

Telephone: 023 9247 4174
Fax: 023 9248 0263
Website: www.havant.gov.uk

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA

Membership: Councillor Satchwell (Chairman)

Councillors Mrs Shimbart (Vice-Chairman), Crellin, Howard, Keast, Lloyd and Lowe

Standing Deputies: Councillor David Guest, Councillor Husky Patel, Councillor Diana Patrick, Councillor Julie Thain-Smith and Councillor Joanne Thomas

Meeting: Development Management Committee

Date: 31 October 2019

Time: 5.00 pm

Venue: Hurstwood Room, Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road,
Havant, Hampshire PO9 2AX

The business to be transacted is set out below:

David Brown
Monitoring Officer

22 October 2019

Contact Officer: Mark Gregory 023 9244 6232
Email: mark.gregory@havant.gov.uk

Page

PART A - (Items Open for Public Attendance)

1 Apologies for Absence

To receive and record apologies for absence.

2 Minutes

1 - 6

To approve the minutes of the Development Management Committee held on 10 October 2019.

3 Declarations of Interest

To receive and record declarations of interests from members present in respect of the various matters on the agenda for this meeting.

4 Chairman's Report

The Chairman to report the outcome of meetings attended or other information arising since the last meeting of the Committee.

5 Matters to be Considered for Site Viewing and Deferment

The Committee are invited to consider any matters they wish to recommend for site viewing or deferment.

6 Applications for Development and Development Control Matters 7 - 10

Part 1 - Applications Viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party

6(1) APP/19/00007 - Camp Field (land to the West of Havant Crematorium), Bartons Road, Havant 11 - 106

Proposal: Outline Application for access with all matters reserved, for up to 72 new homes plus associated green infrastructure including community orchard.

Associated Information: [Click Here](#)

Part 2 - Applications Submitted by Havant Borough Council or Affecting Council Owned Land

None

Part 3 - All Other Applications for Development

None

Part 4 - Enforcement and Other Development Control Matters

None

PART B (Confidential Items - Closed to the Public)

None

GENERAL INFORMATION

IF YOU WOULD LIKE A VERSION OF THIS AGENDA IN LARGE PRINT, BRAILLE, AUDIO OR IN ANOTHER LANGUAGE PLEASE CONTACT DEMOCRATIC SERVICES ON 023 92 446 231

Internet

This agenda and its accompanying reports can also be found on the Havant Borough Council website: www.havant.gov.uk. Would you please note that committee reports are subject to changes and you are recommended to regularly check the website and to contact *Mark Gregory* (tel no: 023 9244 6232) on the afternoon prior to the meeting for details of any amendments issued.

Public Attendance and Participation

Members of the public are welcome to attend the Public Service Plaza and observe the meetings. If you wish to address the Committee on a matter included in the agenda, you are required to make a request in writing (an email is acceptable) to the Democratic Services Team. A request must be received by 5pm on **Tuesday, 29 October 2019**. Requests received after this time and date will not be accepted

In all cases, the request must briefly specify the subject on which you wish to speak and whether you wish to support or speak against the matter to be discussed. Requests to make a deputation to the Committee may be sent:

By Email to: mark.gregory@havant.gov.uk or DemocraticServices@havant.gov.uk

By Post to :

Democratic Services Officer
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant, Hants P09 2AX

Delivered at:

Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant, Hants P09 2AX

marked for the Attention of the "Democratic Services Team"



Havant

BOROUGH COUNCIL

PROTOCOL AT MEETINGS – RULES OF DEBATE

Rules of Debate

- Councillors must always address each other as “Councillor ...” and must always address the meeting through the Chairman
- Councillors may only take part in the debate if they are present at the meeting: video conferencing is not permissible
- A member of the Committee may not ask a standing deputy to take their place in the Committee for part of the meeting
- The report or matter submitted for discussion by the Committee may be debated prior to a motion being proposed and seconded. Recommendations included in a report **shall not** be regarded as a motion or amendment unless a motion or amendment to accept these recommendations has been moved and seconded by members of the Committee
- Motions and amendments must relate to items on the agenda or accepted by the meeting as urgent business
- Motions and amendments must be moved and seconded before they may be debated
- There may only be one motion on the table at any one time;
- There may only be one amendment on the table at any one time;
- Any amendment to the motion can be moved provided it is (in the opinion of the Chairman) relevant to the matter under discussion. The amendment can be a direct negative of the motion.
- The mover with the agreement of the seconder may withdraw or alter an amendment or motion at any time
- Once duly moved, an amendment shall be debated along with the original motion.
- If an amendment is carried, the motion as amended shall take the place of the original motion and shall become the substantive motion on which any further amendment may be moved.
- If an amendment is rejected different amendments may be proposed on the original motion or substantive motion.
- If an amendment is lost, other amendments may be moved to the original motion or substantive motion
- If an amendment is lost and there are no further amendments, a vote will be taken on the original motion or the substantive motion
- If no amendments are moved to the original motion or substantive motion, a vote will be taken on the motion or substantive motion
- If a motion or substantive motion is lost, other motions may be moved

Voting

- Voting may be by a show of hands or by a ballot at the discretion of the Chairman;
- Councillors may not vote unless they are present for the full duration of the

item;

- An amendment must be voted on before the motion
- Where there is an equality of votes, the Chairman may exercise a second (casting) vote;
- Two Councillors may request, before a vote is taken, that the names of those voting be recorded in the minutes
- A Councillor may request that his/her vote be recorded in the minutes

Who To Contact If You Wish To Know The Outcome Of A Decision

If you wish to know the outcome of a particular item please contact the Contact Officer (contact details are on page i of the agenda)

Disabled Access

The Public Service Plaza has full access and facilities for the disabled.

Emergency Procedure

Please ensure that you are familiar with the location of all emergency exits which are clearly marked. In the unlikely event of an emergency an alarm will sound.

PLEASE EVACUATE THE BUILDING IMMEDIATELY.


DO NOT RE-ENTER THE BUILDING UNTIL AUTHORISED TO DO SO

No Smoking Policy

The Public Service Plaza operates a strict No Smoking policy in all of its offices, corridors, meeting rooms and toilets.

Parking

Pay and display car parking is available in the Leisure Centre car park opposite the Civic Offices as shown on the attached plan.



BUS STOP KEY

Services	Bus Stop
20, 21, 39, 63	1
20, 21, 36**, 39	2
23, 36**	3
23, 27**, 37	4
23, 27**, 36**, 37	5

** - also stops "hail and ride" opposite Stop 1 in Civic Centre Road



Public Service Plaza
 Civic Centre Road
 Havant
 Hampshire PO9 2AX

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 10 October 2019

Present

Councillor Satchwell (Chairman)

Councillors Mrs Shimbart (Vice-Chairman), Crellin, Howard, Keast, Lloyd and Lowe

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor(s):

23 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

24 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 28 August and 10 September 2019 were received.

25 Site Viewing Working Party Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 3 October 2019 were received.

26 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Caren Howard advised that although she was acquainted with the neighbour of application APP/19/00625, this acquaintance would not affect her judgement on this application. Councillor Howard further advised that she had not formed a conclusive view on this application.

27 Chairman's Report

The Chairman advised the Committee of a Development Consultation Forum to be held into the proposed new headquarters building for Portsmouth Water Company, which would take place on 22 October 2019.

28 Matters to be Considered for Site Viewing and Deferment

There were no matters to be considered for site viewing and deferment.

29 APP/19/00625 - 62 Ferndale, Waterlooville

(This site was viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party)

Proposal: First floor rear extension; alterations to external wall and roof finish; replacement of existing windows; raised deck to the rear and front boundary fence.

The Committee considered a written report and recommendation from the Head of Planning to grant permission.

The Committee received the supplementary information, circulated prior to the meeting which included:

- (1) the additional information requested by the Site Viewing Working Party held on 3 October 2019;
- (2) an amendment to paragraph 7.8 of the officer's report;
- (3) detailed an additional condition relating to the proposed ensuite window at 1st floor level

The Committee received a deputation from Mr Stevens who, with reference to a previous application for a two-storey extension at 63 Ferndale, objected to the application for the following reasons:

1. the proposal did not overcome the previous reasons for refusal relating to loss of light and high visual impact;
2. the proposal would adversely affect the light available to 64 Ferndale ("64") to the detriment to the quality of life to the residents of this property;
3. although the street was characterised by dwellings of mixed design and type, the range of designs and types was limited. The design, appearance and mixture of materials and finishes proposed didn't fall within any of these styles and were therefore out of keeping with the street scene;
4. the proposal, if permitted would have a detrimental impact on the market value of 64;
5. the flat roof extension was contrary to the Council's requirements set for the first floor extension to 64, which had to be amended to accommodate a pitch roof.

In response to a question by a member of the Committee, the depute advised that:

- (i) The aforementioned extension to 64 took place in 2010/11.

In response to questions from members of the Committee, officers:

- (a) clarified the position and height of the proposed privacy screen to the raised deck area;

- (b) advised that the access to the garden from the raised decking would be via stairs on the side of the decking facing 64. Therefore, the privacy screen would not cover the full side of the decking which overlooked 64;
- (c) advised that recommended condition 5 required the privacy screen to be retained at all times and the removal of this screen could lead to enforcement action. It was assumed that the neighbours would let the Council know if this condition as breached;
- (d) the overlap of the first- floor extension was a design choice. The officers were not aware of any structural need for this overhang;
- (e) the proposal would use the existing access to the highway. The parking provision exceeded the Council's minimum parking requirements; and
- (f) explained the shadow analysis provided by the applicants as set out in Appendix G of the officer's report

The Committee discussed the application in detail together with the views raised by the depute.

Although some members of the Committee felt that the modern design of the proposal was acceptable, a majority of the Committee considered that whilst, in principle, it had no objection to modern designs, such a design had to be in keeping with the area. In this case, the majority of the Committee was of the opinion that the proposed appearance, bulk and design of the proposal was out of keeping with the area, which was characterised by 1950s to 60s designs.

The majority of the Committee also felt that the height, bulk, mass and proximity of the proposal to 64 would lead to a loss of light detrimental to the amenities of 64. It was therefore:

RESOLVED that application APP/19/00625 be refused for the following reasons:

- 1 the proposed extension and alterations to the existing building would result in a building that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area by reason of the proposed design and materials. The proposals would therefore conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed extension would, by reason of its height, mass, bulk and proximity to the boundary have an overbearing impact and result in a loss of light to No.64 Ferndale. The proposals would therefore conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

30 Tree Preservation Order 2091/2019 - 64B Stakes Road, Waterloo

(The trees subject to the Order were viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party)

The Committee considered objections to the Tree Preservation Order 2091.

The Committee also considered the written report of the Head of Planning together with correspondence received.

The Committee received a deputation from Councillor Hughes who expressed concern that the order was made in response to a general enquiry about the status of the trees, without any prior discussion with the owners before the imposition of the order. He further objected to the Order for the following reasons:

- 1) there was no threat to the trees as there was no intention to remove the trees, the subject of the order. Therefore, there was no need for a Tree Preservation Order;
- 2) T1 hindered visibility to drivers when exiting the driveway of 64B Stakes Road causing danger and inconvenience to other road users. A solution to this problem would be to expand the driveway, which could not be achieved, if this tree was retained in the order;
- 3) T1 was too large and unsuitable for a site of this size and location
- 4) the root structure was causing cracking to the driveway;
- 5) the imposition of an order would place an unnecessary financial and administrative burden on the existing owners and any potential buyers of 64B Stakes Road;
- 6) these trees did not need protecting as there were a sufficient number of trees in an excellent condition in the area; and
- 7) The economic and social impact outweighs the environmental impact of keeping the trees protected.

He recommended that the Committee confirm the order subject to the deletion of T1.

Mr Boulding, who had objected to the making of the Order, was invited to take part in the meeting to present his case.

(Mr Boulding joined the meeting)

The Council's Arboricultural Officer presented the officers report and advised that it was considered expedient to make the Order to protect the significant public amenity value of the trees in response to a warning from a member of

the public that there was risk that the trees would be felled. The trees appeared to be healthy and structurally sound.

In response to questions raised by the members of the Committee, the Council's Arboricultural Officer advised that the owner would be able to fell the trees if the Order was not confirmed.

Mr Boulding had no questions for the Officers.

Mr Boulding supported Councillor Hughes's recommendation and objected to the Tree Preservation Order for the following reasons:

- (A) T1 had increased in size and the root structure was causing damage to the driveway; and
- (B) the access onto Stakes Road could not accommodate modern vehicles and needed to be widened;

In response to questions by the Committee, Mr Boulding advised that:

- a) he did not wish to fell the trees himself, only to not have an order restricting this option for future buyers; and
- b) he was aware that an Order did not prevent any works to reduce the impact of the tree. However, to widen the access on to Stakes Road he would require removal of the trunk and root structure.

Mr Boulding was given an opportunity to summarise his case but he advised that he had nothing further to add.

In response to a question from a member of the Committee, the Council Arboricultural Officer advised that the trees appeared to be healthy and structurally sound;

The Committee discussed the views raised by the depute and invitee together with a motion to confirm the order.

The Committee considered that the trees were healthy and structurally sound and had significant public amenity value. It was therefore

RESOLVED that Tree Preservation Order 2091/2019 be confirmed without modification.

The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and concluded at 6.15 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Development Management Committee

APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS REPORT BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING

Applications to be determined by the Council as the Local Planning Authority

Members are advised that all planning applications have been publicised in accordance with the Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at Minute 207/25/6/92, and have been referred to the Development Management Committee in accordance with the Delegation Procedure for Determining Planning Applications 'Red Card System' approved at minutes 86(1)/4/97 and 19/12/97.

All views of consultees, amenity bodies and local residents will be summarised in the relevant report only if received prior to the report being prepared, **otherwise** only those views contrary to the recommendation of the Head of Planning will be reported **verbally** at the meeting of the Development Management Committee.

Members are reminded that all letters received are placed upon the application file and are available for Development Management Committee Members to read on request. Where a member has concerns on such matters, they should speak directly to the officer dealing with the planning application or other development control matter, and if appropriate make the time available to inspect the file and the correspondence thereon prior to the meeting of the Development Management Committee.

The coded conditions and reasons for refusal included in the recommendations are set out in full in the Council's Manual of Model Conditions and Reasons for Refusal. The standard conditions may be modified to meet the specific circumstances of each individual application. Members are advised to bring their copies to the meeting of the Development Management Committee.

In reaching decisions on the applications for development and other development control matters regard should be paid to the approved development plan, all other material considerations, the views of consultees, the recommendations of the Head of Planning, and where applicable the views of the Site Viewing Working Party.

The following abbreviations are frequently used in the officers' reports:

HPS	Head of Planning Services
HCSPR	Hampshire County Structure Plan - Review
HBLP	Havant Borough Local Plan (comprising the adopted Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies from the District Wide Local Plan 2005. A related emerging document is the Draft Allocations Plan 2012)
HWLP	Hampshire, Portsmouth & Southampton Minerals & Waste Local Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework 2012
HBCCAR	Havant Borough Council Conservation Area Review
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CA	Conservation Area
LB	Listed Building included in the list of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SINC	Site of Importance for Nature Conservation
SPA	Site identified as a Special Protection Area for the protection of birds under the Ramsar Convention
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
FP	Definitive Footpath
POS	Public Open Space
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
HBC	Havant Borough Council
GPDO	Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order
DMPO	Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2010 amended
UCO	Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order
S106	Section 106 Agreement
Ha.	Hectare(s)
m.	Metre(s)

RECOMMENDATIONS

To reach decisions on the applications for development and other matters having regard to the approved development plan, all other material considerations, the views of consultees, the recommendations of the Head of Planning, and where applicable the views of the Site Viewing Working Party.

Implications

Resources:

None unless detailed in attached report.

Legal:

Details set in the individual reports

Strategy:

The efficient determination of applications and making of other decisions under the Town & Country Planning Acts in an open manner, consistent with the Council's planning policies, Regional Guidance and Central Government Advice and Regulations seeks to ensure the appropriate use of land in the public interest by the protection and enhancement of the natural and historic environment; the promotion of the economy; the re-use of existing buildings and redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites; and the promotion of higher densities and good quality design in all new development all of which matters assist in promoting the aims of the Council's Community Strategy.

Risks:

Details set out in the individual reports

Communications:

Details set out in the individual reports

Background Papers:

Individual Applications with Case Officers

Simon Jenkins
Head of Planning

Nick Leach
Monitoring Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

Site Address:	Camp Field (land to the west of Havant Crematorium), Bartons Road, Havant		
Proposal:	Outline Application for access with all other matters reserved, for up to 72 new homes plus associated green infrastructure including community orchard		
Application No:	APP/19/00007	Expiry Date:	Extension of Time Agreement until 1 st December 2019
Applicant:	Mr White White Farming Limited	Case Officer:	David Eaves
Agent:	Mr Blackwell		
Ward:	St Faiths		

Reason for Committee Consideration: The application is contrary to the provisions of the adopted development plan.

Density: 36 dph (developable area)

HPS Recommendation: **GRANT OUTLINE CONSENT**

Executive Summary

The proposal is for an Outline Planning Application for access with all other matters reserved, for up to 72 new homes plus associated green infrastructure including a community orchard on a greenfield site that includes land in Havant Borough Council and East Hampshire District Councils administrative areas.

The site is located to the north of Bartons Road, to the north-east is Havant Crematorium (The Oaks), to the east is Spire Hospital Portsmouth (a private health care facility), there are residential properties south of Bartons Road and beyond a line of trees to the western boundary of the site is the new Linden Homes development. A large part of the application site area lies within East Hampshire District Council's administrative area and would remain undeveloped at this stage forming managed fallow grassland, a community orchard and landscaping. A separate application has been submitted to that authority.

The key matter of principle in dealing with this application is whether it should be considered prior to the submission and adoption of the Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 and if so whether the proposal represents sustainable development.

In terms of the principle of development, the site is not allocated in the adopted 2011 and 2014 local plans. The emerging Pre-submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 identifies the site within policy H18 for residential development. This is one of the sites identified to deliver the housing need for the Borough. The identification of the site in the emerging policy forms the Council's direction of travel.

The NPPF (paragraph 48) sets out that weight can be given to relevant policies in emerging plans depending on, amongst other matters, the stage of preparation of the emerging plan and the extent of unresolved objection to individual policies. At the current stage where the Local Plan has been published but not yet submitted, and in combination with the level of objection to these policies, they can be afforded only limited weight at this time.

Whilst the scheme is contrary to the development plan, national policy is a material consideration. The Borough's five year supply of deliverable land for housing is also a material consideration. Whilst the Borough has a five year supply, this is reliant on development taking place at Camp Field. Without the proposed development, the Borough would not have a five year housing land supply. Therefore, national policy considerations may be placed in the planning balance against the conflict with the development plan.

The proposal has been subject to extensive review and consultation. This has resulted in revised details being submitted to address a number of matters raised during the planning application process. The application has been assessed against the three overarching objectives for sustainable development (NPPF paragraph 8), economic, social and environmental and it is concluded that overall these objectives can be met by the development subject to appropriate conditions and legal agreement requirements.

The indicative layout has been assessed in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the area and it is concluded that, subject to the final design and layout (Reserved Matters), there would be an acceptable impact on the surrounding landscape and from public vantage points.

The Housing mix in the indicative layout is considered appropriate providing a range of dwelling types and sizes. 30% Affordable housing provision would be secured from the development to meet the Councils adopted and emerging policies. The density of development secured is also considered acceptable.

The indicative layout has been assessed and is considered to provide acceptable residential amenity for existing and future residents subject to appropriate details at the reserved matters stage.

Highway impacts have been considered in detail and improvements to sustainable travel and to the Bartons Road/Petersfield Road junction would be secured. It is considered that the site is sustainable in transport terms, subject to the mitigation measures proposed, S106 and conditional requirements.

In relation to public open space and food production, the achievable open space provision as set out in the outline scheme is considered acceptable and the Community Orchard secured through the legal agreement meets the emerging policy E9 requirements.

Flood risk and drainage proposals have been considered and subject to suitable foul and surface water drainage conditions, an appropriate drainage regime can be provided which mitigates flood risk.

Ecological impacts have been subject to detailed consideration and where necessary appropriately mitigated for example in relation to bats. Conditions and S106 requirements are recommended to secure mitigation.

