

Deputations Received

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
11 November 2021

I am now able to enclose, for consideration by the Planning Committee on 11 November 2021 , the following deputations submitted since the agenda was published.

Agenda No	Item	
5a	APP/20/00441 - Land west of, Hulbert Road, Havant	1 - 6
	Proposal: Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for the development of up to 100 dwellings and associated improved site access, landscaping, footpaths, SuDS and other associated works on land to the west of Hulbert Road, Havant.	
	Additional Information	
5b	APP/21/00605 - Land at Forty Acres Farm, Havant Road, Havant	7 - 10
	Proposal: Re-plan part of the residential area of the site to facilitate an additional 34 new homes within the development area to create a total 147 dwellings, inclusive of the additional 34 units.	
	Additional Information	

This page is intentionally left blank

**Deputation to HBC Planning Committee 21st October 2021
on behalf of Havant Friends of the Earth and Havant Climate Alliance
re. APP/20/00441 Land west of Hulbert Road.**

We object to this application for Outline Planning Permission.

Local Plan

The site is not designated for housing under the Local Plan to 2037 which is still under public examination. It is stated that the Inspectors may view it as an “omission site” but this is not yet known. **Any decision about the site should be delayed until the outcome of the public examination is known.**

It has been noted that the site is isolated, being outside the urban area as defined by policies CS17 and AL2, and outside the Settlement boundary defined by policy E3 of the Plan under examination.

Under policy IN1 and the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan the site was seen as suitable for an Emergency Services Hub, for Police, Fire and Ambulance, with good access to the major road networks. This would be a more appropriate use of the site, subject to the appropriate environmental avoidance and mitigation. The relocation of these services from the centre of Havant would free up brownfield land near the town centre, more suitable for housing development.

It seems that the only reason that this site is being considered for housing is the pressure to increase home completion targets. However, if planning permission were given, and the developer were to delay building for up to 3 years, it is quite likely that home completions elsewhere would have already increased to an acceptable level within that period.

Noise pollution

Noise mapping shows that noise levels from the A3M would be at unacceptable levels for residents of higher level apartments, even with an added bund. We already have a number of new housing developments close to the A3M and A27 where noise levels are excessive and must impact on residents. Just because previous developments are subject to excessive noise does not mean that the same criteria should be applied to new developments.

If this development is granted Outline Planning Permission, the following conditions should apply:

Trees

We agree with the view that ancient woodland and TPO mature trees should not be felled, including T5 a mature oak tree. The development should be designed around these trees.

A large number of “poor quality” trees and shrubs are to be felled under this plan, mainly to make way for a walk and cycleway. Despite being of “poor quality” they none the less have an important role, in combination, of sequestering carbon. It is

important that the developer compensates for trees felled by planting a comparable number of native species on site. A management plan needs to be in place to assist with the survival of trees and shrubs during their first few years.

Bats

8 species of bats have been recorded on the site, foraging and commuting. This is noted as “a reasonable bat assemblage” which places the site as having regional value. It is important that connectivity round and across the site should be maintained, with infill planting of native species round the edges of the site where needed, and adequate trees and shrubs planted throughout the site to enable this. Bat boxes on houses or trees are advised. Lighting should comply with Bat Conservation Trust standards.

Dormice

A few dormice and their nests were found in 2019 and 2020 surveys. It is important that their habitat on this site is maintained and advice on this followed. Up-to-date surveys would be needed before construction work commenced.

Birds

Construction should only take place outside the breeding season.

Low carbon design

In view of the climate crisis it is essential that construction should comply with low carbon standards due to become mandatory by 2025, which will also increase their attractiveness to future residents. Not only should there be a high standards of insulation, but also low carbon heating using ground or air sourced heat pumps, and use of solar panels (PV or thermal). All can be installed more cheaply during construction, than retrofitted later. The bund beside the A3M could be considered for wind turbines

Active Travel

We support the proposal for an off road cycling and walking track from the site, down to the Asda roundabout, and up to Dunsbury Park. However this should avoid TPO or mature or veteran trees. Homes need secure bike sheds.

