

## Supplementary Information

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 30TH JUNE, 2022

Please note that the attached supplementary information was unavailable when the agenda was printed.

### Agenda No    Item

<b>5(a)</b>	<b>APP/20/01221 - Land to the west of B&amp;Q, Purbrook Way, Havant</b> Proposal:      Erection of retail foodstore with associated car parking, access, landscaping and engineering works.	<b>1 - 4</b>
-------------	---	--------------

[Additional Information](#)

<b>5(b)</b>	<b>APP/22/00161 - 186 Sea Front, Hayling Island</b> Proposal:      Demolition of existing house and replacement with 7 unit apartment development [Use Class C3]	<b>5 - 8</b>
-------------	--	--------------

[Additional Information](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Deputation Submitted by the Applicant

Good evening Chair, members of the committee. My name is James Mitchell, Regional Head of Property for Lidl, thanks for the opportunity to speak to you in support of our proposals.

The scheme before you tonight is the result of 18 months of discussion with officers. I thank officers for the proactive way the application has been handled. Our proposals have evolved massively from submission with a host of improvements made, allowing the scheme to reach this committee with a recommendation for approval.

Time does not permit me to touch on all aspects of the application, but I will touch on a few key matters.

Firstly, retail policy considerations.

The Council policy team raise no objection. This position has been informed by expert external advice which has concluded the proposals comply with all national and local policy requirements, most notably the sequential test.

Turning to landscaping and aboricultural matters.

Our proposals have been hugely improved in this area. Whilst there is some loss of trees towards the site frontage within areas of adopted highway these trees are of generally low quality. The County have confirmed the proposals are acceptable to them and have agreed a CAVAT payment to mitigate the loss of the trees. The scheme boasts massive new soft landscaping and tree planting including 37 new trees, over 5000 hedge, shrub, and ground cover plants as well as extensive areas of wildflower meadow. Crucially our proposals offer vastly enhanced diversity of planting with associated biodiversity benefits. On this basis the case officer concludes our proposals are accepted.

Extensive discussions have taken place with Hampshire Highways to ensure a compliant scheme.

Suitable parking levels are provided along with EVC chargers and cycle parking. Lidl will improve the arm of the roundabout by widening to 2 lanes at the exit carriageway providing increased capacity along with improved crossing facilities. A pedestrian and cycle route into the site is provided direct from Purbrook Way. The proposals before you have been found to be acceptable from a safety, capacity, and policy perspective. In addition to the physical improvement works Lidl will make a s106 contribution of £124,500 towards pedestrian and cycle improvements along Purbrook Way is agreed. The approval of the application will also secure a CIL contribution of £225,000 which in combination with the aforementioned improvements produces a very attractive package of measures.

This application offers;

- Sustainable development including EVC and a solar PV array.
- A diverse and attractive landscaping and tree planting scheme.
- A high-quality design.
- A strong package of highway improvement measures.
- Compliance with all relevant policies.

The application is overwhelmingly supported by local residents with nearly 1200, or 80% supporting the scheme proposals.

Perhaps most importantly our scheme represents economic development creating 40 new locally recruited jobs. This store if would provide a high quality, low-cost shopping option for nearby residents and would serve to complement our other local stores.

Now more than ever in the midst of a cost-of-living crisis these key benefits should weigh heavily in the decision-making process.

On this basis I hope members will uphold their officer's recommendation and grant permission for this much needed development.

I am happy to answer any questions members may have and have with me our retail consultant Alastair Thornton and highway consultant Richard Broad should members have any questions for them. answer.

Thank you.

## **Deputation Submitted by Councillor Pike**

**App: 20/01221**

There are two matters of concern that I believe should be further examined by the committee in their determination of this application.

### **Sequential Test**

It is of obvious concern to residents and retailers that this application will create another out of town supermarket putting further pressure on our town centre businesses. On the face of it, it seems perverse to be building a new supermarket on a green field site when there are two empty supermarkets within a reasonable distance - former Tesco Leigh Park, and former Waitrose Waterlooville. It would be helpful for the committee to examine in detail the sequential test to ensure that all avenues have been pursued to reuse empty buildings before using a green field site.