It is considered that the preservation of the peace, tranquillity and attractiveness of the Crematorium environment is a critical aspect of any residential development of the site. A detailed assessment of the access, setting of the crematorium, landscaping, noise and construction phase impacts has been carried out. Overall and subject to environmental controls and conditions it is considered that the development can be carried out and occupied to preserve the respectful operation of the Crematorium for mourners.

Impacts on trees and proposed landscaping has been assessed and subject to appropriate conditions and the Reserved Matters application acceptable development can be secured.

A package of infrastructure requirements would be secured in relation to the development via the S106 legal agreement in order to ensure that the proposal constitutes sustainable development.

The Council has conducted a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the proposed development under Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, this includes an Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63. The screening under Regulation 63(1)(a) found that there was likely to be a significant effect on Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) requiring mitigation. The subsequent Appropriate Assessment included a package of measures based on the suggested scale of mitigation in the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy and Position Statement on Nutrient Neutral Development. The Appropriate Assessment concluded that this is sufficient to remove the significant effect on the SPAs which would otherwise have been likely to occur.

To conclude, it is considered that the scheme would contribute to the need for housing in the Borough and would provide an attractive development with an acceptable impact. In assessing the proposal (including associated evidence) against the adopted local plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in combination with the direction of travel of the emerging local plan, and given the need to maintain a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, the scheme is considered to represent sustainable development and is therefore recommended for permission.

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site lies to the Northern side of Bartons Road and is an open arable field with a line of three oak trees running north/south across the site with a further dead tree to the northern part of the site. The land slopes down from north to south in its eastern half and down from east to west in its western half.
- 1.2 To the north-east is Havant Crematorium (The Oaks) with the Crematorium's access road running to the east of the site but with access to the application site being taken from the existing Crematorium access to Bartons Road. The approach road to the Crematorium and the grounds of the Crematorium are landscaped and there is an attractive stone wall and gate marking the entrance to the Crematorium road. Further to the east beyond the access road is Spire Hospital Portsmouth (a private health care facility).
- 1.3 A large part of the application site area lies within East Hampshire District Council's administrative area and would remain undeveloped at this stage forming managed fallow grassland, a community orchard and landscaping. A separate planning application has been submitted to that authority and this is currently under consideration. This land provides physical separation to the large area of ancient woodland to the north. To the west is a narrow band of woodland running the length of the application site and separating the proposed development from the recently constructed Linden Homes development including Harrison Way. It is considered that these features would provide an attractive setting to the proposed development.

- 1.4 Bartons Road runs to the southern side of the site with a wide area of road side verge including trees and hedges. There are however views of the site through gaps in the trees and the eastern part of the frontage is more open. To the south of Bartons Road are several large detached dwellings some divided into apartments together with new residential development in the grounds of Eastleigh House. Running south from Bartons Road is the new access road to the Bellway Homes development currently under construction for 175 dwellings. The buildings in that development are set well back from Bartons Road to the rear of the existing residential development.
- 1.5 As evidenced by the surrounding buildings and uses, the site is located on the interface between the built up area and the non-urban area with other individual uses such as the Crematorium and Hospital nearby. It is also on the administrative boundary between Havant Borough and East Hampshire District. It is considered to be important that any development of the site reflects the interface between the urban and non-urban environments.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 Members will recall that the site was subject to a Development Consultation Forum meeting on the 14th August 2018.
- 2.2 A Screening Opinion was issued by Havant Borough Council in relation to the proposed residential development of the site in November 2018 where it was concluded that the development did not constitute EIA development.
- 2.3 There is a current 'partner' application under consideration by East Hampshire District Council with the following description:

Outline planning permission for green infrastructure including community orchard. in association with 72 dwellings on land within Havant Borough Council. (Reference APP/19/00007).
- 2.4 The Havant Borough Council application is reliant on the East Hampshire District Council application to provide infrastructure requirements for the housing development and therefore the recommendation is subject to the approval of the East Hampshire application. Planning Officers from both authorities have been working together in relation to the consideration of the proposals.
- 2.5 There is no other formal planning history relating to the land of relevance to the current application.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal constitutes an Outline Application for access with all other matters reserved, for up to 72 new homes plus associated green infrastructure including a community orchard.
- 3.2 The current Outline planning application seeks consent for the principle of residential development with all matters reserved excepting access. If planning permission is granted, there will therefore need to be a further planning application submitted to consider the 'Reserved Matters', namely the development's, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale. It is however critical at this stage to consider whether the quantum of development proposed is acceptable and can be appropriately provided on this site together with securing the necessary infrastructure to support that

level of development. The application is accompanied by a masterplan which seeks to demonstrate how the level of development could be accommodated together with a suite of supporting information including the following:

- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Transport Assessment
- Travel Plan
- Preliminary Services Appraisal
- Ecology Appropriate Assessment Screening
- Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan
- Phase 2 Ecology Surveys
- Lighting Mitigation Report
- Lighting Calculation
- Lighting Impact on Dark Corridor
- Nutrient Budget
- Addendum Report Nutrient Budget
- Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment
- Affordable Housing Position Statement
- Tree Protection Plan
- Tree Constraints Plan
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Conformity Check with HBLP 2036
- Minerals Report

- 3.3 The site would provide vehicular access to Bartons Road from the current Crematorium access road with an emergency vehicular access and pedestrian/cycle link to the western end of the site. The wide verge to Bartons Road (approximately 5m deep) is maintained and the verge includes a number of trees which would be retained excepting where the emergency access is proposed. The residential development would be set back from the road and the impact of the built form would be reduced by this set back and the existing vegetation.
- 3.4 The building heights shown on the indicative scheme are primarily two storey in height with a small number of units at two and a half storey with rooms in the roof. This reflects the site's location at the edge of the built up area and would help to reduce the impacts of the development when viewed from a distance. If permission is granted it is recommended that a condition is imposed to limit the height of the buildings to a maximum of two and a half storey.
- 3.5 The indicative layout shows the dwellings generally front a central spine road with spurs running north and south from the primary road.
- 3.6 The proposal for up to 72 dwellings would produce a density of development of 36 dph (developable area). The proposed dwellings provide an indicative mix of one and two bed flats and two to four bed houses. The mix is as set out below:

<u>Flats</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>% of Total Units</u>
1 Bed	3	4%
2 Bed	15	21%
<u>Houses</u>		
2 Bed	10	14%
3 Bed	41	57%
4 Bed	3	4%

- 3.7 In relation to Affordable Housing the development would meet the Havant Borough Local Plan requirement for a minimum of 30% affordable housing. The currently proposed mix is 2 x 1 Bed; 14 x 2 Bed, 5 x 3 Bed and 1 x 4 Bed providing a total of 22 units (30.55%).
- 3.8 The proposed built form would be located away from The Oaks Crematorium which lies to the north of the site by a minimum of 47m (from the southern Crematorium boundary which is a landscaped area). A community orchard is proposed to be provided in the north-eastern part of the site adjoining the Crematorium boundary. The access road to the development would split from the Crematorium access after a distance of approximately 17m when entering from Bartons Road. The indicative layout would allow for a physical separation between the built form of the development and the crematorium access route. This would include landscape features.
- 3.9 The indicative layout includes open space running north/south across the site which is partly centred on a large oak tree which forms part of a line of trees running across the field. There is a Swale/attenuation pond proposed in the western part of the site.
- 3.10 The majority of land to the northern part of the site and within East Hampshire would be managed grassland / fallow although the layout allows for the potential of road access to the land so that any future development potential is not prejudiced by the current indicative layout. The retained open land together with the community orchard would provide an attractive feature to the development.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) Policy CS15 Safeguarding – mineral resources
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS1	(Health and Wellbeing)
CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS13	(Green Infrastructure)
CS14	(Efficient Use of Resources)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS8	(Community Safety)
CS9	(Housing)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM11	(Planning for More Sustainable Travel)
DM12	(Mitigating the Impacts of Travel)
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

DM17	(Contaminated Land)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM18	(Protecting New Development from Pollution)
DM24	(Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Pre-Submission Draft Havant Borough Local Plan 2036

DR1	Delivery of Sustainable Development
DR2	Regeneration
ING1	Effective Provision of Infrastructure
ING2	Improving Transport Infrastructure
ING3	Transport and Parking in New Development
ING4	Access onto Classified Roads
ING5	Future Management and Management Plans
E1	High Quality Design
E2	Health and Wellbeing
E3	Landscape and settlement boundaries
E9	Provision of public open space in new development
E12	Low Carbon Design
E14	Local Ecological Network
E15	Protected Species
E16	Solent Special Protection Areas
E18	Trees, hedgerows and woodland
E19	Managing flood risk in new development
E20	Drainage infrastructure in new development
E21	Aquifer Source Protection Zones
E22	Amenity and Pollution
E23	Air Quality
E24	Contamination
H1	High quality new homes
H2	Affordable Housing

H3 Housing Density
H4 Housing Mix
H18 Camp Field Bartons Road

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

No objection in principle subject to works being undertaken in accordance with the submitted documents BJH/03/04 0991 November 2018 Tree Protection Plan and subject also to the submission of a finalised Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

***Officer Comment:** Should planning permission be agreed a condition is recommended to require the submission of the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.*

Building Control

No comments received.

Community Infrastructure (HBC)

CIL

This application is not CIL liable, but any subsequent full or reserved matters application would be. The CIL rate is set out in our Charging Schedule:

The amounts in the Charging Schedule are indexed according to the year in which the CIL liable permission is issued.

The subsequent application would need to be accompanied by:

- CIL Form 1: Assumption of Liability and
- The form titled 'Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - Determining whether a Development may be CIL Liable
- The applicant may also wish to complete CIL Form 2: Claiming Exemption or Relief and Section A3 of this form

S106

Subject to statutory consultee responses we would expect the S106 to include (amongst any other site specific obligations necessary):

1. Affordable Housing
2. Monitoring Fees
3. Management Company
4. Management Plan
5. SuDS/SuDS Bond
6. Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy
7. Education (HCC)
8. Travel Plan (HBC)
9. Highway Works (HCC)
10. Site Specific Transport Improvements (HCC)
11. Others/relating to Ecological Mitigation?/Community Orchard

See the HBC Developer Contributions Guide for additional information.

<http://www.havant.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/planning-policy/community-infrastructure-levy/developer-contributions-guide>

Monitoring Fees: It is customary with the S106 to charge an amount for monitoring, these currently are:

	Prices 2018/2019 (effective 1/4/18)	VAT	Comments
S106 Monitoring Fees	£693 per non-financial head of term	0	Monitoring fee capped at a maximum of £10,000 per application
The Council charges a fee to monitor all planning obligations and this is decided at a cost per head of term contained within the obligation and is in addition to the legal charge for drafting and checking the obligation.	5% of cost per financial head of term	0	

0 = Outside the scope

Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy

Based on the maximum number of dwellings and bedroom sizes; contribution will be indexed (RPI). More information on the current charge on our website here:

<http://www.havant.gov.uk/unilateral-undertaking-solent-recreation-mitigation-strategy>

No of Bedrooms	Amount	Monitoring Fee
1	£337	Plus 5% of total (sum may be included in 'Monitoring Fees' outlined at point 2)
2	£487	
3	£637	
4	£749	
5+	£880	

Officer Comment: The contribution amounts were revised from the 1st April and the amended contribution figures would be as follows:

No of Bedrooms	Amount	5% Monitoring Fee	Administration Fee	Total
1	£346	£17.30	£20	£383.30
2	£500	£25.00	£20	£545.00
3	£653	£32.65	£20	£705.65
4	£768	£38.40	£20	£826.40
5+	£902	£45.10	£20	£967.10

Countryside Access Team

No comments received.

County Archaeologist

I would draw your attention to the file entitled ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT (DBA) that is included among the documentation attached to the above application on your website. This DBA concludes, among other things, that:

'5.2 The assessment has established that based on the available evidence, the site has low potential for archaeological remains of prehistoric, Roman, Saxon, Medieval and Post-Medieval date.

5.3 The construction of the proposed development would remove any archaeological remains which may be present. However, the loss of the potential archaeological interest of the site could be mitigated by a programme of archaeological investigation secured as a planning condition should consent be granted.

I would concur with paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 that the site has archaeological potential and that considering this against the scale of the proposed development, it will be essential to explore this potential further prior to the commencement of any ground working phase prior to construction.

Therefore while there is no indication that archaeology presents an overriding concern I would advise that the assessment, recording and reporting of any archaeological deposits affected by construction be secured through the attachment of suitable conditions to any planning consent that might be granted.

Three conditions are recommended.

Officer Comment: *Should planning permission be agreed Archaeological Conditions are recommended to ensure that the potential of the site is appropriately addressed.*

Council's Ecologist

Final Comments:

The application is accompanied by an Ecological Letter report (The Ecology Co-op, April 2019). This addresses queries raised in my previous consultation response in respect to lighting, the presence of Bechstein's bats and the treatment of the buffer habitat. Additional lighting specifications have also been provided.

Overall, I am content that the submitted information provides sufficient justification for concluding that the proposed lighting would not result in unacceptable light spillage along the western and northern boundaries.

The proposal to bolster the fencing along the boundary with Bartons Copse is welcome, as is the provision of dense native shrub plantings. I am supportive of the provision of bat boxes within Bartons Copse in principle, and note that landowner permission will be required for this to be deliverable. I would suggest that discussions commence in this regard. I would also suggest that funds to assist with the management of Bartons Copse be discussed.

Officer Comment: *Requirements in relation to lighting, boundary treatment with Bartons Copse, planting and ecological enhancement proposals within Bartons Copse would need to be secured through the associated S106 Agreement.*

Original Comments:

The application is accompanied by a Phase 2 Ecology Surveys report, a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan and an Appropriate Assessment Screening Statement (The Ecology Co-op, November 2018).

The site itself comprises a large field of arable land which has been improved grassland in the recent past. The site is of limited ecological value in terms of vegetation communities.

The obvious key constraint here is the presence of Bechstein's bats. The survey effort employed at the application site is acceptable, and included trapping surveys to identify mouse-eared bats. Surveys carried out by the applicant recorded no Bechstein's bats present within the application site in 2018. However, trapping and radio-tracking surveys undertaken by Portsmouth Water in July 2018 recorded a roosting female within Bartons Copse. In addition, a maternity roost of at least 38 bats was recorded at Bartons Copse in 2009. I would request that the ecologist provides an opinion on whether the surveys carried out by Portsmouth Water in July 2018 need incorporating into this assessment.

Detailed comments provided in relation to Bechsteins Bats, their roosting history, functional links, commuting and foraging corridors and work by Portsmouth Water provided.

Officer Comment: *Issues addressed by submission of the Ecological Letter Report (see above).*

In addition to Bechstein's bat, surveys also recorded a diverse bat assemblage which includes two other rare/uncommon species. The fifth confirmed example of Alcaethoe's bat for Hampshire was trapped at the eastern edge of the site in August 2017, and western barbastelle was recorded in April and May 2018 and September 2017. These additional interesting bat records highlight the importance of the site (and indeed the surrounding landscape), which must be considered to be of at least County importance.

In terms of other protected or notable species, the site is relatively unconstrained. Some evidence of badger activity has been recorded from the woodland edge but no setts have been identified. Surveys have recorded the probable absence of hazel dormice and great crested newt. Bird surveys have recorded a typical assemblage of woodland bird species at the site boundaries, but no evidence of ground-nesting farmland birds. Reptiles appear to be absent.

Given that the primary ecological interest at this site is its bat assemblage, it is imperative that the proposed development does not compromise the continued presence of bat species. The proposed 18m-wide buffer between the developed area and the ancient woodland edge is welcome: this area must be devoid of any lighting whatsoever and I would request that a detailed lighting strategy is provided now so that potential issues can be highlighted at the earliest opportunity. It will be essential to ensure that any lighting recommendations are discussed with Hampshire County Council to ensure that requirements for lighting standards and ecological constraints are compatible (experience from a nearby site suggest that this is an issue that needs careful attention at the outline stage). I would add that the more-extensive greenspace outside the buffer could provide valuable foraging/commuting habitat if it remains mostly unlit.

It is proposed to plant the woodland buffer with a native shrub mix, creating a softer edge than at present. This is welcome in principle and should provide additional bat foraging habitat whilst preventing informal access into the woodland. I would request that details of the woodland boundary treatment are provided: is the entire boundary with the woodland currently fenced? If not, will it be? Bartons Copse currently has no public access and there are no rights of way within the woodland. It would be problematical if informal public access to the woodland was facilitated by this proposal.

Officer Comment: *Public access would not be facilitated by the development. The S106 Agreement would secure appropriate fencing and planting.*

I would also raise concerns in respect to the potential for further development within the northern section of the site. Whilst this is outside the current proposal, built development closer to the woodland would be highly undesirable given the very obvious bat interest in this area. The cumulative impacts of various current and future development sites in this general area must be taken into consideration when assessing the impacts on bats in the landscape. It is incumbent upon applicants to ensure that these cumulative impacts are investigated and, where necessary, mitigation/compensation includes off-site measures which will protect/enhance bat habitat at a landscape scale.

Officer Comment: *The land within East Hampshire is not subject to an application for residential development at this stage. Any such application would be required to address impacts on ecology.*

In summary, whilst recognising that detailed survey effort has been employed at this site in relation to bats, the surveys did not highlight the presence of Bechstein's bat. This species was indeed recorded at Bartons Copse in summer 2018 and this woodland is an essential component of Bechstein's habitat within the landscape. Although no direct impacts to the woodland are proposed, I would request that the current assessment takes account of the presence of Bechstein's bat and clarifies how its presence might impact the proposed mitigation.

Officer Comment: *Mitigation measures are secured via the S106 requirements.*

County Minerals

Final Comments:

HCC accept the conclusions of the Minerals Report that there will not be viable extraction of Minerals Resources possible at this site and encourage the use of incidental extraction within the development in the case that any useable sand or gravel is excavated during development.

Hampshire County Council would therefore request the following conditions to be included in any permission for this planning application, to be delivered through submitted construction management plans or similar, requiring a statement outlining:

- i. a method for ensuring that minerals that are excavated during the development operations are recovered and put to beneficial use; and*
- ii. a method to record the quantity of recovered mineral (re-use on site or off site) and to report this data to the MPA upon completion of the development.*

Hampshire County Council is available to discuss this further with Havant Borough Council, as well as the applicant.

Officer Comment: *Should planning permission be granted a condition in relation to a Construction Management Plan incorporating these requirements is recommended.*

Crime Prevention -Major Applications

Further Comments:

The comments contained within my letter of the 18th February 2019 are still relevant.

Officer Comments: *The application is in outline form with all matters excepting access reserved. The reserved matters layout would need to address further the concerns outlined. In addition conditions are recommended in relation to boundary treatments. Furthermore the design of the units will need to provide improved overlooking to access routes and open space together with addressing vulnerability to crime issues. Conditions are recommended in relation to lighting, preventing vehicular access onto the open land within the northern part of the site and a more general condition addressing requirements for the Reserved Matters stage is also recommended.*

Original Comments:

The rear garden boundary treatments of many of dwellings can be accessed from open space or from a swale, running to the rear of the dwellings. Some acquisitive crimes such as burglary and theft are often facilitated by access to the rear of the dwelling. Planning guidance advises, "Planning should promote appropriate security measures", it continues, "Taking proportionate security measures should be a central consideration to the planning and delivery of new developments and substantive retrofits." To reduce the opportunities for these types of crimes, the boundary treatments with access from such places should be constructed as 1.8m close board fence, topped with 300mm of trellis.

There is very little natural surveillance of both the vehicle and the pedestrian accesses into the development. From both of these accesses it is possible to gain unobserved access to the rear of a number of dwellings. Natural surveillance of the residential road network reduces the vulnerability of the area to crime and anti-social behaviour. Planning guidance advises, "In general urban block layouts provide an efficient template with building fronts and entrances to public spaces and their more private backs to private spaces. Such layouts minimise the creation of unsupervised and unsafe public spaces and unsafe access routes." To reduce the vulnerability of the development to crime and anti-social behaviour greater natural surveillance of the accesses should be provided from the nearby dwellings.

A number of dwelling flank walls are shown facing on to the road through the development. Currently the walls are shown as being protected by ornamental planting, which increases the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour. Planning

guidance advises, "There should be a clear definition between public and private space. A buffer zone, such as a front garden, can successfully be used between public outdoor space and private internal space to support privacy and security." To reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour if these walls contain ground floor windows this planting should be enclosed within a robust boundary treatment, perhaps hoop topped railings so as to prevent access to the window.