EV Charging points

These need to be installed outside all homes to encourage the take up of electric vehicles.

Patricia Brooks

APP/20/00441 – Land West of Hulbert Road

Good evening Members. My name is Dr Chris Lyons, and I am a Director at Tetra Tech Planning consultancy, and I would like to start by saying thank you for the opportunity to speak to you about this planning application. As a former Planning Manager for the Council it is always nice to be back again.

The planning application in front of you tonight is an outline application for 100 new houses to be provided in a highly sustainable location and will provide significant benefits to the local area in addition to the new housing. We all know the Council has a difficult position to find more sites for an increasing number of new houses and so all of the 'easy' sites have already gone. However, this site can provide 100 houses and there have been very few concerns raised by local residents, which demonstrates how it can be developed with little controversy. Many of the issues raised in fact have been addressed by the application, such as claims the site cannot be cycled too or that the woodland will be at risk from the development. The development offers many benefits, and I will touch on those now.

The proposal includes a new lit dedicated footpath and cyclepath from Bedhampton up to the site which means residents will be able to cycle from the site to all of the nearby services and shops. For example, to the south of the site there are employment opportunities at the many shops and food outlets (Asda, B&Q, McDonalds, KFC, the industrial units by Asda for example), and there are bus stops only 300m from the site and Bedhampton railway station slightly further away.

Heading north from the site, there will be a new lit footpath going from the site up to the roundabout to provide access to Dunsbury Park and the job opportunities; within approximately 600m.

The site is therefore highly accessible with access to large shops, jobs, food outlets, schools, colleges, a pub, and all the facilities a community requires.

The site will also offer the policy requirement of affordable housing which as we know, are desperately needed in the area for young people to be able to get on the housing ladder. The location will be attractive with good access to Havant and Waterlooville and a short distance from Portsmouth via the A3(M), nearby buses or the train station.

It should be noted that there is sufficient capacity within the schools nearby and there will be a financial contribution towards health facilities to ensure there is no detrimental impact on those services.

The development will also result in improvements to the woodland to the north and south. The development is focused on the part of the site that is already open and while there are a few trees required to be removed to improve the access and to facilitate the new footpath, the majority of trees to be removed will have to be felled due to poor health anyway. The Trust will ensure the woodland is improved going forwards and there will be an increase in the number of trees to be planted as a result of the development rather than a loss.

The site itself is close to the A3(M) but the development proposes a 3m bund with a 1.8m acoustic fence on top to ensure the noise implications can be satisfactorily addressed and we believe this is a better relationship than other houses already built adjacent to the A3(M). The site is not dissimilar to others further south along the A3(M) and the Environmental Health team have confirmed they are happy with the proposals.

The Council Planning Officers accept in the report that it is sustainable development¹ and that the proposal will deliver significant social, economic, and environmental benefits. The new footpath will provide a safe route for existing residents to be able to walk from Bedhampton up to Dunsbury Park, the woodland will be improved, and there will be no detrimental impact on the school or medical facilities in the area. The site is highly sustainable and a good location for a new community in a woodland setting with good access to the existing community to the south and the facilities.

I recommend this application to you and trust you will agree with your officer's recommendation to approve the scheme and I would like to particularly thank Lesley Wells and Steve Weaver for their assistance.

¹ para (7.40(4))

Deputation Submitted by Councillor Keast

Land to the West of Hulbert Road, Bedhampton

Please accept my representation on the above application.

The points that I wish to raise are as follows.

I cannot remember a planning application where so much effort has been put in to influence the planning process. It is my hope that you look at this application as you always have. Namely on the merits of the application and not on the need to satisfy the Governments housing targets.

Two years ago this site was considered for inclusion in the Local Plan and was rejected because of its isolated position. It was unsustainable as a stand-alone site. This fact has not changed one iota, and for that reason alone you should be looking to refuse this application.