A similar situation happened in Havant when Tesco built a second store, a condition was applied to ensure the 1st store in Leigh Park remained opened. This ensured continued support of the town centre location. I would recommend the committee add a similar condition to this application to ensure the Somborne Drive store remains in situ - I believe the Tesco agreement was 15 years, but many of the documents from this time are not available online.

### **Walking and Cycling access**

It is once again disappointing that the Highway Authority are not doing all they can to secure good walking and cycling access across the Borough, and have agreed a set of measures that will worsen cycle access. The off road cycle route along Purbrook Way is well used, and is the main route to South Downs College from Leigh Park.

By creating a two lane exit from the site, the walking/cycling crossing will not be LTN1/20 compliant, and in the words of the Government Guidance will be 'suitable for few people, and will exclude most potential users and /or have safety concerns'. To be allowing this modification is obviously concerning, and therefore I would recommend the committee ensure further debate about the junction improvement before approval so that walking and cycling use is improved rather than degraded.

It should be perfectly possible to allow good motor vehicle, cycling and walking access around the area - that are appropriately segregated from each - and HCC should be demanding the level of investment required to achieve LTN1/20 compliance.

Kind regards

Tim

Cllr Tim Pike

Councillor - St. Faith's Ward

Havant Borough Council

This page is intentionally left blank

## PLANNING APPLICATION APP/22/00161

### DEPUTATION TO PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING 30<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2022

This deputation to the planning committee meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022, is made on behalf of all the neighbours to the development site and local residents who have objected to this scheme.

There have been over 20 objections, following common themes, which are addressed below.

#### **PARKING**

There have been many objections on the grounds that unallocated parking provision would have detrimental effects on the neighbouring streets.

We believe that the HBC Parking SPD has been mis-applied here, and that parking should be provided on an allocated [Parking SPD Table 4a] basis, rather than an unallocated one [Table 4b]. Application of the correct table would lead to a requirement for 14 parking spaces.

The Parking SPD text gives further definition. At **paragraph 3.05**, it states with reference to reduced parking in town centres and other locations, that;

*“The level of parking to be provided must be based on the nature and scale of development, access to shops and services together with public transport accessibility. A lower level of provision must not result in displacement of parking pressure into nearby residential areas. Utilising near-site parking in dedicated car parks (not on-street parking) should be considered together with demand based measures to reduce parking pressure”.*

We contend that reduced parking provision would lead to displacement of parking pressure into Alexandra Avenue, which is already under severe pressure from visitors to Mengham town centre and the beach.

At **paragraph 3.06**, the **Parking SBD** goes on to say that;

*“On any site where a reduced level of parking provision is considered justified by the Local Planning Authority, the design and layout of the development must include a sufficient space for servicing, emergency services and medical personnel to park, loading and drop off, courier and supermarket deliveries. This should be provided as a single space, the size of which is related to the scale of the proposed development”.*

The application doesn't make such provision, and cannot for the size of site, given that parking is not permitted at the southern end of Alexandra Avenue.

At **paragraph 3.07**, the **Parking SBD** comments that;

*“On any other site where a lower level of parking is proposed, this will be assessed on a case by case basis. A justification would need to be provided which should consider accessibility to shops and services, accessibility to public transport and the site's relation to the relative accessibility of different areas set out in figure 3.1”.*

The officer's comments in the Report to Committee notes; "**Officer Comment:** *The traffic team's initially comments [Requiring allocated parking provision] were withdrawn at their request, as they were based on allocated, not unallocated parking spaces, in accordance with Havant's Car Parking SPD*".

No justification has been provided for unallocated parking, either in the officer's report, or elsewhere. If parking is unallocated on this development, people would not be able to find a space, and will look elsewhere. This will increase the number of vehicle movements to and from the development, by its two entrances. This will increase parking pressure in the northern half of Alexandra Avenue [the southern half is double yellow lined], but will also inevitably lead to illegal 'drop off' parking in the area of the development.