The area to the north of the housing has yet to be developed, however, it will be possible to access this space from the proposed development. This creates a large area within which anti-social behaviour might occur. To reduce the opportunities for anti-social behaviour appropriate barriers should be put in place to prevent motor vehicle access to the field to the north of the dwellings.

To provide for the safety and security of residents and visitors lighting throughout the development should conform to the relevant sections of BS5489:2013.

East Hampshire District Council

Officer comment: *Formal comments are awaited, however, officers have worked together and discussed the proposals in detail. East Hampshire District Council will also be a party to the S106 agreement in relation to cross boundary requirements. The recommendation is subject to planning approval being granted by East Hampshire District Council.*

Education Department

The proposed development of 72 dwellings would usually be expected to generate a total of 22 additional primary age children and 15 additional secondary age children. This is based on a figure of 0.3 primary age and 0.21 secondary age children per new dwelling which was derived by conducting demographic surveys of developments that have been completed within Hampshire and calculating the average number of primary age children on those developments.

The development site is served by Sharps Copse Primary School which is full and forecast to remain so from the number of pupils living in the area. Consequently additional primary school places will be needed to cater for the additional 22 pupils and a contribution is sought from the developer to pay for this expansion. Details of the forecasting methodology used, along with the current pupil numbers in Sharps Copse Primary School provided.

Similarly, Havant Academy serves the proposed development but it can be noted that there is a sufficient number of secondary school places available to accommodate the yield from the proposed development.

The County Council has used previous extension projects to derive a cost for the proposed expansion, and this is estimated at £313,875 on a pro-rata basis for the cost of the expansion required to accommodate the pupil yield from the development. Details of how these costs were derived are provided. This will go towards the proposed expansion of Sharps Copse Primary School.

Please note that these costs are at 4Q2017 price base and the contribution will be subject to indexation using the BCIS All-in TPI Index. No contribution will be sought to provide additional secondary school places owing to the surplus places within the existing school.

In summary, the contribution towards the expansion of Sharps Copse Primary School is necessary as without this expansion it will not be able to accommodate the children from the development. The level of contribution being sought is based on the pro-rata cost of providing an additional classroom to accommodate these children at the school and therefore is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. This information is supported by the County Council's '*Planning for School Places Guidance Document*' which sets out the methodology for assessing the impact of development on education infrastructure.

Recommendation

The County Council, as Local Education Authority, raises no objection to the planning application subject to:

The following Grampian planning condition being included in any planning permission in order to mitigate the impact of the development on educational infrastructure and ensure that sufficient school places are provided to accommodate the additional children expected to be generated by the development.

No development shall take place until a scheme to provide additional school places at Sharps Copse Primary School has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Local Education Authority. No part of the development shall be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented.

Without the provision of a contribution towards the provision of additional school places the County Council, as Local Education Authority, would object to the proposal on the grounds that the impact on the existing infrastructure cannot be sufficiently mitigated and therefore the development is unacceptable in planning terms.

Officer Comment: *The Education Contribution requirement would be a requirement of the associated S106 Agreement which would secure the financial contribution towards Sharps Copse Primary School.*

Environmental Health

Final Comments:

I am satisfied that the acoustic report demonstrates that with the proposed acoustic mitigation measures effectively implemented, the potential significant rail and road traffic noise impact on affected dwelling units internally and in personal external amenity spaces is resolved.

Whilst this office would have no objection in principle to this development, I would ask that the following conditions and informatives be added to any decision notice, if any future consent were to be granted.

Condition 1: Acoustic Mitigation Methods

Condition 2: Lighting

Furthermore, based on the close proximity of neighbouring residential properties, that the following informatives also be included. These should in all likelihood be addressed under the Construction Management Plan when submitted.

Informative regarding Hours of Work:

Informative regarding Bonfires

Informative regarding Dust Control:

Officer Comment: *Conditions and Informatives to address the issues raised are recommended.*

Environmental Officer:

Further Comments:

The revised documentation has been reviewed. I note that the revisions seek to address comments made by Hampshire County Council Transport & Highways consultee, and that the applicant has not sought to address the comments made by Environmental Health with respect to sustainability, transport assessment or emerging policy as regards air quality.

The revisions to the travel plan are noted, as is the note that EV charging infrastructure essentially forms a reserved matter subject to consideration under a future detailed application. It is similarly noted that the design & access statement is explicit on the deferral of decisions as regards other features relevant to sustainability and air quality.

On this basis, I have nothing substantive to add to previous comments.

Officer Comments:

The S016 Agreement seeks to address traffic queues at the Bartons Road / Petersfield Lane junction through S106 Agreement requirements. A condition is recommended in relation to electric vehicle charging point provision and the S106 Agreement secures the Travel Plan and improvements to the cycle and walking network which in combination are considered to positively reduce the potential for air pollution. It is noted in the Environmental Officers conclusion below that - I will not object on air quality grounds, largely due to the relatively low quantum of the development which is 'on the table'.

Original Comments:

I have reviewed the draft scheme & supporting documentation. Being an essentially greenfield site, I have no contamination concerns. I have reviewed the Flood Risk and Surface Water Management Strategy, and have no specific concerns in relation to the pollution provisions.

Comments relate principally to the assessment of transport impact (and by extension, air quality).

Transport Assessment (Routing model, magnitude & location of impacts; Air Quality)

It is understood that land to the north of the proposed development in the East Hampshire Area is to be safeguarded for further development of up to 78 dwellings, with access to be taken via the proposed 72 dwelling development. It is noted-, and agreed to be appropriate that the transport assessment assess the potential impact of the whole development allocation taking it's principle access from Bartons Road.

To a large extent, acute impacts to the highway (e.g. peak period congestion) are a matter for the local highways authority. Public Health interest would typically be focussed upon the overall change in transport emissions resulting from the development, as it affects the average day, and by extension, the average year. The exception to this would be where queuing traffic at a congested junction blocks turning movements, leading to a disproportionate impact on the existing traffic flow, or leads to aggressive gap seeking & a disproportionately elevated local emissions. These impacts may occur at some distance from the development site.

The trip rates agreed with Hampshire County Council provide for 357 vehicular trips/day associated with the completed 72 dwelling development, and 745 vehicular trips/day for the proposed (HBC) + likely future (EHDC) development areas. The latter figure forms less than 10% of the current flows on Bartons Road, and would therefore normally be screened out from requiring a specific Air Quality assessment.

The assessment accounts for committed local development (land North of Bartons Road, and Land South of Bartons Road), and accounts for 'other local development trip pressure' through the use of TEMPRO generated NRTM growth factors. It is worth noting that the NRTM factors represent travel demand growth primarily as *development related growth*, and do not represent *acceptable growth without need for mitigation*. In this way, assessment of the proposed development trip generation against the 'natural' growth provides a measure of proportionality, and not acceptability *per se*. It would be erroneous to consider the development as being divorced from this 'natural' growth.

On this basis, I would challenge conclusions that junction capacity issue arising from the projected 'natural' traffic growth are systemic problems which the development need not contribute to mitigating. All new residential development is considered to contribute travel demand which is new to the local road network, and so all new residential development contributes to this growth.

The report concludes that no material impact at either the Emsworth Road / Southleigh Road, Emsworth Road / Bartons Road, or the Barton's Road / Petersfield Road Junction; with all three predicted to operate within the benchmark capacity (0.85 RFC) in 2023 accounting for proposed (HBC & EHDC) & committed development.

The report concludes that the Bartons Rd. / Comely Hill / Horndean Rd. / Emsworth Common Road Junction (the "B2148" junction) is operating at just above the benchmark under 2018 observed conditions, and approaching it's theoretical limit under the 2023 baseline scenario. The 2018 result is as expected given local knowledge of the junction, and the length of Queue's that are currently anecdotally reported. It is noted that the observed Queue reported in Table 6.4 (cited as verification of the model estimated Q's) is substantially adrift of the maximum observed Queues reported in appendix B (7.9 PCU, x 4.9m average vehicle length = 38.71 vehicle length metres, vlm [reported in table 6.4], max recorded 130+ [as vlm]). This is important as the tabulated observed queue length is used to verify model performance, and the anticipated length of queues is material to the saturation of available stacking lanes for particular turning movements (beyond which, disproportionate queuing response might be expected).

It is notable that the assessed Bartons Road right-hand turn (RHT) queue is under-represented cf. the maximum observed as the 130m+ observed exceeds the available stacking for this turn (ca. 105m), and exceeds the distance to the Eastleigh Road Junction (ca. 127m), potentially interfering with Eastbound RHT to Eastleigh Road and the LHT to Comely Hill. It is also notable that the maximum observed queue on Emsworth Common Road is around 75m (vlm) in the PM peak - I have known the traffic on this junction arm to queue in a Westbound direction to well over 200m (to Southleigh Landfill Entrance). The report may be referring to '*average queues*' and not to '*maximum queues*'; if so, the above should serve to illustrate the difference that should be expected between a modelled average queue and the queue's likely to be experienced during peak periods in practice.

The report argues that the development contribution to peak flows at this junction falls within the 'general daily variation'. I would not disagree that the general daily variation at the junction may exceed this value (i.e. > +/-8 PCU), however it is relevant to stress that the general daily variation will not be reduced proportionately to the addition of development traffic, and that the daily variation does not provide 'capacity' which the development may consume, or within which the impact is acceptable.

The additional trips will elevate the average base flows (daily, and peak period) around which the daily variation occurs. In this way, the frequency of occurrence of congested conditions will increase proportionately, as will the average emissions associated with the junction (and it's sphere of influence as regards queuing etc.).

I note the relatively low proportional trip allocation given to this junction, and in particular to Emsworth Common Road (21% & 5% respectively). It is unclear what destinations were accounted for in making the distribution decisions, but as a route to Chichester which avoids the notably congested A27 roundabouts, it is considered possible that agreed routing bias disproportionately favours the National Trunk Road network for destinations to the East, routing via Eastleigh Road.

It appears that the routing bias presented in Table 5.3 may have been taken directly from a third party transport report. I assume that 'left & dissipates' (considering that the routing model is derived from travel to work data) refers relative to this development to 'outbound right turn' trips travelling South via New Lane, and North via Wakefords Way (otherwise this traffic should be considered as an impact to the B2148 junction). The transport assessment gives cause for concern about emissions at a road junction which to date has received little attention from an air quality perspective, but is now located within a strategic development area.

The comments above are not intended to 'pin' these problems specifically on the proposed development, rather they are made in order to assist in framing the context of arguments made within the report as to the impact being 'negligible' (and therefore not justifying any mitigation or acknowledgement of contribution to problems which are framed as 'systemic').

It is also to flag the capacity & queuing issues which exist in relation to this junction even without accounting for the delivery of the STR1 allocation, and the likely need to consider air quality specifically as a result of the cumulative air quality impact at the B2148 junction as a consequence of development allocations. Each local development will contribute to the impact at this junction, and it could be argued that each should consider proportionate mitigation under policy DM12.

Key receptors as regards air quality impacts of traffic associated with this (and committed & allocated) development in the vicinity are primarily anticipated to comprise;

- Gravel Pit & Badgers Cottages, Emsworth Common Road (exacerbation of existing emissions pressure where stationary queuing traffic are common)
- Home Farm Barn, Eastleigh Road (relevant facade at the kerbside, 33% traffic routing)

It is accepted that the impact of this individual development is not likely to materially impact local air quality as defined under the NSCA guidance 'planning for air quality', though it may contribute to a foreseeable cumulative material impact in the medium term.

Design, and Emerging Policy (Environmental)

Given the scope of matters that may be reserved, I am unclear as to when the opportunity to secure design features relevant to air quality (and other environmental matters) should properly be exercised. Given this, approval of outline consent without considering these matters fully may miss the opportunity to exercise 'air quality relevant' policies to secure a development which has excellent sustainability credentials (a key means through which the Council is able to seek to secure general incremental improvements in local air quality).

I note that the development does not make any specific provision for low or zero carbon energy, renewable contributions to space heating, infrastructure to support charging of electric & plug-in hybrid vehicles, minimising the use of domestic combustion, or specifying ultra-low-NOx appliances. Many of these design elements are represented within emerging policy and are relevant to the national policy direction reiterated in the revised NPPF that local policy should 'sustain compliance' with national objectives and 'where possible, improve' local air quality.

The application does not refer heavily to emerging policy, other than to establish the acceptability of the principle of development by reference to the H21b allocation. In consideration of the outline status of the development, the emerging policy may gain additional material weight in the period between granting outline and seeking reserved matters.

A number of the policies refer to design matters relevant to the environment (the contribution of design features, transport / parking, and infrastructure to air quality goals in particular, but also contribution of services to carbon and air pollution aspirations). In this context, it is considered the designers should have regard to emerging policies IN3 (EV charging) & IN4 (Access to Classified Road Network), as well as environmental policies E1, E2, E12, and E20-23.

Policy IN3 is particularly relevant given the comment at 6.11 of the Outline Travel Plan (*'promoting new transport technologies'*), where I would take 'promoting' to mean *'facilitating and encouraging'* and not simply *'publicising'*. An interpretation along the lines of the emerging policies could be applied to extant policy under CS14, CS16, DM11 & DM12, among others.

Off-Site Mitigation

Section 8.1 acknowledges that mitigation works could be justified (in highways impact terms) on the basis of enabling appropriate provision for sustainable travel modes.

Consideration is given in the transport assessment is principally framed in terms of the direct highway impact for motor vehicles, dismissing 'severe', or even 'material adverse' impacts on this basis. Coupled with the recent, and committed improvements to pedestrian and cycle facilities on Bartons Road (associated with committed development), the report argued that no mitigations are therefore justified.

Justification for such measures could however be argued to include aspirational measures to contribute toward the achieving of policy aims under DM6 (Coordination of Development, specifically with reference to 'consumption of residual capacity at road junctions, and in terms of emissions capacity before NAQS objective limits are met); DM11 (Planning for More Sustainable Travel), DM12 (mitigating the impacts of travel), CS1(Health & Wellbeing, particularly (7) &(8)), and CS11 (Protecting... the Environment...; with respect to the impact of transport on habitats & water bodies (2)).

It could be argued that mitigation either undertaken or committed in connection with the approval of nearby development on Bartons Road should not have simply created 'capacity' to accommodate this development, and if there is no remaining local deficit in infrastructure, it may still be appropriate to identify proportionate off-site improvements which directly benefit residents of this scheme.

Travel to school is considered to a key journey with respect to opportunities for modal shift. The travel plan acknowledges this at 7.13, recognising the importance of encouraging active travel to school, and of local community schemes such as the 'walking bus'.

The site audit referred at 6.1 of the transport assessment is agreed to be constructive, as this is likely were off-site improvements might be most productively and justifiably deployed. In line with the comment above as regards matters which may be reserved - I am unclear as to when, in planning terms, it would be most appropriate to seek to secure such assessment &/or agree the delivery of improvements.

Summary

No objection in principle to the granting outline consent. I do not entirely accept the assertion that the impact of development is negligible, but would agree that it is not significantly adverse when viewed in isolation. It is worth noting that the transport contribution of the consented development at 'Land South of Bartons Road' was borderline in triggering a requirement for an air quality assessment, and that development + this proposal would exceed the NSCA screening criteria (and it must therefore be concluded, in combination have potential to materially impact air quality at a relevant location).

Cumulative impact could be accounted for (and proportionate mitigation sought) under a variety of extant and emerging policy. The sustainability credentials of the draft scheme are not strong, so there is an argument for this. Ultimately a planning decision - I will not object on air quality grounds, largely due to the relatively low quantum of the development which is 'on the table'.

No adverse comments as regards contamination or pollution matters concerned with SuDS.

Forestry Commission

Development management and woodland

Ancient woodlands are irreplaceable.

It is Government policy to refuse development that will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland, ancient trees or veteran trees, unless "*there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists*" (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 175c).

You can find the updated NPPF at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

The Forestry Commission is a non-statutory consultee on developments in or within 500m of ancient woodland - further details.

The Forestry Commission has prepared joint standing advice with Natural England (Last updated 5 November 2018) on ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees which we refer you to in the first instance. This:

- is provided in place of individual responses to planning consultations,
- should be taken into account by planning authorities where relevant when determining planning applications,
- will provide you with links to Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory, assessment guides and other tools to assist you in assessing potential impacts.

In the majority of cases this will provide the advice you need to help you make your decision about a development proposal. If you wish to consult further the Forestry Commission please contact your local Forestry Commission Area office.

In the wider planning context the Forestry Commission encourages local authorities to consider the role of trees in delivering planning objectives. For instance through:

- the inclusion of green infrastructure (including trees and woodland) in and around new development; and
- the use of locally sourced wood in construction and as a sustainable, carbon lean fuel.

Officer Comment: *The protection of the Ancient Woodland is addressed by the requirement to provide suitable boundary fencing and planting around the site. This is secured through the ecological enhancements within the S106 Agreement. There are no works proposed within the Ancient Woodland with the exception of the proposal for bat boxes within the copse secured via the S106 Agreement.*

Hampshire Fire & Rescue

Building Regulations: Access for Firefighting

Access and facilities for Fire Service Appliances and Firefighters should be in accordance with Approved Document B5 of the current Building Regulations.

Hampshire Act 1983 Section 12 – Access for Fire Service

Access to the proposed site should be in accordance with Hampshire Act 1983 Sect, 12 (Access to buildings within the site will be dealt with as part of the building regulations application at a later stage). Access roads to the site should be in accordance with Approved Document B5 of the current Building Regulations.

Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004

The following recommendations are advisory only and do not form part of any current legal requirement of this Authority.

Access for High-reach Appliances

High reach appliances currently operated by the HFRS exceed the maximum requirements given in Section 17 of the Approved Document B. When considering high rise buildings these variations should be considered as additions and incorporated as follows. Structures such as bridges, which a high-reach appliance may need to cross should have a maximum carrying capacity of 26 tonnes. Where the operation of a high reach vehicle is envisaged, a road or hard standing is required 6m wide. In addition, the road or hard standing needs to be positioned so that its nearer edge is not less than 3m from the face of the building.

Water Supplies

Additional water supplies for fire fighting may be necessary. You should contact the Community Response Support, Hampshire Fire and Rescue Headquarters, Leigh Road, Eastleigh, SO50 9SJ (risk.information@hantsfire.gov.uk) to discuss your proposals.

Fire Protection

HFRS would strongly recommend that consideration is given to installation of an Automatic Water Fire Suppression Systems (AWFSS) to promote life safety and property protection within the premises.

HFRS is fully committed to promoting Fire Protection Systems for both business and domestic premises. Support is offered to assist all in achieving a reduction of loss of life and the impact of fire on the wider community.

Testing of Fire Safety Systems

HFRS strongly recommends that, upon commissioning, all fire safety systems are fully justified, fully tested and shown to be working as designed. Thereafter, their effectiveness should be reconfirmed periodically throughout their working lifecycles.

Fire-fighting and the Environment

Should a serious un-suppressed fire occur on the premises, the water environment may become polluted with 'fire water run-off' that may include foam. The Service will liaise with the Environment Agency at any incident where they are in attendance and under certain circumstances, where there is a serious risk to the environment, a 'controlled burn' may take place. This of course could lead to the total loss of the building and its contents.

Premises' occupiers have a duty to prevent and mitigate damage to the water environment from 'fire water run off' and other spillages.

Timber-framed Buildings

These types of buildings are particularly vulnerable to severe fire damage and fire spread during the construction phase.

The UK Timber Frame Association publication '16 Steps to Fire Safety on Timber Frame Construction Sites' provides guidance on this issue and is available from: <https://tff.co.uk/download/16-steps-fire-safety-timber-frame-construction-sites/> This guidance should be read in conjunction with the 'Joint Code of Practice on the Protection from Fire of Construction Sites and Buildings Undergoing Renovation', published by the Construction Confederation and The Fire Protection Association (Sixth Edition, ISBN 1-902790-33-2)

Copies of the 'Joint Codes of Practice' and useful sister publication, 'Construction Site Fire Prevention Checklist' (Second edition, ISBN 1-902790-32-4), are available for purchase from the Fire Protection Association: (www.thefpa.co.uk) and from the Construction Industry Press:

(Publications for Construction Professionals and Builders / CIP Books)

Hampshire Highways

Final Comments:

The applicant initially submitted a technical note dated May 2019 (ref 17-055-007) to address the comments raised in the Highway Authority's response dated 12th March 2019. Following a review of this document, further discussions have taken place to discuss the outstanding Highway matters, resulting in subsequent technical notes being submitted dated July 2019 (ref 17-055-009) and 6th September 2019 (17-055-010).