The site has been part of a strategic gap (or green belt) that separates Bedhampton and Leigh Park from Waterlooville for at least 100 years. Although the Motorway and housing have done their best to destroy it, it still remains so. If this application is approved this green belt will be gone forever, never to be replaced.

At the presentation last night, you heard that applications should be sensitive to nature and take into account environmental considerations. On each side of the application site sit two areas of Special Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC), and these form a vital component of biodiversity in the whole area. They support numerous species, plus the fox seen on site view. The link between the two sites is the application site itself. All three areas rely on each other to survive, and the application site provides a corridor between the two SINC sites. Build houses here and you leave the SINC sites in isolation, with no way of interaction between the two, or passage for the various species.

To the north of the application site it is planned to run a footpath and lighting through the TPO trees towards the motorway. This is a SINC site for goodness's sake. Can you imagine this being allowed in Emsworth or Hayling Island. Of course not. So why allow it in Bedhampton. We should be protecting this area.

Hulbert Road will remain unlit despite the development, and I must seriously question the safety of users at night using this footpath. The footpath ends at the Dunsbury Hill roundabout. Here there are no footpaths in any direction. So why put the footpath in in the first place. The applicant knows that this is an isolated site, and he is trying to convince you that it is not. Are you really going to approve a footpath to nowhere?

The application site was never part of the local plan and the application before you is an opportunist one. I cannot believe that we have even entertained this application in the first place. The site sits in isolation from its surroundings and on that basis alone should not be supported.

Hulbert Road is adjacent to the site. It has changed very little over the years and is not much wider than a country lane. It is the very busy link from Havant, Bedhampton and Leigh Park to the A3M motorway, Waterlooville and beyond. Anyone who uses it knows the incredible volume of traffic that travels on it daily. At peak times traffic can build up past the proposed entrance to the site and cause considerable delays. Without major changes to Hulbert Road, it is both dangerous and fool hardy to allow the volume of vehicles created by this site, to enter and leave daily on to this busy road. It could easily amount to 300/400 movements a day in and out of the site. It is also noted that the promised right turn into the site has been removed from the plans, and as if to prove my point regarding the dangers created by this site, I understand a proposal to reduce the speed limit to 30mph is likely.

Please refuse this unsuitable and unwelcome application that is objectively bad. The adverse harm it causes far outweighs any benefits.

Cllr. David J Keast

Deputation Submitted by Mr Giles

Your Ref: APP/21/00605

Site Address: Land at Forty Acres Farm, Havant Road, Havant
Proposal: Re-plan part of the residential area of the site to facilitate an additional 34 new homes within the development area to create a total 147 dwellings, inclusive of the additional 34 units.

I object to this application, we've been fobbed off with science saying everything is ok for far too many years, and now look at the state of the planet, when are you going to wake up and realise that builders get and do what they want, run away with the profits and leave a trail of destruction behind them for householders and local authorities to pay for the consequences' the more studies required the more fog they produce, the end product is the same, householders and local authorities footing the bill for flooding/environmental issues, and it doesn't stop there, all the building work on this site affects all the existing properties in the surrounding area, it overloads an already full to capacity area with regards to flooding, schools, doctors, hospitals etc yet the fog proves otherwise.

Southern water claim there are no recorded flood related issues, you don't need a study to know that's not true, I've lived in Portsmouth for 40 plus years and have been hearing and seeing first hand flood related issues getting worse year on year, you have also heard of the flooding in Portsmouth for many years yet the documents/fog state its ok, you bury your heads in the sand and pretend you've not heard or seen flooding issues, you've all heard about the fines they have received because of pumping raw sewage into Langstone harbour, why do they do that, daaa, the system cant cope, again, you don't need a 650 page document to tell you that, it's a fact, we all know it yet the documents supporting say its ok, well here's some news for you all, ITS NOT OK, when are we going to wake up and start acting responsibly and doing what's right for all, not just the builders of this world.