#### **SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT & ITS OVERBEARING NATURE, CHARACTER & APPEARANCE**

The application has shrewdly been pitched as a Seafront development, but in reality it is a development on, and facing, Alexandra Avenue. The site's entrances face that road, as does the building itself. It doesn't sit with the remainder of the street, but dominates and overbears upon it.

Multiple views from the proposed development's many windows will intrude upon neighbours to such an extent that the amenity of those properties will be severely affected. Privacy in particular, will be severely diminished.

The officer's report relates the application's character to the neighbouring apartment development completed approximately 3 years ago. This is erroneous, as the portion facing the seafront is about ¼ of that facing Alexandra Avenue. Correctly viewed on this basis, the application does not respond to the local context.

#### **THE NEED FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT**

The need for this development, in this location isn't proven. The neighbouring apartment development, completed approximately 3 years ago, has not fully sold, and the application's tenure is unclear. There is no affordable element to the residential provision, despite the requirements of local policy. If this to be the case, the justification for such an approach should be given publicly. It has not.

David Towse  
28<sup>th</sup> June 2022



**Planning Application Ref: APP/22/00161**

**Site Address: 186 Sea Front, Hayling Island, PO11 9HT**

**Proposal: Demolition of existing house and replacement with 7-unit apartment development [Use Class C3]**

On behalf of the applicants, we would like to make the following comments regarding the above application for consideration by Members.

It is important to understand the context of this particular application. This application is a resubmission of a previous application which was found to be unacceptable by planning officers. This application was withdrawn. As a result, the client has re-appraised the scheme with the architects, taking into account helpful pre-application advice received from planning officers, resulting in the scheme now submitted. This new scheme is found to be acceptable by planning officers.

The location of the proposed development is in a sustainable urban area with access to amenities in the form of public transport, health provision and retail opportunities and so in principle it is considered to be a suitable location for more intensive residential development.

The net addition of 6 further units of accommodation in such a location makes a contribution to the Council's overall housing requirements.

The proposal would represent a high density development at 7 dwellings on a site of approximately 0.1053 hectares (a density of approximately 67 dwellings per hectare). The principle of making more efficient use of an existing urban site is supported having regard to the surrounding character and built form.

The plot is able to accommodate the density of development without appearing cramped or congested. It is considered that the design approach complies with Policy CS16 by not only retaining the character of the street scene, but providing an enhancement with high quality, interesting architecture, which would also increase the density on the site, providing much needed housing units.

The proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to significant overlooking or loss of privacy and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

The case officer considers that the development would provide a good standard of amenity for future occupiers and the proposal is considered to accord with Policies CS9 and CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011.

The Highway Authority has been consulted over the proposal and following a review of their earlier comments on the new access have raised no objection, subject to conditions in respect of visibility splays and a Construction Method Statement.

The level of communal parking spaces is a satisfactory alternative to allocated spaces, which Havant's Car Parking SPD expressly takes account of in its standards and is therefore compliant. The level of cycle storage is also compliant with Havant's Car Parking SPD. The Highway Authority has raised no objection on highway safety grounds. Therefore, the proposal is considered to have satisfactorily addressed highway and parking issues for this development.

There is no objection on drainage grounds to the proposal. Having regard to the drainage and flooding aspects of the proposal the development is considered to accord with Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy 2011.

The proposal also generates a CIL and s106 contributions to the benefit of the local authority.

We draw attention to the overall conclusion of your planning officer which states:

*“The proposed development would be an efficient use of the land in housing terms, adding to the Council's housing stock in a sustainable location, with the necessary mitigation packages agreed for the SRMS and for nutrient neutral development. The development would not adversely impact on the appearance of the area or residential amenity. It has also been concluded that the development would not have an adverse impact on highway safety, in terms of providing safe access to the site. The proposed car parking levels comply with the standards set out in the Parking SPD in terms of communal parking. The proposal is also acceptable in drainage and ecology terms. The proposal accords with the development plan when considered as a whole and the recommendation is conditional planning permission.”*

We fully endorse this recommendation for a scheme which has been the subject of an iterative design process including a previous application and pre-application advice, resulting in a much improved and appropriate development scheme for this location.

We therefore encourage Members to endorse the officer recommendation to grant planning permission subject to conditions.