The following response addresses the points raised across all 3 of the technical notes.

PIA Data

At the request of the Highway Authority, the applicant has obtained updated PIA data for the period 01/01/2014 - 31/12/2018 at the following junctions:

- . Bartons Road/New Lane
- . Eastleigh Road/Southleigh Road
- . Bartons Road/Comley Hill/Horndean Road/Emsworth Common Road
- . Bartons Road/Petersfield Road
- . Bartons Road

The accident data has been reviewed and it is noted that there are no accident clusters present which have not been subject to safety improvements. The Highway Authority is therefore content that this development will not exacerbate any existing safety issues.

Site Access Arrangements

An updated site access arrangement has been shown in drawing number 17-055-011 Rev I. The latest revision includes shared use footway/cycle provision to the east from the site access towards the Bartons Road/Eastleigh Road junction. The shared use provision shown in this drawing is acceptable in principle and should be provided via a Section 278 agreement with the Highway Authority.

Revised tracking has been undertaken for a standard and luxury bus (drawing number 17-055-022 Rev C), a super large refuse vehicle (drawing number 17-055-034 Rev B), a hearse and large car (drawing number 17-055-041). These updated drawings have been reviewed and are now considered acceptable, however it should be noted that alterations to the access may be required following the construction of the Land South of Bartons Road access and right turn lane arrangement. Consideration may also need to be given to the inclusion of 'keep clear' road markings by the crematorium junction to prevent vehicles obstructing access. Should these alterations be required, they should be picked up and addressed at the detailed design stage of the Section 278 process. The land ownership document presented in Appendix B of technical note 17-055-007 confirms that the applicant owns the land associated with the site access proposal.

With regards to the emergency access, the existing dropped kerb is to be replaced by a full height kerb which is now acceptable. Following further conversations with the Highway Authority, visibility has been demonstrated to 120m in both directions from the emergency access which is considered acceptable. The accepted emergency access arrangement is shown in drawing number 17-055-011 Rev J.

To prevent conflicts in construction traffic and vehicles entering/egressing the crematorium, the emergency access to the site should be made accessible and used as the primary vehicular access for construction vehicles during the build out of the site. This should be reflected within a Construction Traffic Management Plan.

A 2.5m shared use footway/cycleway, including a 0.5m margin strip against the carriageway, is proposed to connect into the existing provision at the Linden Homes development to the west. This arrangement is considered acceptable and should be implemented along with a pedestrian/cycle connection to the southern side of Bartons Road via a S278 agreement. The agreed in principle access drawing is shown in drawing number 17-055-011 Rev J.

To tie into the proposed shared use provision from this development and the shared use path due to be implemented as part of the Land South of Bartons Road and Eastleigh House applications, a shared use connection is required between the emergency access and site access internal to the development to link this provision together. This provision should be included within any subsequent reserved matters application.

Traffic Impact

Trip Distribution

Further information has been provided in Technical Note 17-055-007 regarding the distribution of vehicular traffic from the site. Similar to the vehicular trip rate, the distribution of traffic has also been adopted from the land south of Bartons Road site. This approach is considered acceptable. Based on this assessment, Petersfield Road South is proposed to accommodate the greatest level of vehicular traffic from the development (34%), followed by Eastleigh Road (33%) and Comley Hill (13%).

To provide a robust assessment of future traffic growth in the area, additional committed developments have been assessed, including the Land East of Horndean application (ref 55562/005) and the Colt International site (ref APP/18/00244). A comprehensive list of committed developments assessed within the junction modelling has been included below:

- . Colt International - APP/18/00244
- . Land East of Horndean - 55562/005
- . Linden Homes Development - APP/14/00863
- . Land South of Bartons Road - APP/15/01435
- . Southleigh Park House - APP/17/00863

Junction Modelling Review

To assess the impact of development related vehicle trips on the local road network, junction modelling was undertaken by the applicant in the initial T A. Following HCC's first formal response to the application, the model files were revised and reissued for review. The following junctions have now been assessed with the agreed level of committed development:

- . Site Access
- . Bartons Road/Petersfield Road junction
- . Bartons Road/Eastleigh Road junction
- . Eastleigh Road/Southleigh Road junction
- . Bartons Road/Horndean Road/Emsworth Common Road/Comley Hill junction.

The junctions noted above have been assessed under the following scenarios:

- . 2023 Baseline
- . 2023 Baseline + Proposed Development (72 Dwellings)
- . 2023 Baseline + Sensitivity (150 Dwellings)

Following a review of the updated model files, the Highway Authority has the following comments to make.

Site Access Junction

Under all scenarios, the site access junction with Bartons Road and the existing Crematorium access operates with spare capacity. The model and outputs are therefore considered acceptable.

Bartons Road/Petersfield Road Signal Junction

Following the request to remodel the associated junctions with committed development, an updated model file was provided with associated outputs in technical note 17-055-007. The model file was subsequently reviewed and it was noted that length of the left turn lane had been incorrectly modelled. An updated model correctly reflecting the length of the left turn lane was produced, with the outputs presented in technical note 17-055-009. Under the 2023 baseline, a number of approaches were noted to be close to or over capacity. The worst performing approaches were noted as Bartons Road and Petersfield Road (S) Right approaches at 93% Degree of Saturation (DoS) in the AM and PM peaks respectively. With the addition of development traffic, the overall operation of the junction worsens, with all approaches over capacity in both the AM and PM peak hours except from the Petersfield Road (S) Ahead approach. Following discussions with the applicant, it was agreed that an appropriate mitigation scheme was required to offset the impact of development traffic and return the junction within operational capacity.

The proposed mitigation scheme is presented in drawing number 17-055-046. The improvement features an increase in the length of the left turn lane from 18m to 28m with associated footway realignment and any necessary utility diversions. Further studies are currently being undertaken to establish whether there are any utilities present which would require diversion as a result of the works. Once the studies have taken place, the contribution value required from this application will be established and secured within the Section 106 agreement.

Given the land will potentially be allocated for 150 dwellings, it has been agreed to split the contribution payment between the current 72 dwelling application and any subsequent application for the remaining allocation. Should the remaining land not be subject to a planning application by the time the first occupation of the current application has taken place, the developer has agreed to pay the full cost of the improvement as a contribution for HCC to implement the works. Wording securing this matter will be reflected within the S106 agreement.

Bartons Road/Eastleigh Road Junction

The Bartons Road/Eastleigh Road Junction has been modelled under the aforementioned scenarios. Under the most onerous assessment (150 dwelling sensitivity test) the arm operating with the highest RFC value is Eastleigh Road (S) at 0.76. This is still within operating capacity following development traffic and is therefore considered acceptable.

Eastleigh Road/Southleigh Road Junction

The model file for the Eastleigh Road/Southleigh Road Junction has been assessed. With the worst affected arm operating at an RFC value of 0.65 (Eastleigh Road Right Turn) at an increase of 0.02 from the 2023 baseline, this junction will continue to operate within design capacity following development traffic.

Bartons Road/Horndean Road/Emsworth Common Road/Comley Hill

Following a review of the original model file, it was noted that a number of inputs into the model were incorrect and required amendment to reflect the situation on the ground.

As a result, the junction was remodelled in Technical Note 17-055-009 to incorporate the agreed scope of committed development alongside background growth and development traffic. The correct geometric parameters were also input into the model to correctly reflect the situation on the ground. Under the 2023 baseline, the Bartons Road Right Turn operates at an RFC of 1.34 in the AM peak and the Emsworth Common Left and Right Turn operate with RFCs of 1.11. When considering the addition of development traffic from the current 72 dwelling application the Bartons Road Right Turn continues to operate at an RFC of 1.34 and the Emsworth Common Left and Right Turn movements in the PM peak slightly increase to an RFC of 1.12.

Based on the agreed distribution from the development, the current 72 dwelling application places 8 trips through this junction in the AM and PM peak hour. Given the existing capacity issues and low level of additional impact from this development, the Highway Authority will not be seeking an improvement to this junction in this instance.

Travel Plan

Comments regarding the suitability of the original Travel Plan were raised in the Highway Authority's initial response. To address these matters, a revised TP was produced which sufficiently addressed the previous matters raised by the Highway Authority.

The framework travel plan is therefore considered acceptable on the basis that outstanding information will be provided at the full travel plan stage.

Recommendation

Following the submission of a number of technical notes, the outstanding matters raised in the Highway Authority's original response have now been overcome and therefore no objection is offered, subject to the following obligations and condition:

Obligations

- Delivery of the site access works, as detailed in drawing number 17- 055-011 Rev I, via a S278 agreement with the Highway Authority;
- Delivery of the shared use path between the site access and Eastleigh Road via a S278 agreement as detailed in drawing number 17-055-011 Rev I;
- Delivery of a shared use connection between the emergency access and Linden Homes development as detailed in drawing number 17- 055-011 Rev I;

- Payment of a contribution sufficient to cover the full or proportional (split with the remaining allocation should it come forward) cost of the identified improvement scheme at the Bartons Road/Petersfield Road junction, as shown in drawing number 17-055-046;
- Payment (by developer) of HCC fees in respect of approval (£1,500) and monitoring (£15,000) of the Framework Travel Plan prior to commencement; and
- Provision of a bond, or other form of financial surety, in respect of measures within the Travel Plan.

Conditions

- A Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Hampshire County Council Highway Authority) before development commences. This should include construction traffic routes and their management and control, parking and turning provision to be made on site, measures to prevent mud being deposited on the highway, adequate provision for addressing any abnormal wear and tear to the highway, and a programme for construction.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety

Hampshire Highways Original Comments (where not superseded by later response)

Outline planning permission is sought for the construction of 72 dwellings with associated green infrastructure works. The site to the north of the application land is an emerging allocation within the East Hampshire District Council Local Plan for 78 dwellings. This emerging allocation would be directly accessed only through this application site. The full 150 dwellings will therefore need to be considered by the Highway Authority when reviewing this application, in particular when considering the access arrangements to the site.

It is also noted that a separate application has been received for public open space within EHDC, formal comments have been provided by the Highway Authority on this matter. The response to this separate application stated that comments on the greenspace provision are not a matter for the Highway Authority, however comments on the highway impact of development proposals would be considered within the review of this application.

Existing Conditions

The proposed development is located west of Havant crematorium. To the west, the application for 55 dwellings (APP/14/00863) is currently under construction and to the south the land south of Bartons Road application (APP/15/01435) has received outline planning permission for 175 dwellings and works have commenced on site under application APP/18/00565 for the construction of the site access road. To understand existing speeds along Batons Road, ATC surveys were undertaken between 15th – 21st March 2018. The results of these ATC surveys found the 85th percentile speeds to be 39mph eastbound and 39.8mph westbound. Adjusted for wet weather, these speeds are measured at 36.5mph and 37.3mph respectively.

Vehicle flows in the peak hours were observed as 532 eastbound and 627 westbound in the AM peak and 545 eastbound and 692 westbound in the PM peak. The extent to which the Linden homes site was occupied during these surveys has not been detailed and should be clarified.

Accessibility

Walking and Cycling

Proximity to local facilities has been assessed within the TA.

Assuming a 'maximum preferred' walking distance of 800m for town centres, 1200m for elsewhere and 2km for commuting/sight-seeing (as set out in the CIHT guidance 'Providing for Journeys on Foot'), some of the identified retail facilities, business parks and leisure facilities sit within proximity to the site. Both Sharps Copse Primary School (1.4km) and Saint Alban's CoE Primary School (1.6km) are situated above the acceptable walking distance of 1km and are therefore less likely to attract walking trips especially for younger children to either primary school.

Opportunities exist to extend the shared use footway/cycleway provision along Bartons Road to the east to further encourage walking and cycling trips. A number of local trip attractors such as Havant College and Solent Retail Park sit outside the walkable distance and are a 3km and 3.6km respective cycle from the development. Improving local footway and cycle links around the development to improve the routes to school and local facilities should therefore be investigated further and discussed with the Highway Authority.

Bus

The nearest bus stops to the site sit 500m from the proposed emergency access, serving bus routes 20 and 21. Taking the distance from the centre of the site places this distance at circa 700m, although it is noted that the proposals to widen the footway on the southern side of Bartons Road to a 3m wide shared footway/cycleway to the west, which this development proposes to tie into, will increase the accessibility of these stops.

Rail

Warblington Station is the closest form of rail travel from the development, circa 2km away. This sits at the maximum preferred walking distance for pedestrians and is therefore less likely to attract many walking trips when travelling by train when considering current conditions along Bartons Road. Improving shared use facilities along the road to the east will help to increase the accessibility of the station and pedestrian and cycle travel to the station.

Parking Provision

Details of car parking requirements will be responded to by Havant Borough Council as parking authority. However, it is noted that the parking will be provided in accordance with HBC's SPD which is considered acceptable.

Future Year Scenario

To account for growth rates in traffic, TEMPRO has been utilised to a forecast year of 2023, applying the general 'Havant' geographical area. These growth rates have been applied to the observed 2018 traffic flows and are provided as the following:

- AM: 1.0729
- PM: 1.0685

These growth rates are considered acceptable.

**HBC Housing
Final Comments:**

Current planning policy requirements Core Strategy policy CS9. 2, the Havant Borough Housing SPD (July 2011), and the governments Ministerial Statement published during the summer of 2016, mean that developments of 11 units or more would be required to provide 30-40% affordable housing on site; Havant Borough Council Draft Local Plan 2036 states that town centres should be able to include 20% affordable housing.

The demand for affordable housing remains high within Havant borough; as at 27th August 2019 there were 1722 households registered on Hampshire Home Choice seeking accommodation in our area and of these 822 are waiting for a one-bedroom home, 574 for a two bed, 256 for a 3 bed, and 70 for a 4+ bedroom home.

The applicants are proposing 22 (30% of the 72 units proposed) affordable units comprising of a mixture of 1, 2, 3, and 4-bedroom homes:

Bedroom Size	Number of Units
1	2
2	14
3	5
4	1
Total	22

I note from the Master Plan 089 PL 05 J, and the Affordable Housing Plan that the latest proposal includes 3No 1-bedroom apartments, one in each of the three blocks throughout the development. The blocks look to be included in the affordable provision. As there appear to be only 2no 1-bedroom homes stated in the affordable unit schedule I would like confirmation as to the tenure of the 3rd unit.

I would also like confirmation of how the 2-bedroom provision is made up- houses, and apartments.

If possible, I would like to see a small number of the ground floor flats made accessible for tenants with mobility issues, or wheelchair users.

The applicants have provided details of the location, and house type, of the affordable units; I am satisfied that they are reasonably well distributed around the site, and will be indistinguishable from the open market homes. They do however need to provide the tenure split which I would expect to be around a 70/30 split Affordable Rent/Shared Ownership; this will help meet the affordable housing needs of the borough.

Once developed, and subsequently transferred to a Registered provider, the Affordable Rent homes will be required to be advertised through Hampshire Home Choice, and the weekly rental will be capped at Local Housing Allowance Rates.

The Shared Ownership homes will be marketed through Help to Buy South, our local Help to Buy Agent, and will be available to those applicants registered as being eligible for this type of low cost home ownership product.

The location of the development on Bartons Road is close to West Leigh; this area is served by buses that provide transport around the borough i.e. Havant where retail, medical, and educational opportunities are available, and this should help to create a mixed and well-integrated community.

Should this proposal eventually lead to development of the site Housing would support the application pending confirmation of the exact number, type, size, and tenure of the affordable homes.

Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council

Further Comments:

- We require the off road cycle provisions to extend into the site and as a minimum to service the primary access roads. The rationale to abruptly reduce the width of the footway is unclear and is not deemed acceptable.
- We would like to see a gateway feature introduced within the soft landscape proposals, 2 no. legacy native oak trees should frame the site.

Original Comments (where not included above)

From a landscape perspective we have the following comments:

- A significant landscape buffer screening the site from the access road to the Oaks crematorium is essential. The existing approach to the Oaks is deemed to be peaceful and uninhabited which, any development will need to retain or enhance.
- A design which extends the bund adjacent to the Oaks access road is preferred, as this will assist with segregating the new development from the crematorium.
- Excessive banks of car parking will need to be broken up with soft landscaping. As a rule we would want to see a maximum of 5 no. cars before vegetation will need to be introduced.
- Open space within the site needs to conform with HBC's open space policy E9; 'On-site space should generally be provided largely as one principal park providing a focal point for the development. This also means that other elements of the site layout, such as car parking provision, should not create undue physical or visual barriers around the open space. It must also be connected appropriately to all parts of the development by surfaced footpaths.
At present the open space is too dominated with boundary car parking, which is not deemed acceptable.
- The soft landscape design is deemed to miss the opportunity to frame the entrance of the site with large legacy trees such as Quercus Robur.
- There is a lack of clarity on proposed building materials within the submitted documents. The existing streetscape vernacular has a fairly finite palette. Any development should be in accordance with planning policy CS16 High quality Design 1-C Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing building lines, plot widths and depths, material and proportions of windows and doors;
- There is a lack of clarity in relation to the proposed hard landscaping.
- The soft landscaping plan does not provide sufficient information to understand all proposed planting.

We require the following to be submitted for comment:

- A detailed soft landscape scheme requiring submission of fully annotated plans at sufficient scale to identify species of individually planted trees, shrubs, hedges, marginal, bulbs and any areas of turfing / seeding. Planting areas should show the locations of different single species groups in relation to one another, and the locations of any individual specimen shrubs. Other information shall include plant tree pit details, specification schedules, comprising plant size, number and density, as well as, the proposed planting implementation programme.

- Hard landscape details requiring submission of fully annotated plans at sufficient scale that comprise a range of coloured and textured surfacing treatments, which identify:

- finished levels

- hard surfacing material type / product reference and colour

- laying bond

- edging or threshold detail / type

- retaining structures or steps

- Boundary details requiring submission of fully annotated plans at sufficient scale showing the locations of existing, retained and proposed new boundary treatments, with scaled elevation drawings to show height, design, materials, type and colour of proposed new walling / fencing or other type of enclosure and associated gates.

- Further details on building material specification for the development requiring submission including material type, product reference and colour to understand how the proposed development will affect the existing streetscape

Officer Comments:

With regard to the off road cycle provision, the internal layout is not fixed at the outline stage as this is a reserved matter.

In relation to the gateway feature to the Crematorium, it is understood that the gateway feature is to be re-positioned further into the site and that the proposals have been discussed with the crematorium operator and that whilst there is additional landscape planting proposed, there is a requirement for uninterrupted views to the crematorium access which would not be achieved with legacy native oak trees.

Conditions are proposed in relation to the landscape design and relationship to the Crematorium, parking area design and relationship to open space, materials and hard landscaping details. This will guide the Reserved Matters application.

Local Lead Flood Authority HCC

Further Comments:

The County Council has reviewed the following documents relating to the above application:

- *Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy by C&A Consulting Engineers Ltd dated Dec 2018*
- *Site Investigation Report by Ground & Water Geotechnical and Environmental consultants dated June 2018*
- Environmental Agency Flood Zone Mapping
- *Indicative Surface Water Drainage Strategy dwg no. 17-055-031 Rev A by C&A Consulting Engineers Ltd dated Nov 2018*

- *Micro Drainage calculations (Source control and Network output data sheets) C&A Consulting Engineers Ltd dated Nov 2018*
- Drainage Technical Note by Charles & Associates dated May 2019

The submitted information addresses our requirements/previous concerns and we have no further comments.

This response has been provided using the best knowledge and information submitted as part of the planning application at the time of responding and is reliant on the accuracy of that information.

Natural England

Comments in relation to HRA and Appropriate Assessment

Natural England notes that your authority, as competent authority, has undertaken an appropriate assessment of the proposal in accordance with Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended). Natural England is a statutory consultee on the appropriate assessment stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Your appropriate assessment concludes that your authority is able to ascertain that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the sites in question. Having considered the assessment, and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal, Natural England advises that we concur with the assessment conclusions, providing that all mitigation measures are appropriately secured in any permission given.