The whole planning system is floored, has been for far too long and I can't ever see it changing, the builders know how to manipulate the system to get what they want, council officers are encouraged to approve and all relevant paperwork written to get approval, the genuine merits of local residents, common sense etc doesn't enter the equation, why not because it gets in the way of the money makers, you see thousands of properties with serious problems all over the country in the news on a regular basis yet you carry on creating the same problems year after year pretending its ok, well its not ok and the sooner you wake up to that the better.

Years ago, there was a directive saying in so many words, no more building on flood plains, then in small print underneath a line saying, quote; unless there is a need for housing, unquote, what a mess, and know body challenges this stupidity, they all go along with it like a load of deluded sheep, what a mess.

I read a saying many years ago which said, if you pay a scientist enough money, he will prove to you black is white, how true that statement is, and like fools to many people will believe it.

I appreciate that only planning related issues are relevant at such meetings so most of what I've said isn't included, doesn't make it irrelevant, in fact it's the opposite, it's very relevant, its just that you must not let it get in your way so its disregarded.

Reject this application, make a stand, do what is right, don't be manipulated by the builder, and don't get me started on Section 106 of the town and country act.....

Mr Mick Giles

Deputation / statement on application APP/21/00605 (Forty Acre Farm, Bedhampton)

Jon Gateley, for Barratt David Wilson Homes Southampton
9 November 2021

Good evening Councillors and my thanks to the officer for his thorough report.

Firstly to recap on the background. You'll recall that this site has been in the Council's plan for over 5 years, originally as part of the *Local Plan Housing Statement*. Our original application was for 320 dwellings, along with a care home, which this committee approved in 2019. Construction is now well under way following officers' helpful support for various minor amendments.

As the report explains, this application increases the total number of homes on the site by just over 10%, but within all the key parameters of the original permission. This includes:

- Containing the additional homes within the same built-up area;
- Keeping the same points of access;
- Keeping the same overall limit on building height;
- Generally using the same house types as previously approved;
- Using the same palette of materials;
- Retaining the care home;
- Increasing the number of parking spaces in proportion to the additional units, in line with parking standards;
- Maintaining the Habitat Mitigation Zone and areas of public open space in full.

Generally the extra units are achieved by substituting larger units with smaller ones, on smaller plots, which are laid out in a more regular geometric pattern than the original consent. Most of the increase in unit numbers is located within the eastern portion of the site, bringing it up to a similar density to the rest of the site. It's important to note that none of the changes relate to the land adjoining Westways.

The application has been subject to extensive consultation, and we have made various adjustments to detail in response to planning officers and consultee advice. There are no objections from any of the statutory consultees or specialists, including ecology, landscape, highways and drainage, and I should reinforce that all the same controls will be sustained over development by way of planning conditions.

I would like to highlight a number of key benefits to the scheme.

- Firstly we will be providing an extra 10 affordable housing units, which with a small additional commuted sum to deal with 0.6 of a unit, will be policy compliant.
- Secondly the site will attract a significant extra sum in Community Infrastructure Levy contributions.
- Thirdly the site will provide various other Section 106 contributions in proportion to the uplift. These include

- A contribution towards Health of £5,440

- Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy contribution of £26,605.85
- A contribution towards a Community worker of £8,500

There have been a handful of objections, but these generally repeat grievances from the original development and so with respect I would ask members to be guided by the officer and to look objectively at the bigger picture. Central to this is the urgent need to provide housing in sustainable locations. The recent Inspector's findings on the Local Plan have undermined much of the Council's future supply of housing, making it all the more important to make the best use of the deliverable sites that it does have.

Approval of this application would be barely noticeable by residents, but the extra 34 units would be an important first step towards getting housing supply back on track, reducing the Council's exposure to losses at planning appeals on sites that it does not want.

To conclude, I fully agree with the officer in his recommendation that the site represents sustainable development, and would ask members to grant planning permission.