / communal areas including roads, open space and SuDS and bond.
4. Solent Recreation Management Project - £41,134.
5. Travel Plan
6. Offsite highways works
7. Phasing of the listed building conversion works.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The development site was not identified as an allocated housing site in the adopted Local Plan but has now been identified as a housing extension site in the LPHS and as an allocation in the Draft Local Plan 2036. The existing Local Plan does not meet the Objectively Assessed Housing Need, this is a compelling material consideration which indicates that a decision could be taken that departs from the local plan. In terms of whether the development would constitute sustainable development, there is a balance between the loss of several protected trees on the site against the benefits it would bring in terms of housing and the future protection of heritage assets however, the submitted

plans provide for a satisfactory form of development which achieves an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area, and the amenities of neighbouring properties. Ecological and Technical requirements such as highway considerations have been addressed and the Lead Local Flood Authority has indicated that the drainage strategy is acceptable.

- 8.2 In summary, the proposed development is considered to comply with the Housing Statement, the Borough Design Guide and the NPPF and the emerging Draft Local Plan policy. It would boost the supply of much needed housing in a sustainable manner. As such the recommendation is for permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement and planning conditions.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to:

(A) Grant Full Planning Permission for only the following part of the above proposal as described:

FULL planning permission for change of use, alterations to and extension of existing buildings to 20no. residential units, (13no. units in the main house and 7no. units in the other listed buildings) with associated landscaping, parking and amenity space.

Subject to the following:

(a) The completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other relevant legislation, (subject to such changes as the Head of Planning and the Solicitor to the Council may determine);

(b) Planning conditions set out in Appendix E (subject to such changes as the Head of Planning and the Solicitor to the Council may determine);

(ii) Grant Outline Planning Permission with respect to the following part of the above proposal as described:

OUTLINE planning permission with all matters reserved except means of access) for the demolition of 1983 office building and associated brick and glass corridor link and development of up to 70 residential units, associated landscaping, parking and infrastructure works.

Subject to the following:

(a) The completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other relevant legislation (subject to such changes as the Head of Planning and the Solicitor to the Council may determine);

(b) Planning conditions set out in Appendix F (subject to such changes as the Head of Planning and the Solicitor to the Council may determine);

Appendices

A – Location Plan

B – Existing Site Plan

C – Illustrative Masterplan (amended version)

D – Landscape Strategy (amended version)

E – Proposed conditions for the Full part of the planning application

F – Proposed conditions for the OUTLINE part of the planning application

G – Off site highway works plan – Drwg No. 160720-200 Rev E