Final Comments:

Deterioration of the water environment

It is noted that a revised nutrient budget has been provided in line with Natural England's advice dated June 2019. It is noted that the development achieved nutrient neutrality based on the existing and proposed land uses at the site. Provided Havant Borough Council, as competent authority, is satisfied with the assumptions included in the assessment, Natural England raises no concerns. Should the design of the scheme change, a recalculation should be undertaken.

Natural England recommends a condition that secures the water use of 110 litres per person per day.

Officer Comment: *A condition is recommended in relation to water use.*

Please note the calculation is based on all wastewater from the development being treated at Budds Farm WwTW. If this situation changes, a reassessment of the nutrient calculation will be required and a revised Habitats Regulations Assessment will be necessary.

Officer Comment: *Southern Water have confirmed that wastewater would be treated at Budds Farm.*

The competent authority will need to be assured for perpetuity that this open space will be managed as such and there will be no additional inputs of nutrients or fertilisers onto this land. The nitrogen budget assumes that a total area of 1.46 ha will be managed as open space (0.4 ha as open space, 1.06 ha as biodiversity enhancement. Appropriate planning and legal measures will be necessary to ensure it will not revert back to agricultural use, or change to alternative uses that affects nutrient inputs on the long term. It is therefore recommended that these areas are designated open space on-site and long term management is secured to ensure the provision of dog bins and that these are regularly emptied.

Officer Comment: *A condition in relation to dog bin provision and maintenance is recommended. The requirements in relation to the long term use of the land would be secured through the S106 Agreement.*

Additional ecological information

Natural England welcomes the additional ecological information submitted and provision for a fund to install bat boxes in Barton Copse to provide further opportunities for bat roosting. It is also noted that additional measures are proposed to restrict informal access into the woodland by repairs to the existing fence and a secondary robust barrier.

It is recommended that the fund covers the maintenance and repair of the bat boxes and any necessary management associated with the bat boxes, in perpetuity. It is also recommended that the fund covers ongoing repair of the fence and any associated management to prevent informal access in perpetuity.

It is noted from the design of the scheme and submitted documentation that there is an aspiration for additional development to the north of the site on land within East Hampshire District Council. It is Natural England's view that further development to the north of the site will raise issues with regard to Bechstein's bats and ancient woodland that are yet to be resolved and would be extremely difficult to resolve. Natural England has concerns about further development encroaching into this sensitive habitat and buffer area. It is difficult to see how this would not have a significant impact.

Natural England recommends that the proposed orchard is secured and maintained with any planning permission.

Natural England recommends that the Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP), or equivalent, and the lighting strategy is agreed with your retained ecologist and secured with any planning permission.

Other advice is included in our consultation response dated 27 February 2019 (ref 272286).

Original Comments (where not amended by further comments)

Summary of Natural England's Advice:

Biodiversity and Protected Species

Natural England does not hold locally specific information relating to protected species, local or national biodiversity priority habitats and species, local sites (biodiversity and geodiversity) and local landscape character. These remain material considerations in the determination of this planning application and we recommend that you seek further information from the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and other appropriate bodies. In some instances, further surveys may be necessary through an ecological appraisal to be agreed by an HCC ecologist.

Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species. Please note Standing Advice is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation. If you have any specific questions not covered by our Standing Advice, or have difficulty in applying it to this application please contact us at consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Natural England welcomes the submitted Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan. In order for your authority to be assured that the proposal meets the requirements of the standing advice and the additional requirements for biodiversity enhancement and net gain as set out in National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 8, 118, 170, 174 and 175d, Natural England recommends that the Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP), or equivalent, is agreed with a Hampshire County Council (HCC) Ecologist prior to determination.

It is noted that the surveys identified a high diversity of bats at the site. Whilst Bechstein's bat was not recorded in this survey, the presence of Bechstein's bat is established within the adjacent ancient woodland. Appropriate mitigation and enhancements are required to ensure there are no residual effects on bats and net biodiversity is achieved. It is therefore essential that the proposals include appropriate buffers to woodlands, trees, hedgerows and other light corridors in accordance with policy E15.

Natural England welcomes the proposed buffer to the ancient woodland and the proposal for bat boxes on site and within the development. However we strongly recommend that further consideration is given to maximising the width of the buffer and extending the buffer for enhanced ecological connectivity. Natural England encourages further multi-functional open space on the western and northern boundary of the site including woodland planting / natural regeneration to ensure there are no residual impacts on roosting and foraging bats and to further support and enhance the ancient woodland. Consideration should also be given to whether measures to prevent opportunities for informal access into the adjacent ancient woodland are required.

We recommend that consideration is given to other developments proposed in the locality, which are also impacting on the ancient Forest of Bere landscape, to ensure the biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures are addressed strategically and ensure the continued ecological function of the area. Natural England recommends that opportunities to enhance the existing network are considered, for example through additional woodland planting or the provision of additional bat roost boxes within the adjacent ancient woodland to benefit and support the diversity of bat species present in the area including Bechstein's bats.

Natural England strongly recommends that a sensitive lighting strategy that meets best practice guidance is agreed with the County Ecologist. The agreed strategy should be secured and implemented with any planning permission to ensure there are no residual impacts on foraging and commuting bats and other wildlife.

The submission of an HCC approved BMEP will help ensure your authority meets the requirements of Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006), which states that 'Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'. Section 40(3) also states that 'conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'. Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife

and ecosystem services and Making Space for Nature (2010) also provide strong drivers for the inclusion of biodiversity enhancements through the planning process.

Please note that provided the Hampshire County Council Ecologist is satisfied with the submitted biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures and the measures are secured by any permission then no further consultation with Natural England on this aspect of the proposal is required.

Other Advice

Bird Aware Solent / Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy

Natural England is aware that Havant Borough Council has adopted a planning policy to mitigate against the adverse effects from in-combination recreational disturbance on the Solent SPA sites, as agreed by the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP) Definitive Strategy. Provided that the applicant is complying with this policy and an appropriate planning condition or obligation is attached to any planning permission to secure the contributions towards this mitigation measure, Natural England is satisfied that the applicant has mitigated against the potential adverse effects of recreational disturbance on the integrity of the European site(s).

Construction Environmental Management Plan

We advise that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as a condition of any planning permission. This should identify the steps and procedures that will avoid or mitigate impacts on the ecological interests and sensitivities at the site. The CEMP shall ensure best working practices are maintained during the construction phase. The CEMP should address the following impacts:

- Storage of construction materials/chemicals and equipment
- Dust suppression
- Chemical and/or fuel run-off from construction into nearby watercourse(s)
- Waste disposal
- Noise/visual/vibrational impacts on bats
- Lighting impacts on bats.

The approved CEMP should be secured via an appropriately worded condition attached to any planning consent and shall be adhered to at all times, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Officer Comment: *A condition is recommended to secure the Construction Environmental Management Plan*

Water resources

Natural England encourages all new development to adopt the higher standard of water efficiency under the Building Regulations (which equates to 110 litres /head/day including external water use) and re-use in line with best practice. Consideration should be given to the use of grey water recycling systems and efficient appliances.

Planning Policy

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. The Pre-submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 (HBLP 2036) was approved by the Council on 30 January 2019 and must be afforded some weight.

As highlighted in earlier comments, the new plan does include a number of new provisions, such as minimum densities, internal space standards, requirements for housing mix, open space and food growing provision, and expectations for electric vehicle charging points, as well as the future management of the site. I understand that applicants will be providing a statement of conformity with the emerging Local Plan, which will assist in assessing compliance with the new provisions and how much weight should be afforded to them. This is likely to become pertinent at the reserved matters application stage.

Principle of Development

In the adopted local plan, the site lies outside of the urban area as defined by policies CS17 and AL2 of the adopted plan. These policies seek to restrict development in these locations, except in exceptional circumstances. I do not consider that any of the exceptions in the policy apply here, the proposal being a major scheme on greenfield land.

By contrast, the Pre-submission Local Plan includes a site allocation for this land (Camp Field, Bartons Road - Policy H18).

Overall, while the adopted Local Plan resists the principle of development in this location, the emerging plan clearly supports the principle, and this must be given weight in the determination of this application.

Coordination of Development

Pertinent to this site is policy DM6 of the Core Strategy, which states that proposals will only be permitted where they do not undermine the future development potential of adjacent sites. Proposals should not prevent future access to potential development sites or prejudice future schemes.

The new allocation policy in the HBLP 2036 also requires development not to prejudice the potential future development of the land to the North, in East Hampshire. Since both parcels are controlled by the same site promoter, and indeed the application documentation makes clear that the land to the north is being considered for development in parallel, I consider that this is likely to be met.

That being said, careful consideration must be given to whether the infrastructure to be provided as part of this application is sufficient to serve the wider site, or at least does not prejudice future delivery to serve the wider development (see criterion b of Policy H18, which requires consideration of the wider site in infrastructure planning). I note that sensitivity testing has been included in the Transport Assessment accompanying the application to meet this requirement. Reference is also made in the Design & Access statement to the fact that the Open Space and SuDs is designed for the current application but has anticipated 50-70 houses for the land in East Hampshire and leaves sufficient open space including SuDS for that eventuality. We must satisfy ourselves that it will remain possible to deliver the site to the north, including meeting the full infrastructure requirements arising from delivery of the whole site, whether development on land to the north is delivered at the same time or at a later date.

At the same time, we must also satisfy ourselves that undue reliance is not placed on the East Hampshire Land to meet any policy requirements arising from development of land in Havant alone (in case the East Hampshire land does not come forward). For example, the current plan proposes a community orchard on the East Hampshire land. It appears that this land is being relied upon to meet the policy requirement under policy E9 of the Pre-submission Local Plan for food growing. A mechanism must be

found to ensure that this is deliverable.

Development Requirements

The emerging site allocation policy H18, together with the DM policies in the adopted and the emerging Local Plan, sets out development requirements which should be considered during the determination of this and the subsequent reserved matters application.

A particular requirement with regard to this site worth highlighting at this stage is the need to minimise visual and noise disturbance from the dwellings and open space to ensure that the adjacent crematorium remains a tranquil place where mourners can expect a respectful experience. I note that an Acoustic Position Statement has been submitted. However, I note that this is focused on noise impacts on the proposed development, rather than those emanating from it. I would suggest that the noise impacts on the Crematorium need to be considered specifically to meet criterion h.i. of the emerging policy for the site.

Officer Comment: *The residential development itself is set well off the boundary of the Crematorium. The closest element of the development to the Crematorium is the Community Orchard. This use is not considered likely to result in an unacceptable noise impact. Further comments in relation to the impact on the Crematorium are provided in part 7 (x) of this report.*

Minerals Safeguarding

Policy 15 of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan seeks to prevent the needless sterilisation of Mineral Resource by other development. The policy and the associated SPD therefore define a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) where prior extraction of minerals should be considered before development takes place. The Minerals and Waste Consultation Area (MWCA), i.e. the area where LPAs are required to consult HCC, is set to cover the Minerals Safeguarding Area.

The purpose of the MCA is for LPAs to consult the mineral planning authority and take account of the local minerals plan before determining a planning application on any proposal for non-minerals development within the MWCA. This site lies within the MSA/MWCA.

The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Safeguarding SPD clarifies that efforts for minerals extraction and consultation with HCC is only expected on developments that are greater than 3 hectares. At 2.5ha, the site area of the application site is below this threshold. However, the SPD is also clear that consideration should be made if a proposal sits alongside other piecemeal development (i.e. other small proposal clusters within the MWCA) or there are known future plans for development (i.e. site is located within a wider development area) - see Paras 4.13-4.18 and Appendix 2 of the SPD. This is clearly the case for the application site when the land in East Hampshire, another 2.6ha, is taken into account.

On the basis of the Minerals & Waste Plan and associated SPD, I consider that prior extraction of minerals needs to be considered, and HCC as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority should specifically be made aware of the wider site and their input sought (see box on p.36 of the SPD).

Officer Comment: *This matter has been addressed further with HCC minerals following the submission of further details and a condition is recommended in relation to reuse of materials during the construction phase if appropriate.*

Conclusion

The principle of the development is not supported by the adopted Local Plan, but is accepted in the emerging HBLP 2036, through a draft site allocation. The Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 can be attributed only limited weight at this point.

The weight given to the emerging allocation must go hand in hand with the weight given to the other policy requirements and standards in the emerging plan; i.e. development in this location can only be considered acceptable where significant efforts have been made to comply with emerging policies requirements. The applicant's statement of conformity with the emerging Local Plan should be used to assess compliance with pertinent emerging policies and inform the planning balance for this application, and for subsequent reserved matters applications.

Officer Comment: *Further comments in relation to the conformity with the emerging Local Plan are provided in part 7 of this report.*

Portsmouth Water Company

Final Comment:

Site Setting

The site is located in Source Protection Zone 1c (SPZ1c) for the Havant and Bedhampton springs- an essential public water supply source. The SPZ1c relates to subsurface activity only, where the Chalk aquifer is confined and may be impacted by deep drilling activities. Subterranean activities such as deep drainage solutions and/or piling may pose a risk to groundwater quality and our supply at Havant and Bedhampton Springs. The site is also located less than 2km south west of the proposed Havant Thicket Water Storage Reservoir site.

Portsmouth Water's Position

Portsmouth Water have no objections in principle to the proposed development, however due to the sensitivity of the groundwater environment and local habitats for protected species we would wish to see more detail regarding the proposed foundation solution for the site, in addition to the protection of Bechstein's Bats.

Drainage

The proposed surface water drainage strategy is a sustainable drainage system comprising of attenuation basins/tanks and swales with discharge to an existing ditch. Portsmouth Water have no further comments on the surface water drainage strategy. The proposed foul water drainage strategy is the connection to an existing main sewer system, this is acceptable to Portsmouth Water in relation to groundwater protection. Portsmouth Water require the use of the highest specification pipework and designs for schemes involving new sewerage systems in SPZ1 to minimise leakage. Portsmouth Water have no further comments on foul water drainage for the site.

Officer Comment: *An informative is recommended in relation to the specification of pipework.*

Foundation Design

The proposed site is situated in a sensitive groundwater catchment and there are potential significant risks associated with groundworks in this area.

Portsmouth Water would have a presumption against piling at this location if the piles penetrate the full depth of the Clay cover. We would have no objection to piled foundations that terminate within the Clay cover; in this instance we would expect a piling risk assessment and method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, vibration and the programme for the works) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Portsmouth Water.

Any piling, if proposed, must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can pose a risk to potable supplies from, for example, turbidity, mobilisation of historical contaminants, drilling through different aquifers and creation of preferential pathways.

Officer Comment: *A condition is recommended in relation to potential piling for foundations.*

Protection of Bechstein's Bats

You will be aware of our previous comments with regard to the protection of Bechstein's bat, and the on-going studies that we have been carrying out on this matter. We have reviewed the supporting information and also the comments made by the Borough Council's ecologist and note that no new ecological information on this matter has been provided as part of this latest consultation, therefore our previous comments remain valid. To summarise, we provide the following comments;

- Myotis or 'mouse-eared' bats are generally woodland species and some are particularly susceptible to light pollution, the Bechstein's bat *Myotis bechsteinii* being one of those. It is therefore essential that any development proposals consider the impacts at a site and at a strategic level, in order to ensure that important foraging or commuting corridors are not impeded. It is acknowledged that the applicant's ecologist has tried to do that, using trapping surveys, but were unable to catch any Bechstein's bats. However, our data has confirmed the use of Barton's Copse by Bechstein's bat during 2018 and also confirmation of a functional link between Barton's Copse, Southleigh Forest and Havant Thicket.
- Barton's Copse is evidently an important component of the landscape for the local Bechstein's bat population with roosts recorded in both 2009 and 2018. We acknowledge that, with appropriate mitigation, it may be possible to minimise the impacts of this development on the local Bechstein's population, but we are concerned that any future development of the northern part of the site could have significant impacts. We acknowledge that any future development on that part of the site is not being considered at this point, however we consider it crucial that any mitigation measures should consider the site as a whole if they are to be effective. Such measures should include large buffers along woodland edge habitats, that are protected from any spill from artificial lighting. Such measures could include the planting of scrub species to create an enclosed corridor for bats to commute and forage along.
- Portsmouth Water are currently working with the Borough Council's ecologist and Natural England to develop a Bechstein's bat strategy/action plan. The aim of this document will be to provide guidance for development in the local area, where it is considered inappropriate and example mitigation measures in order to ensure that the favourable conservation status of the species is maintained.

Officer Comment: *The impact in relation to Bechstein's bats has been considered in detail by the Council's Ecologist and mitigation in relation to bats secured via the S106 Agreement and lighting requirements.*

Public Spaces

No comments received

Portsmouth Hospitals NHS Trust

Summary:

Planning for the Future

It is evident that the existing, ageing population and future population growth will require additional healthcare infrastructure to enable it to continue to meet the acute and community healthcare needs of the local population.

It is not sensible for the Trust to plan strategies to cope with further population growth on a piecemeal basis. The cost and planning implications of so doing are impracticable. Instead, the Trust has considered the anticipated population and demographic growth across our area and looked at the overall impact of the proposed increased population through an internal process which acts as an anticipated healthcare demand forecasting tool to serve the future healthcare needs of the growing population. This process takes into account the trend for the increased delivery of healthcare both in and out of the hospital and into the community and the impact of an aging population on the provision of acute healthcare.

Current Position

Across England, the number of acute beds is one-third less than it was 25 years ago, but in contrast to this the number of emergency admissions has seen a 37% increase in the last 10 years. The number of emergency admissions is currently at an all-time high.

The Trust's hospitals are now at full capacity and there are limited opportunities for it to further improve hospital capacity utilisation. The Trust is already experiencing difficulty in managing to provide the services in a manner that complies with the Quality Requirements of the NHS. Coping systems already incur some premium rate costs, and even so some penalties are inevitable at current activity levels, This is under address currently, and is requiring diversion of resources, as the current pricing mechanism is not sufficient to cover the costs of the marginal rate increases in activity. There are not sufficient resources, services or space within the existing facilities to accommodate more and sudden population growth created by the development, without the quality of the service as monitored under the standards set out in the Quality Requirements dropping further, and ultimately the Trust facing additional costs and inevitable further sanctions for external factors which it is unable to control.

In order to maintain adequate standards of care as set out in the NHS Standard Contract quality requirements, it is well evidenced in the Dr Foster Hospital Guide that a key factor to deliver on-time care without delay is the availability of beds to ensure timely patient flow through the hospital. The key level of bed provision should support a maximum bed occupancy of 85%. The 85% occupancy rate is evidenced to result in better care for patients and better outcomes. This enables patients to be placed in the right bed, under the right team and to get the right clinical care for the duration of their hospital stay. Where the right capacity is not available in the right wards for the treatment of a particular ailment, the patient will be admitted and treated in the best possible alternative location and transferred as space becomes available. Although

multiple bed/ward moves increases the length of stay for the patient and is known to have a detrimental impact on the quality of care. Consequently, when hospitals run at occupancy rates higher than 85%, patients are at more risk of delays to their treatment, sub-optimal care and being put at significant risk.

Appendix 2 details that the Trust's utilisation of acute bed capacity exceeded the optimal 95.26% average in 2016/17 with escalation beds open. This demonstrates that current occupancy levels are highly unsatisfactory, and the problem will be compounded by an increase in the population, which does not coincide, with an increase in the number of bed spaces available at the Hospital. This is the inevitable result where clinical facilities are forced to operate at over-capacity and is why there is now a very real need to expand the Trust facilities. Any new residential development will add a further strain on the current acute healthcare system.

The existing infrastructure for acute and planned health care is unable to meet the additional demand generated because of the proposed development. The population increase associated with this proposed development will significantly impact on the service delivery and performance of the Trust until contracted activity volumes include the population increase. As a consequence of the development and its associated demand for emergency healthcare there will be an adverse effect on the Trust's ability to provide on-time care delivery without delay, this will also result in financial penalties due to the Payment by Results regime.

The direct impact on the delivery of suitably and safely staffed hospital services, caused by the proposed development

The NHS, in common with public health services in many other countries is experiencing staff shortages. The Trust has a duty to provide high-quality care for all and ensure that it is appropriately and safely staffed in order to manage both the unpredictable demand for major trauma and emergency care and diagnostic and elective care. Rising unplanned demand for care in a hospital setting, often paid for at a Premium Cost, has detrimentally impacted on the financial position of the Trust. To ensure the continuing provision of the highest standard of patient care, the need will arise for the Trust to employ both medical and non-medical agency staff where prospective cover arrangements are not in place. Agency staff play a vital role in the NHS, giving hospitals the flexibility to cope with fluctuating staff numbers and helping Trusts to avoid potentially dangerous under-staffing. Agency staff can be cost effective, because they are only hired when needed and don't carry the same longer-term costs, as directly employed staff – such as pensions, sick pay and holiday pay. They are an essential part of the Trust's staffing resources presently and with current vacancy rates any expansion in service will require agency staffing at premium cost. As an NHS Trust we are required to manage the value of agency costs within a threshold set by our NHSI. The Trust needs to ensure that the level of services is delivered as required, by the NHS Standard Contract for Services regardless of the increased demand due to the development. To engage agency staff is the only option to keep up with the required standard.

For the additional acute interventions, the Trust will be required to source additional, suitably qualified agency based staff to work alongside the permanent workforce in order to meet this additional demand, until it is in receipt of CCG funding to enable recruitment of substantive posts to manage the additional demand. The normal funding arrangement is only related to the existing staff levels. It does not include the additional staffing demand required to address the required additional service levels.

The Trust has a duty to provide high-quality care for all and ensure that it is appropriately and safely staffed in order to manage both the unpredictable demand for both emergency as well as required elective care. There is no way to reclaim this additional premium cost for un-anticipated activity. The only way that the Trust can maintain the “on time” service delivery without delay and comply with NHS quality requirements is that the developer contributes towards the cost of providing the necessary additional capacity for the Trust to maintain service delivery during the first year of occupation of each dwelling. Without securing such contributions, the Trust will have no funding to meet healthcare demand arising from each dwelling during the first year of occupation and the health care provided by the Trust for all patients would be significantly delayed and compromised, putting the local people at risk.

Impact Assessment Formula

Residents from the area are currently generating significant interventions per head of population per year. This is detailed in full in Appendix 3.

(Development Population x Average Emergency Admission Activity per Head of Population x Tariff x 30% Cost per Emergency Admission Activity (=Total delivery cost)) + (Total Delivery Cost x Trust Pay Costs 30 % x Premium Pay Costs 39 %) = Developer Contribution

This proposed development comprises of 72 dwellings and based on the 2011 Census average household size per dwelling being 2.4 we have calculated that this development will accommodate a population of 169 residents. This means that this residential development will generate 298 interventions for the Trust based on the average calculation above. The consequences of that number of interventions and the costs of them are set out in Appendix 3 The contribution requested is based on this calculation and by that means ensures that the request for the relevant landowner or developer to contribute towards the cost of health care provision is directly related to the development proposals and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. Without the contribution, being paid the development would not be acceptable in planning terms because the consequence would be that there would be inadequate healthcare services available to support it and it would adversely impact on the delivery of healthcare for other patients in the Trust’s area.

As a consequence of the above and due to the payment mechanisms the Trust is subject to, it is necessary that the developer contributes towards the cost of providing additional designed capacity for the Trust to maintain service delivery during the first year of occupation of each dwelling. The Trust will receive no commissioner funding to meet each dwelling’s healthcare demand in the first year of occupation due to the preceding year’s outturn activity volume based contract and there is no mechanism for the Trust to recover these costs in subsequent years. Without securing such contributions, the Trust would be unable to support the proposals under the applicable average cost per case payment system and would object to the application because of the direct and adverse impact of it on the delivery of health care in the Trust’s area. Therefore, the contribution requested for this proposed development of 72 dwellings is £87,254.00. This contribution will be used directly to provide additional services to meet patient demand.

Having considered the cost projections, and phasing of capacity delivery that the Trust requires for this development, it is necessary that the Trust receives 100% of the above figure on the implementation of the planning permission. This will help us to ensure that the services are delivered in a timely manner.

Summary

As our evidence demonstrates, the Trust is currently operating at full capacity in the provision of acute and planned healthcare. It is further demonstrated that although the Trust has plans to cater for the ageing population and growth, it will not be able to plan for the growth in a piecemeal manner. The contribution is being sought not to support a government body but rather to enable that body to provide services needed by the occupants of the new homes. The development directly affects the ability to provide the health service required to those who live in the development and the community at large. Without contributions to maintain the delivery of health care services at the required quality standard and to secure adequate health care for the locality the proposed development will put too much strain on the said service infrastructure, putting people at significant risk. This development imposes an additional demand on existing over-burdened healthcare services, and failure to make the requested level of healthcare provision will detrimentally affect safety and care quality for both new and existing local population. This will mean that patients will receive substandard care, resulting in poorer health outcomes and pro-longed health problems. Such an outcome is not sustainable. One of the three overarching objectives to be pursued in order to achieve sustainable development is to include *b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities ... by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being.*" NPPF paragraph 8.

There will be a dramatic reduction in safety and quality as the Trust will be forced to operate over available capacity as the Trust is unable to refuse care to emergency patients. There will also be increased waiting times for planned operations and patients will be at risk of multiple cancellations. This will be an unacceptable scenario for both the existing and new population. The contribution is necessary to maintain sustainable development. Further the contribution is carefully calculated based on specific evidence and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It would also be in the accordance with the Core Strategy and Annual Monitoring Report.

Officer Comment: *This issue is addressed further in part 7 (xii) of this report.*

SE Hants Clinical Commissioning Group

Whilst we recognise that not all of the occupants of the proposed dwellings will be new to the area, we make the Health Care planning assumption that this application will generate up to 173 additional residents (proposed no. of dwellings at 2.4 persons per dwelling).

The resulting growth in the locality population will inevitably seek registration with a local GP surgery and place additional pressure on existing NHS services; NHS services in primary, community and secondary care settings.

Our estimate of the level of additional demand that will be placed on NHS primary care does not in our view warrant the commissioning of an additional GP surgery. The increased demand will be accommodated by the existing GP surgeries open to new registration requests from people living in the area of the proposed development, however additional capacity within the premises will be required.

The CCG considers that the application should be required to make an appropriate financial contribution to the capital investment that the NHS will make in this regard.

Please see below the NHS investment projection that the CCG will consider should the application be granted by the Council;

The proposed contributions formula for developments under 2000 dwellings that we use is: 72 No. of dwellings x 2.4 divided by average list size (1800) x 16 (size of a consultation room (m2) x £375 (cost of rent and other additional expenses with regard to premises) x 20 (number of years expected on a lease)

This means that South Eastern Hampshire CCG will be looking for a contribution of £11,520 to be flowed through the CCG to practices for planning gain for health.

Officer Comment: *The contribution requested will be a requirement of the associated S106 Agreement.*

Southern Electric

No comments received

Southern Gas Network

No comments received

Southern Water

Please find attached a plan of the sewer records showing the approximate position of a public foul sewer within the site. The exact position of the public foul sewer must be determined on site by the applicant before the layout of the proposed development is finalised.

Please note:

- No development or tree planting should be located within 3 meters on each side of the external edge of the public foul sewer without consent from Southern Water.
- No soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses or any other surface water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5 meters of public or adoptable sewers.
- All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works

We have restrictions on the proposed tree planting adjacent to Southern Water sewers, rising mains or water mains and any such proposed assets in the vicinity of existing planting. Reference should be made to Southern Water's publication "A Guide to Tree Planting near water Mains and Sewers" and Sewers for Adoption with regards to any landscaping proposals and our restrictions and maintenance of tree planting adjacent to sewers and rising mains and water mains.

In order to protect drainage apparatus, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, a condition is attached to the planning permission. For example, "The developer must advise the local authority (in consultation with Southern Water) of the measures which will be undertaken to protect the public sewers, prior to the commencement of the development."

Furthermore, it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

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 read our New Connections Services Charging Arrangements documents which has now been published and is available to read on our website via the following link <https://beta.southernwater.co.uk/infrastructure-charges>.

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. 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.

Land uses such as general hardstanding that may be subject to oil/petrol spillages should be drained by means of oil trap gullies or petrol/oil interceptors.

No ponds, swales, attenuation tanks or tanked permeable paving as well as permeable paving acting as soakaways shall be located within 5 meters of adoptable sewers. 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 non-compliance 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.

Traffic Management

The Traffic Team have no comment to make at this stage but would reiterate the requirement for parking and cycle storage as contained in the HBC Parking Supplementary Planning Document July 2016.

Waste Services Manager

Can we please ensure the service road for this new development is suitable to take a 26t refuse collection vehicle for waste collection.

Officer Comment: *A condition in relation to ensuring that this requirement will be met in the Reserved Matters layout is recommended.*

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: 24

Number of site notices: 6

Statutory advertisement: 08/02/2019

Number of representations received: 4

Comment	Officer Comment
<p>Strongly object: Whilst we live on a new development, it is a development on an existing dwelling site. We bought our homes based on information that no building development would be allowed on the land west of the crematorium bordering my back garden as there are restrictions to new developments on crematorium ground;</p>	<p>The site is proposed for development in the Pre-submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036</p>
<p>The ancient and veteran trees in the strip that border our back gardens and the proposed development site boundary have Tree Protection Orders and cannot be touched.</p>	<p>Trees subject to TPO protection are proposed to be retained.</p>
<p>The scenic, pastoral view, diverse wildlife, both protected and rare.</p>	<p>The Ecological impacts are assessed in part 7 of this report.</p>
<p>No noise or light pollution from the road or other buildings;</p>	<p>Light pollution is considered in relation to ecology in part 7.</p>
<p>The privacy aspect: My home is currently on the edge of the countryside, with no one being able to look over us.</p>	<p>A significant landscaping belt with mature trees would be retained to the western boundary preventing unacceptable overlooking.</p>
<p>Upon purchase of my property, no new development plans were cited in our land searches (undertaken in November 2017), either to the land west of the crematorium, or to the land south of Barton's Road (Southleigh Estate);</p>	<p>Planning allocations for development evolve over time and in relation to the 2036 Local Plan.</p>
<p>With two sites consisting 175 dwellings each being built on the greenfield site, Southleigh Estate, this already has an impact on the character of the area;</p>	<p>It is accepted that new residential development has an impact on the</p>

<p>In addition to the developments currently underway on the two greenfield sites at Southleigh Road, Rowlands Castle, the reservoir in Havant Thicket, the 200+ dwellings planned for the brownfield site where Colt International was (corner of New Lane and Barton's Road, which was not mentioned during the Forum), developments in Emsworth and Horndean, the roads and junctions around Barton's Road, Emsworth, Warblington, Rowlands Castle, and Petersfield Road will become even more damaged, potholed, gridlocked and littered with industrial debris;</p>	<p>character and appearance of the area. Highway impacts are considered in part 7.</p>
<p>Lack of good quality, safe, highway infrastructure - for vehicles and cyclists. With Southleigh Estate contractor vehicles parked on the verge of Harrison Way/Barton's Road, turning left or right into Barton's Road is already proving difficult and dangerous;</p>	<p>Highway impacts considered in part 7.</p>
<p>The noise, pollution, dust and increased heavy plant traffic will affect our tranquillity, and stability of our new homes as they are still settling.</p>	<p>Impacts from the development phase are considered in part 7</p>
<p>Given the number of building developments currently taking place in this area (listed above) the impact on the Ancient Woodland and hedgerows will include chemical pollution, year-round disturbance to the animals' (dormice, bats, newts, deer, foxes) nests, hibernation locations and breeding sites, fragmentation and the introduction on non-native plants. Indeed, we already see foxes who have been displaced;</p>	<p>Impact on ecology considered in part 7</p>
<p>Other notable omissions from 'the consideration of protected species' presentation that we are highly concerned about, and that were not mentioned, include: the great crested newts that have made their homes around us, with three mounds that have not been touched by Linden Homes; the barn owls living in the Ancient Woodland; the nesting woodpeckers and a nesting buzzard. The buzzard is often seen standing in the field to the north of the field. There is also a herd of around 15 deer (female and young) plus five stags who live in the Ancient Woodland, who are regularly (every day and evening) seen on the edge grazing in the field backing on to our gardens, running through the crematorium access road, and zig-zagging through the Ancient Woodland.</p>	<p>Ecological impacts are considered in part 7.</p>
<p>Potential to impact on property prices/negative equity, who paid for their homes under the impression that the land in question was protected and not going to be touched by developers.</p>	<p>Impacts on property prices are not a material planning consideration.</p>

<p>We researched before purchasing the property and there were no plans for any developments around this area. We feel somehow cheated as there are now new developments everywhere we look around us.</p> <p>I also believe that the trees bordering our development and the field are protected. We often see deer, woodpeckers and foxes in the field.</p> <p>The road is dangerous with contractors cars parked up on side, restricting the view for people coming out Harrison way to Barton's road.</p>	<p>Whilst concerns are understood the pre-submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 allocates the site for development.</p> <p>Impacts on trees and ecology considered in part 7</p> <p>Highway impacts are considered in part 7. A construction management plan is recommended to control construction vehicle parking.</p>
<p>I am a resident of the Barton's Rise development and strongly object to this planning application.</p> <p>We were always advised that the land was protected due to its association with the crematorium and its facilities. I would be interested to understand the relationship between the crematorium and Havant Borough Council (or any of its current serving councillors), do Havant Borough council have any current interest in both the land and crematorium facility?</p> <p>We were also advised that the trees immediately adjacent to our property and bordering the land in question are both protected as a wildlife corridor and many of the trees individually are subject to Tree preservation orders.</p> <p>From the documents submitted, I see little evidence that the developer has taken into account the varied species of wildlife that it would be upsetting with this development.</p> <p>I also cannot understand how this application is even being consider on the basis that it falls outside of the local development plan? What additional information has been provided to address this very significant issue, which goes against government guidance.</p> <p>With the many applications that have already been approved in this area and which, listed by my neighbours. Little consideration has been given to the wider impact this has on Highway safety and traffic for this area.</p>	<p>This application is being considered on its planning merits. It is understood that HBC do not have an interest in the Crematorium or the application site land. Any Councillor interest by members of the Development Management Committee would need to be declared in accordance with the Councils Constitution. The wildlife corridor would be retained</p> <p>An ecological assessment has been submitted in relation to the development.</p> <p>This matter is addressed in Part 7 under Principle of Development.</p> <p>A full assessment in relation to highway matters has been made in consultation with Hampshire County Council who are the Highway</p>

<p>It also seems that no consideration at all has been given to the local amenities and facilities, including appropriate schools, leisure facilities, and open/green field space. Where has all the funding, that should/has have been provided by developers to these kinds of facilities been allocated?</p> <p>Local authority should be insisting any current developments already approved, are completed before any further applications are considered. Especially as many of these haven't even been commenced yet, and this new application falls outside of the local development plan. If these kinds of application are being considered, what is to stop large development companies 'land banking' sites at the detriment of the local area.</p> <p>No information has been provided so far on the appearance of these properties, but from the plans submitted it would appear that a once open field which is next to my property has now become a block of affordable housing (which I presume are going to be flats). This would interrupt my privacy and outlook and without knowing the full detailed application could affect my right to light!</p> <p>The planned development would also bring further contractors to this area, who already park in dangerous and obstructed positions along Barton's Road. This not only causes a safety concern, but would increase noise, smells, and fumes to this area. What plans has the developer submitted which mitigates the risks and increased pollution to a green field site?</p> <p>I would also be interested to know if this planning application will proceed to full planning committee for approval, especially if Havant Borough Council has some interest in the crematorium facility?</p>	<p>Authority.</p> <p>Developer requirements are considered in part 7.</p> <p>There is a need to ensure the continuity of a five year housing supply in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>This is an outline planning permission and the current layout is indicative. The Reserved Matters stage will provide the detailed layout.</p> <p>The construction phase would be subject to a Construction Management Plan. This would relate to measures to reduce the impact from this phase of the development.</p> <p>The matter is being considered by the Development Management Committee.</p>
<p>I write on behalf of my clients, The Southern Co-operative Ltd, to set out their observations on the scheme.</p> <p>The Southern Co-operative Ltd operate The Oaks Crematorium that is located adjacent to the application site. The crematorium also shares the same vehicular access as that indicated on the submitted plans to serve the proposed housing development. Whilst the Southern Co-operative raise no objections to the proposed development of the land with housing <i>per se</i>, they would wish to point out the sensitive nature of the neighbouring crematorium use and ask that the following matters are taken into consideration in your determination of the application;</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>1. As noted above, the vehicular access for the crematorium is shown on the submitted plans to be shared with that of the new development. As would be expected from its current use, the existing access is subject to frequent use by funeral corteges and mourners. The crematorium operates six days a week and with the majority of services taking place between 9am and 4pm.</p> <p>It may be expected that development of the site in the manner proposed will give rise to a significant number of trips during the construction phase by both operatives and delivery vehicles. It is of critical importance that the entrance and access road for the crematorium be kept clear of obstruction at all times, as clearly, it could cause undue distress to mourners were corteges and/or mourners themselves to be obstructed from entering the crematorium or have to manoeuvre around parked or waiting construction vehicles.</p> <p>For this reason, the Southern Co-operative would request that a separate temporary access be formed for the purposes of construction of the proposed development and that a condition be imposed on any grant of planning permission requiring all construction traffic and operative's vehicles to use that temporary access. Formation of the permanent access to the development should be the final operation on site in order to ensure that it won't be used by construction vehicles. This arrangement could be secured via a construction traffic management plan, and for the avoidance of doubt the Southern Co-operative requests that the applicants be asked to provide that information at the application stage rather than leaving it to a condition.</p> <p>2. As noted above, the crematorium operates six days a week, and it is important that services are conducted in a peaceful setting. To that end the Southern Co-operative would request that any planning permission be subject to a condition limiting any noisy activities on the site to being controlled at a level that will not be audible from the crematorium itself. We appreciate that some noise is unavoidable at construction stage, but, for example, would ask that piling be avoided unless it is a necessity, and that audible music from construction worker's radios be avoided. We would request that a construction management plan be required to set out a series of measures designed to minimise noise disruption from the development. This is particularly so given the potential for additional development on this land in the future.</p> <p>3. There are existing entrance gates and walls at the</p>	<p>Construction arrangements would be secured via a Construction Management Plan. This will need to ensure that construction traffic uses the emergency access route away from the crematorium. Further details are provided in part (x)</p> <p>Concerns noted and will be addressed in the Construction Management Plan requirements.</p> <p>The construction management plan condition will address construction noise. The piling condition will control potential piling issues.</p>
--	--

<p>front of the existing access point and that identify the frontage of the crematorium. Although not specifically labelled as such, the site plan indicates that those walls and gates will be relocated further back and clear of the entrance to the new residential development. The Southern Co-operative would request that a condition be imposed on any grant of planning permission requiring that those walls and gates are relocated prior to the sale of any market house on the site, which would be in order to ensure that the relocation is undertaken in a timely manner.</p> <p>Further Comments: We have not fully agreed the landscaping proposals as we believe this proposal should be supported by a legal agreement between the site owner and Southern Co-op in order to make our agreement binding on any third party.</p> <p>I wish to confirm that to date we have not reached an agreement on the proposed access amendments to the Oaks Crematorium and from Southern Co-op's perspective the following matters remain outstanding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of a clearway on access road • Agreement with the site owner of a method statement and a risk assessment by Southern Co-op in relation to the change of access road works which allows the Oaks Crematorium to continue operating and enables access for the bereaved to visit memorials at all times. • Agreement that construction noise will be kept to a minimum given the sensitive nature of the Oaks Crematorium. • A legal agreement with the site owner confirming that construction traffic for the development of the proposed housing will not pass the frontage of the 	<p>A condition in relation to the relocation of the gates and the timing of this work is recommended.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority cannot legally require agreements between parties. Where requirements are necessary in planning terms these will be secured via conditions or the S106 Agreement associated with this planning application.</p> <p>This is considered by HCC Highways who state <i>Consideration may also need to be given to the inclusion of 'keep clear' road markings by the crematorium junction to prevent vehicles obstructing access.</i> The matter is being raised further with HCC and members will be updated in relation to this.</p> <p>These matters will be addressed via the Construction Management Condition</p> <p>This will be addressed via the Construction Management plan and piling condition</p> <p>Construction traffic requirements will be secured in the Construction</p>
---	---

<p>new access road to the Oaks Crematorium, to not be in conflict with the bereaved's access to or exit from the Oaks Crematorium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocation of the current front entrance pillars, gates and signage to the position identified at the new Oaks Crematorium entrance to a standard of construction satisfactory to the Southern Co-op. • All works in relation to the above are to be completed at the site owner's cost with all professional fees of the parties met by the site owner (and for the avoidance of doubt at no cost to Southern Co-op). <p>The afore mentioned points of concern were highlighted as key heads of an agreement at a meeting dated 17th January 2019 between representatives of Southern Co-op and the site owner with their representatives. To date no draft legal agreements have been forthcoming and given we now appear to be approaching a determination of the outline planning application, the Southern Co-op is concerned that our continued service to our community may be compromised.</p> <p>On the basis of the above and with the current lack of legal protection, I am afraid we are forced to raise an objection to this outline planning application.</p>	<p>Management Plan</p> <p>A condition in relation to the re-location of the entrance features is recommended.</p> <p>The recommended condition would secure the works, however, the costs in relation to the works and who pays for them are not able to be controlled by condition.</p> <p>Noted, however it is considered that subject to suitable conditions and the requirements of the S106 Agreement the issues raised can be appropriately addressed in planning terms.</p>

7 Planning Considerations

Impacts on European Sites / Nutrient Neutrality

- 7.1 A Habitats Regulations Assessment including Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended). Natural England have been consulted in relation to the assessment and have concurred with the assessment conclusions providing that all mitigation measures are appropriately secured. The Habitats Regulations Assessment concludes that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of any of the sites in question.
- 7.2 The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) (the partnership has since changed its name to the Partnership for South Hampshire) Integrated Water Management Strategy has identified that there is uncertainty as to whether new housing development can be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the designated sites within the Solent. Natural England have highlighted that there are high levels of nitrogen and phosphorous input into the water environment at these sites, with evidence that these nutrients are causing eutrophication and that there is uncertainty about the efficacy of catchment measures to deliver the required

reductions in nitrogen levels, and/or whether upgrades to existing waste water treatment works will be sufficient to accommodate the quantity of new housing proposed. The applicant has undertaken a Nutrient Budget and Addendum to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment Stage 1 and Stage 2, which reflects Natural England's latest advice (June 2019).

- 7.3 The Position Statement on Nutrient Neutral Development sets out that for development on agricultural sites, such as this one, that it would be expected that on-site avoidance and mitigation measures would be used to achieve nutrient neutrality. Natural England have produced 'Advice on achieving nutrient neutrality for new development in the Solent region'. This sets out a methodology to calculate the nutrient emissions from a development site. The applicant has used this methodology to calculate the nutrient emissions from the site. This calculation has confirmed that the site will not emit a nutrient load into any European Sites. The calculations for this development site are found within the submitted nutrient budget addendum.
- 7.4 Achieving a position where there are no net nutrient emissions into European Sites from this development involves the use of specific on-site avoidance and mitigation measures. Appropriate planning and legal measures will be necessary to ensure it will not revert back to agricultural use, or change to alternative uses that affect nutrient inputs on the long term. Natural England have agreed with this assessment.
- 7.5 The development would result in a net increase of dwellings within 5.6km of the Solent SPAs. In line with Policy DM24 of adopted Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations), Policy E 16 of the Draft Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 and the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy, a permanent significant effect on the Solent SPAs due to increase in recreational disturbance as a result of the new development is likely. As such, in order to lawfully be permitted, the development will need to include a package of avoidance and mitigation measures. The applicant has proposed a mitigation package based on the methodology in the Developer Contributions Guide. The scale of the proposed mitigation package would remove the likelihood of a significant effect. The applicant has confirmed that they would be willing to enter into a legal agreement to secure the mitigation package in line with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and Policy DM24.

Appropriate Assessment conclusion

- 7.6 The Appropriate Assessment concluded that the avoidance and mitigation packages proposed are sufficient to remove the significant effect on the SPAs which would otherwise have been likely to occur. The HRA was subject to consultation with Natural England as the appropriate nature conservation body under Regulation 63(3) who have confirmed that they agree with the findings of the assessment.
- 7.7 In all other respects and having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan

and all other material considerations it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Housing mix and affordable housing
- (iv) Impact upon residential amenity (for existing and future residents)
- (v) Highway impacts, on site layout and parking
- (vi) Public open space and food production
- (vii) Flood Risks /Drainage
- (viii) Ecological Impacts
- (ix) Relationship to land in East Hampshire and associated planning application
- (x) Impact on the Crematorium
- (xi) Impacts on Trees
- (xii) Conformity with emerging policy
- (xiii) Infrastructure/S106 requirements

- 7.8 The application is for Outline Planning Permission and the submitted application form confirms that all matters are reserved with the exception of the proposed access. This means that the following matters are for consideration at the Reserved Matters Stage:

Appearance;
Landscaping;
Layout and;
Scale.

- 7.9 Notwithstanding this, in considering an outline planning application it is necessary to critically assess whether the quantum of development and its planning requirements can be successfully provided on the proposed application site. As such the applicants have undertaken pre-application discussions including taking part in a Development Consultation Forum on the 14th August 2018 and obtaining a Screening Opinion from the Local Planning Authority which confirmed that the proposal submitted was not considered EIA development. The application itself has been submitted with a detailed suite of supporting information seeking to demonstrate that the development could be appropriately provided. The supporting information includes the following:

Indicative Layouts
Design and Access Statement
Design Analysis
Technical Note: Surface Water Drainage
Lighting Mitigation Report
Outdoor Lighting Report
Dark Corridor Plan
Nutrient Budget
Noise Impact Assessment
Technical Note - Response to Highway Authorities Comments

(i) Principle of development

- 7.10 As required by section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan

7.11 The Development Plan consists of:

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) (2011), the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations Plan) (2014), both of which cover the period until 2026. The development plan also includes the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). These plans continue to form the basis for determining planning applications in the Borough. The application site is located close to, but outside of, the urban area. Policies in the adopted plans support appropriate residential development within the urban areas. "Exception schemes" are only supported in the countryside. This is not an exception scheme and the site is located in a non-urban area. Therefore, this application does not accord with the development plan (it has been advertised as a departure from it). Planning permission should therefore be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

Pre-submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036

7.12 The Council published the Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 for public consultation between 1 February 2019 and 18 March 2019. The publication of this document followed a long period of public engagement between 2016-2018, including the now revoked Local Plan Housing Statement. The Camp Field site was not one of those identified as part of the Local Plan Housing Statement. The emerging plan includes the Council's proposed new housing allocations. The application site is identified within Policy H18 for residential development, capable of accommodating about 90 residential dwellings. The application site is identified as one of those necessary to deliver the identified housing need for the Borough.

7.13 Therefore, while the site lies outside the urban area, as defined by policy AL2 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) and Policy CS17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) it nonetheless is one of the sites identified for allocation and forms the direction of travel for the emerging Local Plan.

Consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework.

7.14 The Secretary of State's National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) is a material consideration which should be placed in the s.38(6) planning balance.

The NPPF's primary objective is to promote sustainable growth and development through a "plan-led" planning system. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF advises that a presumption in favour of sustainable development is seen as the golden thread running through both plan-making and decision making, which means; "approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay, and; where the development plan is, absent, silent, or out-of-date, granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole".

7.15 A robust assessment has taken place of land in the Borough to inform the Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal. This has shown that there are sufficient deliverable and developable sites upon which to meet the Borough's housing need. The application site has been assessed by officers and found to be free of any significant constraint and capable of delivering houses in the short term.

Five year housing land supply and delivery of housing need

- 7.16 The Government has an objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing. Under paragraph 73 of the NPPF, Havant Borough is required to have a rolling five year supply of deliverable housing sites. If this is not in place, proposals for development should only be refused if:
- The site is within particular designated areas set out footnote 6 of the NPPF. The application site in question is not within any of these areas.
 - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

Such a situation would result in a tilted planning balance towards the granting of planning permission. This would diminish the need to provide the necessary infrastructure to support development or appropriate environmental safeguards (outside of those required by the Habitats Regulations).

- 7.17 The Borough's five year housing land supply was updated in January 2019. This shows that the Borough has a 5.1 year housing land supply with the necessary buffer based on the results of the housing delivery test.
- 7.18 The development proposed by this planning application is included within these five year supply calculations with all of the dwellings included for delivery within the five year supply period. This reflects the time needed to obtain Reserved Matters planning permission, discharge pre-commencement conditions, build the housing and the phasing of such a development.
- 7.19 The provision of 72 homes is equivalent to 0.15 years of supply. As such, without the proposed development at Camp Field, the Borough would have a housing land supply of 4.95 years. This is below the five year supply threshold.
- 7.20 As such, an appeal against the refusal of planning permission on this site or other planning applications on other sites would be considered with a tilted balance in favour of granting planning permission. This would diminish the need to provide necessary infrastructure alongside development and secure environmental safeguards.
- 7.21 Notwithstanding that the site is located outside of the urban area and in the development plan, it is proposed for development in the emerging Havant Borough Local Plan 2036. It is reasonably proximate to facilities and services. There are no overriding environmental objections to its development. It would also deliver significant economic and social benefits.
- 7.22 The site would make a substantial contribution to the Borough's five year housing land supply, so much so that without development on this site, there would not be a sufficient supply of new housing in the Borough.
- 7.23 On that basis, officers consider that in the particular circumstances that prevail at this time, if the applicant's scheme is granted planning permission, it would constitute sustainable development. The justification for this conclusion is set out in more detail in the paragraphs that follow.

Deliverability

- 7.24 The NPPF, in annex 2, clarifies that:
"To be considered deliverable, sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years."

- 7.25 The application has been assessed and consultations carried out with infrastructure providers and others (as set out in this report). As such there would not appear to be significant off-site infrastructure works arising from the development which might delay the implementation of the development. Therefore, there are no evident barriers to the development coming forward within the current 5-year period, which weighs in support of the scheme.

Environmental Sustainability

- 7.26 Introducing a housing estate to an undeveloped field would alter its character but it is concluded that this would have a limited impact, as any harmful visual impact of the development would be localised. The additional landscaping that is proposed would reduce, and mitigate to a degree, the landscape impact of the development and overall the development would not unduly affect the character and appearance of the wider area, which is considered in more detail in this report. Furthermore, the provision of open space, play area and community orchard provision is of significant benefit to this application.
- 7.27 In terms of the location of the site relative to services and facilities the closest such services are offered by the Co-Op at Snowberry Crescent situated approximately 0.8km from the site emergency (cycle and pedestrian) entrance. There are employment opportunities at New Lane approximately 0.3km from the emergency entrance. The nearest bus stops to the site sit 500m from the emergency access, serving bus routes 20 and 21. Route 20 runs every 30 minutes Monday to Saturday, operating between Portsmouth and Havant. Route 21 operates every 10 minutes Monday to Saturday between Portsmouth and Havant via Leigh Park.
- 7.28 In addition, Warblington railway station is 2 kms from the site, which offers stopping services towards Brighton to the east and Southampton and Portsmouth to the west. The site is approximately 2.4 kms from Havant Station offering routes to London, Brighton, Southampton and Portsmouth. In accessibility terms, the site is in a sustainable location, and has realistic alternatives to the use of the car, which weighs in support of the scheme.

Economic Sustainability

- 7.29 One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is proactively to drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver, amongst other things, the homes that the country needs.
- 7.30 The development would bring economic benefits at the construction phase and following occupation. As with any new housing the proposed development would bring people into the area which would be a continuing economic benefit that would support growth in the local economy. In addition, the development would also create construction jobs, which would contribute towards the local economy. Furthermore, the proposed development would result in financial contributions being secured to offset certain impacts of the development, such as contributions towards the provision of enhanced community infrastructure.
- 7.31 Provided they are appropriately secured and address the adverse impacts of the scheme, these elements are all considered to be benefits in the planning balance and overall it is considered that the development would be economically sustainable.

Social Sustainability

- 7.32 In accordance with the Local Plan development is only to be permitted where adequate services and infrastructure are available or suitable arrangements can be made for their provision. Where facilities exist, but will need to be enhanced to meet the needs of the development, contributions are sought towards provision and improvement of infrastructure. A development should also offer a mix of house types and tenures to ensure a balanced and thriving community. The applicant has been working with the LPA on a draft S106 and has agreed to the principle of the obligations sought.
- 7.33 The application proposes that a range of house types, sizes and tenures would be provided, including 30% affordable housing (shared ownership and affordable rented) in accordance with Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy. The Council's adopted Affordable Housing SPD is also a material consideration, as is the NPPF which aspires to "deliver a wide choice of high quality homes in inclusive and mixed communities to meet the needs of different people". The Housing Officer supports this proposal subject to the final details being agreed.
- 7.34 The proposal also proposes significant areas of open space and a Community Orchard which could be used by both new and existing local residents and is considered to be a significant benefit in the overall planning balance. In addition, the proposal includes provision of new pedestrian/cycle links along Bartons Road leading to wider sustainable routes which will be of benefit to both new and existing local residents, by enabling safe and sustainable access to facilities in Havant and West Leigh. A Community Officer contribution will be secured to help new residents in the development integrate into existing communities. Contributions would also be secured through the Community Infrastructure Levy to improve off-site community infrastructure in accordance with relevant adopted policies and the adopted SPD on Planning Obligations.

Education and Health

- 7.35 The capacity of local schools has been considered in assessing the proposed development and infrastructure requirements. Hampshire County Council, as the Local Education Authority (LEA), has advised the development site is served by Sharps Copse Primary School. As this school is at capacity a financial contribution would be secured to enable expansion of the facility. Havant Academy is the Secondary School serving the development. The Local Education Authority confirms that there are a sufficient number of secondary school places.
- 7.36 The NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has assessed the impact on local GP surgery and place additional pressure on existing NHS services in primary, community and secondary care settings and a financial contribution is to be secured in relation to this matter.
- 7.37 The contributions would be secured via the associated S106 agreement.

Prematurity

- 7.38 In relation to prematurity, paragraphs 49-50 of the 2019 NPPF states:

*'...arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than in the limited circumstances where both:
a) the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by*

predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging plan; and
b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.

Refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft plan has yet to be submitted for examination. Where planning permission is refused on grounds of prematurity, the local planning authority will need to indicate clearly how granting permission for the development concerned would prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process.'

7.39 In the light of this guidance, Officers are satisfied that the emerging plan, which has not yet been submitted for examination, is not yet at such an advanced stage, nor is the development considered so substantial or its cumulative effect so significant, as to undermine the plan-making process. Therefore, prematurity may not be raised legitimately as a reason for not granting planning permission.

Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements

7.40 While the adopted Local Plan contains policies that seek to maintain the undeveloped gaps between settlements in policy AL2, in the emerging Local Plan this is no longer considered possible. The NPPF, in paragraph 11, is clear that Local Plans should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless there are strong reasons for restricting development. Those reasons are defined in footnote 6 of the NPPF, and do not include gaps between settlements as a particular consideration. The Council's Housing Constraints and Supply Analysis mapped constraints to development, and found that it was not possible to meet housing need on land unconstrained by nationally recognised constraints, while also protecting gaps between settlements. For this reason, a number of sites, including this site, have been put forward as proposed housing allocations in the Pre-Submission Local Plan 2036.

7.41 In conclusion on this issue,

- (1) The scheme is contrary to the development plan;
- (2) National planning policy is a material consideration;
- (3) The presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged in this case because: (a) the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable land for housing without Camp Field forming part of that supply and (b) the main important policies for the determination for the application set out in the development plan are out of date in that respect;
- (4) The proposals would constitute sustainable development in policy terms;
- (5) It is deliverable now and is required to bolster the 5 year supply;
- (6) The scheme is not premature;
- (7) Therefore, national policy considerations may be placed in the planning balance against the conflict with the development plan.

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

7.42 The site and its location have been described in detail in section 1 of this report. The current proposal is in outline form and therefore the detailed appearance of the proposed development cannot be considered at this time. An indicative layout has however been provided which seeks to demonstrate how the quantum of development could be successfully provided on the site. The proposed development consists of up to 72 dwellings. Given the need to make best use of land, and that this quantum of development is below the 'about 90 dwellings' in policy H18 of the Havant Borough

Local Plan 2036 Pre-Submission Draft, it is considered necessary to secure 72 units from this development. A condition to that effect is therefore recommended.

- 7.43 The built form of the residential development would be located within the Havant Borough Council administrative boundary with only very limited parts of gardens and road terminations within East Hampshire District.
- 7.44 The proposed indicative layout is for a fairly traditional residential scheme with a single point of vehicular access, a central spine road and spurs to the north and south and an emergency cycle and pedestrian route to the western side of the site. The layout indicates short terraces, semi-detached and detached units together with three modest blocks of flats. The mix of dwelling types is considered further in (iii) below.
- 7.45 The development would be set back from the Bartons Road frontage with the existing wide verge (approx. 5m deep) retained. The trees along the frontage would generally be retained although the frontage is more open at its eastern end. The properties currently proposed are generally two storey with a limited number of two and a half storey units utilising roof space. The set back, screening and dwelling heights would reduce the potential visual impact from Bartons Road and from the wider landscape. A condition is recommended in relation to building heights in order to limit the potential visual impact on the wider landscape.
- 7.46 Vehicular access would be from the existing Crematorium access point and details have been provided to demonstrate how an attractive route into the Crematorium could be provided. This includes additional landscaping, wide verges and re-positioned Crematorium walls / entrance features. These are considered further in paragraph (x) below. This approach is considered to appropriately respond to the need to provide an appropriate access to the site. An emergency access with cycle and pedestrian link would be provided to the western part of the frontage. This would provide links to the wider pedestrian and cycle network. This access would need to be designed to exclude general vehicular use and a condition is recommended in that regard.
- 7.47 The layout provides a significant physical separation between the proposed built form and the Crematorium which lies to the north of the site. This physical separation (minimum 47m to the landscaped area of the Crematorium) is considered important in retaining the tranquil setting currently enjoyed by the crematorium. The existing access road to the crematorium is landscaped and this would be further enhanced by additional planting and a bank between the application side and the existing road. Full details would be secured at the Reserved Matters stage.
- 7.48 The layout includes open space provision on site and this is shown on the indicative layout to run north / south through the central part of the site. The northern part of the open space would be centred on an existing oak tree and would be in line with two other oak trees in the wider undeveloped site. There would also be a swale / attenuation pond to the south-western part of the site. A community orchard would be located within the East Hampshire site area adjacent to the southern boundary of the crematorium. It is considered that this would provide an attractive enhancement to the setting of the Crematorium.
- 7.49 The land to the north of the site provides a setting not just to the crematorium but also to the Bartons Copse ancient woodland. This area would be managed grassland / fallow and would also contribute to ecological requirements providing an opportunity for additional boundary planting and more secure arrangements to limit public access to the woodland which is beneficial in terms of ecological requirements. The layout has however allowed for the potential for future access to the open land within East

Hampshire so that any future development potential is not prejudiced by the current indicative layout.

- 7.50 The site is located approximately 1.4 km from the closest part of the South Downs National Park. Wider landscape views are limited from the north and east by the forest, the Hospital and Crematorium and agricultural land. Given the height of the development and the residential scale of the proposals it is considered that any impact on the wider landscape and the South Downs National Park would be limited and acceptable. To the west of the site is a line of important trees separating the site from the Linden Homes development to the west. This line of trees is important in providing screening between the residential developments and from an ecological perspective. This important landscape feature would be retained in the proposed development.
- 7.51 Overall, it is considered that a development of up to 72 dwellings could be designed to have an attractive layout with an acceptable impact on the surrounding landscape and from public vantage points. This would be subject to the final design and layout which would need to form part of the reserved matters application should outline planning permission be granted.

(iii) Housing mix and affordable Housing

- 7.52 The proposal for up to 72 dwellings would produce a density of development of approximately 36 dph (developable area). Emerging Local Plan 2036 policy H3 states that planning permission will be granted for dwellings (outside town centres and defined opportunity area) where it provides for a minimum of 40dph. Overall and given the sensitivities of the site in terms of its location on the interface between the urban and non-urban area and the relationship to the Crematorium the lower density of development proposed in this application is considered to be justifiable is considered to be acceptable. It is not considered that the density of development proposed could be considered artificially low whereby an application should be refused.
- 7.53 The proposed housing mix is as follows:

Flats

1 Bedroom	3	(4%)
2 Bedroom	15	(21%)

Houses

2 Bedroom	10	(14%)
3 Bedroom	41	(57%)
4 Bedroom	3	(4%)

Adopted Local Plan 2011 policy CS9 requires provision of a mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures. Emerging Local Plan 2036 policy H4 relates to housing mix and requires the provision of a range of dwelling types and sizes with a minimum of 35% as two bedroom homes. Whilst the above mix includes a majority of three bed units, there are a range of dwellings proposed including 35% two bed units and this mix is considered acceptable.

- 7.54 In relation to Affordable Housing, the proposal would provide a total of 22 affordable

units which would comprise the following:

- 2 x 1 bed (flats)
- 14 x 2 bed (10 flats 4 houses)
- 5 x 3 bed (houses)
- 1 x 4 bed (house)

This represents 30% of the total units and would comply with the quantum of affordable housing required under the adopted and emerging policies CS9 (30-40% required) and H2 (30% required). The tenure split is anticipated to be 70/30 Affordable Rent / Shared Ownership. The units are spread though the site in the indicative layout and this arrangement is considered acceptable.

- 7.55 Subject to necessary requirements being secured within the associated S106 Agreement it is considered that the required on site affordable housing can be suitably secured.

(iv) Impact upon residential amenity (for existing and future residents)

Existing Residents

- 7.56 The main impacts from the proposed developments are likely to relate to vehicular movements, and the potential from overlooking or overbearing impact. The nearest properties are located to the south side of Bartons Road including new development in the grounds of Eastleigh House, and the properties to the west of the development site in Harrison Way. As the application is for outline permission with all matters with the exception of access reserved it is not possible to assess the detailed layout or appearance of the proposed development. The indicative layout however has been assessed in relation to its potential impacts.

Traffic Impacts (noise)

- 7.57 Bartons Road is a C class road and is a linking route with generally wide verges. The properties to the south are generally set back from the road with boundary fences and in many cases tree screening. The vehicular access to the site is set away from nearby properties. Given the existing relatively busy nature of the road it is not considered that the increase in traffic would result in significant additional road noise to existing residents.

Overlooking / Detailed relationships

- 7.58 The properties to the south of Bartons Road are set more than 30m from the proposed development with the road between. Given the height of the units proposed (max 2.5 storey), the separation distance would be sufficient to avoid any significant overlooking or overbearing issues.
- 7.59 The properties in Harrison Way to the east are set beyond a belt of trees and undergrowth which would be retained. The proposed flats in the south east corner of the site would be located closest to the properties beyond. The closest relationship between the existing and indicative flats would be 15m. The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 requires a separation distance of 10m for two storey to two storey (here the indicative design shows 2 storey to two and a half storey relationship in the indicative design). This relationship has been considered in detail and it is clear that the relationship is relatively tight notwithstanding the intervening trees. Dependant on the detailing of the proposed flats it is considered that their final design can be

designed to avoid overlooking and to provide appropriate relationships in terms of mass and bulk, it is also important to note that the layout is not fixed at this stage and that the reserved matters application layout may result in a different relationship which would need to be assessed at that stage.

Proposed Residents

- 7.60 Notwithstanding the indicative nature of the layout, it is important to ensure that the layout demonstrates appropriate residential amenity as this will ensure that the quantum of development proposed could be appropriately provided on site. In this regard the garden areas provided for the houses achieve a 10m depth excepting two units which have wider gardens. This provides adequate external amenity space for the proposed houses. The layout also provides appropriate separation distances between dwellings, and it is considered that the layout is in conformity with the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011.
- 7.61 The flats are shown with varying levels of external space, however, the emerging policy H1 seeks to secure minimum private or shared external amenity space at a rate of 1.5 sqm private amenity space per bedroom or 1 sqm private amenity space per bedroom. Whilst this is an emerging policy it is considered that a condition is required to secure adequate external amenity space for residents particularly considering that the proposal is coming forward at this stage in the Local Plan's evolution.
- 7.62 The emerging plan 2036 also requires housing developments to meet appropriate internal space standards and it is intended to condition compliance with the nationally described space standards.
- 7.63 With regards to the noise environment for future residents the application has been submitted with an acoustic report in relation to road and rail noise (the Portsmouth to Waterloo rail line runs approximately 100m to the east beyond the Linden Homes (Harrison Way) estate). The Councils Environmental Health Officer has confirmed that the acoustic report demonstrates that with the proposed acoustic mitigation measures effectively implemented, the potential significant rail and road traffic noise impact on affected dwelling units internally and personal external amenity spaces is resolved. A condition is recommended in relation to noise mitigation in the design of the dwellings.
- 7.64 Overall it is considered that the indicative layout demonstrates that subject to appropriate conditions the development can be designed to provide a good quality living environment for future residents in accordance with adopted plan 2011 policies CS16 and DM10, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and emerging local plan 2036.

(v) Highway impacts, on site layout and parking

- 7.65 The National Planning policy Framework at Paragraph 108 states that, in relation to development proposals, decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. Paragraph 109 states that, *Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.* Paragraph 110 also states that developments should be located and designed where practical to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements; and create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians.
- 7.66 There have been detailed discussions with County Highways at the pre-application

and application stage in relation to the highways aspects of the proposals. The application has been submitted with a Transport Assessment, Travel Plan, Technical Notes and detailed plans in response to the Highway Authority's comments. The main issues in relation to the highways considerations are considered to relate to the following:

- Assessment of Existing Conditions
- Committed Development
- Accessibility
- Personal Injury Accident Review
- Site Access Proposals
- Sustainable Travel Improvements
- Parking Provision
- On site layout
- Trip Distribution and Generation (including Future Year Scenario)
- Junction Assessments
- Travel Plan

Assessment of Existing Conditions

- 7.67 The context for the proposed development is set by current road conditions Surveys were carried out by the applicants Transport Consultants, between 15th - 21st March 2018. The results measured traffic speeds and the quantum of vehicular movements. The surveys found the 85th percentile speeds to be 39mph eastbound and 39.8mph westbound (adjusted for wet weather 36.5mph and 37.3mph respectively).
- 7.68 Vehicle flows in the peak hours AM were 532 eastbound and 627 westbound. In the peak hours PM they were 545 eastbound and 692 westbound.

Committed Development

- 7.69 The development has been assessed taking account of committed development in the vicinity of the site (Linden Homes development (55 dwellings), Land South of Bartons Road (175 dwellings), Southleigh Park House (90 dwellings), Land East of Horndean Road (Current application for mixed uses including up to 800 dwellings employment land local centre etc) and Colt site (up to 100 dwellings and Employment)).

Accessibility

- 7.70 In relation to Walking and Cycling the Transport Assessment has assessed the proximity of the development to local facilities. Some of the identified retail facilities, business parks and leisure facilities sit within proximity of the site. Sharps Copse Primary School (1.4km) and Saint Alban's CoE Primary School (1.6km) are situated above the acceptable walking distance of 1km and are less likely to attract walking trips by young children.
- 7.71 The development brings opportunities to extend the shared use footway/cycleway provision along Bartons Road to encourage walking and cycling trips (these are considered under Site Access Proposals below). A number of local trip destinations such as Havant and South Downs College and Solent Retail Park are outside the walkable distance at 3km and 3.6km respectively and therefore cycle access is more appropriate. Improvement to routes are considered further below.
- 7.72 In relation to Bus travel, the nearest bus stops are located 500m from the proposed

emergency access, serving routes 20 and 21. Accessibility to these stops will be improved by proposals to widen the footway to the south side of Bartons Way to a 3m wide footway/cycleway. The development proposal is to tie into this route from the site.

- 7.73 The closest Rail station is Warblington Station approximately 2km away. This is at the maximum preferred walking distance and is less likely to attract many walking trips when considering current conditions along Bartons Road. Improving shared use facilities along the road to the east would help increase the accessibility of the station from pedestrian and cycle travel to the train.

Personal Injury Accident Review (PIA)

- 7.74 Data has been provided and assessed in relation to accidents at the following junctions:

Bartons Road/New Lane
Eastleigh Road/Southleigh Road
Bartons Road/Comley Hill/Horndean Road/Emsworth Common Road
Bartons Road/Petersfield Road
Bartons Road

Hampshire Highways have noted that there are no accident clusters present which have not been subject to safety improvements and the Highways Authority is content that this development will not exacerbate any existing safety issues.

Site Access Proposals

- 7.75 The primary access into the development would be via the existing crematorium access onto Bartons Road. Access to the crematorium site itself would be via a bellmouth junction internal to the site. The development would upgrade the existing access to provide a wider carriageway.
- 7.76 Tracking has been undertaken for a standard and luxury bus, a super large refuse vehicle, a hearse and large car. These details have been assessed by the Highways Authority and are considered to be acceptable. It should be noted that alterations to the access may be required following the construction of the Land South of Bartons Road access and right turn lane arrangement. As set out in part (x) below, consideration is being given to the inclusion of a 'keep clear' road marking by the crematorium junction to prevent the possibility of vehicles obstructing the access. Should these alterations be required they would be included at the detailed design stage via the S278 process.
- 7.77 It is considered that subject to the detailed requirements of the S278 process, an acceptable vehicular access can be provided to the site and that this can function appropriately with the adjacent Crematorium use.
- 7.78 An emergency access point to the site is also proposed which will double up as a shared pedestrian/cycle access. The existing dropped kerb is to be replaced by a full height kerb to prevent it being mistaken for a full access. Visibility has been demonstrated to 120m in both directions from the emergency access and this is considered acceptable by the Highway Authority.
- 7.79 To prevent conflicts in construction traffic and vehicles entering/egressing the

crematorium, the emergency access will need to be made the primary vehicular access for construction traffic during the build out of the site. This would be secured within a Construction Traffic Management Plan condition. The emergency access and shared pedestrian/cycle access is considered acceptable.

Sustainable Travel Improvements

- 7.80 Pedestrian/cycle access to the site is proposed through the emergency access. A 2.5m wide shared use footway/cycleway, including a 0.5m wide margin strip against the carriageway, is proposed to connect into the existing provision at the Linden Homes development to the west. There would also be a pedestrian/cycle connection to the southern side of Bartons Road. These links to the wider network would be secured via the S278 agreement.
- 7.81 To tie into the shared access provision from this development and the shared use path due to be implemented as part of the Land South of Bartons Road and Eastleigh House applications, a shared connection is required between the emergency access and site access internal to the development to link this provision together. This provision should be included within any subsequent Reserved Matters application.
- 7.82 In addition a shared use footway/cycle provision is provided from the main site access to the east from the site towards the Bartons Road/Eastleigh Road junction. This would link via a pedestrian/cycle refuge to the footway/cycleway secured via the Southleigh House development. These requirements would be secured via the S278 Agreement.
- 7.83 Overall it is considered that the package of travel improvements that would be secured by this development would improve sustainable linkages to existing and proposed routes improving the accessibility of the site to non-car based journeys.

Parking Provision

- 7.84 With regard to parking, whilst the internal layout including parking is a Reserved Matter, the indicative layout has been assessed in terms of its compliance with Havant Borough Council Parking SPD as set out below:

The development as shown on the indicative layout provides car parking to fully meet the car parking standards including meeting allocated parking standards for the flats. The Reserved Matters application would need to address issues in limited areas of the site where the parking would need to be amended to provide parking better related to the units that they would serve. There is also a need to address landscape concerns to ensure that the parking areas are attractively landscaped to avoid long runs of spaces. In addition, there are currently indicated in the Design and Access Statement to be 15 visitor spaces and a further 15 'additional visitor spaces'.

- 7.85 The SPD requires that with the exception of small residential developments an additional 20% of unallocated parking for visitors should be accommodated. In this regard this proposal fully meets the requirements for visitor parking. It would be necessary at the Reserved Matters stage to address concerns in relation to the proximity of some of the spaces to the associated plots and to seek to reduce the amount of parking surrounding the central open space (an issue considered further in (vi) below). A condition in relation to this matter which will guide the Reserved Matters application is recommended.
- 7.86 Cycle parking would be required to meet the Council's Parking SPD standards and a

condition is recommended to secure this.

On Site Layout

- 7.87 The indicative on site layout is considered to be generally acceptable, the detailed Reserved Matters application will provide detailed layout proposals.

Trip Distribution and Generation (including Future Year Scenario)

- 7.88 Following pre-application discussions with Hampshire Highways it was agreed that the trip rates from the Land South of Bartons Road application should be adopted to calculate the number of vehicular trips occurring in the peak hours from the development. The residential development of 72 dwellings place the two-way vehicular trip rates at 41 in the AM peak and 42 in the PM peak.
- 7.89 A sensitivity test has also been carried out for the potential future development of an additional 78 dwellings to the north of the site (within East Hampshire's jurisdiction). Vehicular trip rates for the full 150 dwellings have therefore been considered under the sensitivity test. This results in two-way trips of 84 in the AM peak and 87 in the PM peak for 150 dwellings.
- 7.90 Similar to the vehicular trip rate, the distribution of traffic has also been adopted from the Land South of Bartons Road site. This approach is considered acceptable by the Highways Authority. Based on this assessment, Petersfield Road South is proposed to accommodate the greatest level of vehicular traffic from the development (34%), followed by Eastleigh Road (33%) and Comley Hill (13%).
- 7.91 To provide a robust assessment of future traffic growth in the area, additional committed developments have been assessed (as set out in paragraph 7.63). In addition, to account for the growth rate in traffic TEMPRO has been used to a forecast year of 2023. These growth rates have been applied to the observed 2018 traffic flows and the methodology is considered acceptable to the Highways Authority. The above assessments have been used to inform the assessment of a number of key junctions on the Highway Network as set out below.

Junction Assessments

- 7.92 The scope of junction testing has been agreed with Hampshire Highways and junctions assessed taking account of committed development. The following junctions have been modelled:

Site Access

Bartons Road/Petersfield Road junction

Bartons Road/Eastleigh Road junction

Eastleigh Road/Southleigh Road junction

Bartons Road/Horndean Road/Emsworth Common Road/Comley Hill junction

These junctions have been assessed under the following scenarios:

2023 Baseline

2023 Baseline + Proposed Development (72 Dwellings)

2023 Baseline + Sensitivity (150 Dwellings)

The assessments for each of the junctions below have been carried out by HCC as

the Highway Authority following the submission of further detailed information from the Transport Consultants.

Site Access Junction

- 7.93 Under all scenarios, the junction with Bartons Road and the existing crematorium access operates with spare capacity.

Bartons Road/Petersfield Road Signal Junction

- 7.94 Under the 2023 baseline a number of the approaches were noted to be close to or over capacity. The worst performing approaches were noted as Bartons Road and Petersfield Road south in the AM and PM peak periods. With the addition of development traffic, the overall operation of the junction worsens, with all approaches over capacity in both AM and PM peak hours (except Petersfield Road South ahead approach). A mitigation scheme is therefore required to offset the impact of development traffic and return the junction within operational capacity.

- 7.95 The improvement features an increase in the length of the left turn lane from 18m to 28m with associated footway realignment and any necessary utility diversions. Once further studies have taken place, the contribution value required will be established and secured through the S106 agreement. Given that the land will potentially be allocated for 150 dwellings, the contribution payment would be split between the current 72 dwelling application and any subsequent application for the remaining potential allocation. Should the remaining land not be subject to a planning application by the time of the first occupation of the current application has taken place, the developer has agreed to pay the full cost of the improvement as a contribution for HCC to implement the works. This will be secured within the S106 agreement.

Bartons Road/Eastleigh Road Junction

- 7.96 The junction has been modelled under all the scenarios and would be within operating capacity following development and is considered acceptable.

Eastleigh Road/Southleigh Road Junction

- 7.97 This junction would continue to operate within design capacity following development traffic.

Bartons Road/Horndean Road/Emsworth Common Road/Comley Hill

- 7.98 Under the 2023 baseline, the Bartons Road right turn operates at a Ratio to Flow Capacity (RFC) of 1.34 in the AM peak and the Emsworth Common Road left and right turn operate with RFCs of 1.11. When considering the addition of development traffic from the current 72 dwelling application the Bartons Road right turn continues to operate at an RFC of 1.34 and the Emsworth Common left and right turn movements in the PM peak slightly increase to RFC of 1.12.
- 7.99 Based on the agreed distribution from the development, the current 72 dwelling application places 8 trips through this junction in the AM and PM peak hour. Given the existing capacity issues and low level of additional impact from this development, the Highway Authority will not be seeking an improvement to this junction in this instance.

Travel Plan

7.100A revised Travel Plan has been prepared in support of the application detailing how more sustainable modes of travel would be encouraged. The Travel Plan is now considered to meet the requirements of the Highway Authority with any outstanding information being provided at the full travel plan stage. The Travel Plan will be secured through a legal agreement, which will also include approval and monitoring fees and a bond.

7.101 Taking all these highway factors together it is considered that the site is sustainable in transport terms, subject to the mitigation measures proposed, S106 and conditional requirements. Car and Cycle parking can be secured to meet the Council's Parking Standards SPD requirements. Overall the impacts on the highway network are not considered to be severely harmful to the safety or free flow of the highway network and as such the development should not be refused. It is clear in paragraph 109 of the NPPF that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Following the implementation of the agreed mitigation proposals required by legal agreement and conditions, these are considered to mitigate the impact of the development on the highway network and therefore a reason for refusal on this basis could not be justified.

(vi) Public open space and food production

7.102 The indicative proposal includes an area of Public Open Space including a Local Area of Play centred upon an existing Oak Tree which forms part of a line of trees running across the wider site. This would be linked by a landscaped open space to trees fronting Bartons Road to provide a green space running through the site north to south. There would also be an incidental landscaping area incorporating a swale/attenuation pond to the western part of the site adjacent to the existing tree line and a landscaped approach to the site via the access road. An area of landscaping with banking providing a landscaped approach to the Crematorium access road would further enhance the existing landscaping to the approach route. A further swale would run to the southern side of the site behind the verge to Bartons Road.

7.103 The formal open space areas provided on site would have an area of approximately 1590sqm (0.15ha). The proposal also includes a Community Orchard within the East Hampshire part of the site and this area measures approximately 4400 sqm (0.44ha). The emerging local plan policy E9 states that:

Proposals for residential development of 50 dwellings or more will be permitted where:

a. High quality on-site public open space is provided to a standard of 1.5 ha per 1,000 population;

and

b. On development where the open space requirement exceeds 0.5ha, an element of play space is provided; and

c. On greenfield sites, part of this requirement is provided in the form of community food growing space, to a standard of at least 0.2ha per 1,000 population.

7.104 The requirement for open space provision in relation to this development would, based on the predicted population of 165 persons be 2467sqm (0.25 ha). The proposed public open space plus Community Orchard would provide 5990sqm (0.599 ha) therefore providing significantly above the standard for public open space. The requirement for community food growing space requirement is also exceeded in the proposals.

- 7.105 In terms of the public open space the requirements for management and maintenance would be secured via the S106 agreement and at this stage it is anticipated that a Management Company would be set up to secure these requirements. As the Community Orchard is located with East Hampshire that authority would be a party to the S106 Agreement. Overall it is considered that the concerns originally expressed by the landscape officer have been addressed with a significant landscape buffer to the Crematorium access road including planting and a bund, whilst the parking layout requirements can to be addressed further at the Reserved Matters Stage. The central open space provides a focal point for the development with pavement access to the area. The parking arrangements around the open space will need further attention moving forward to avoid the dominance of parked cars. Landscape detailing is a reserved matter and hard landscaping details will be required by condition. Boundary treatments, including those to open space, would be subject to a condition.
- 7.106 Overall the achievable open space provision as set out in the outline scheme is considered acceptable and appropriate for the development.

(vii) Flood Risks / Drainage

- 7.107 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (lowest flood risk) and within a Source Protection Zone 1c. The application has been accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment including a Surface Water drainage plan, Technical Note Surface Water Drainage and an indicative foul drainage strategy. The application has been considered in detail by the Local Lead Flood Authority (Hampshire County Council), Portsmouth Water and Southern Water (the Environment Agency have confirmed that the proposal is not within their remit for comment).

Surface Water Drainage

- 7.108 The surface water drainage strategy sets out that the existing site exhibits green field run off rates. A sustainable drainage system has been shown in order to manage the runoff from the development although further work will be required at the detailed design stage.
- 7.109 The indicative strategy demonstrates that a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme can be delivered. Following consideration of soakage tests the site is not favourable for infiltration drainage as the main method of drainage disposal at the site. A mixture of surface water attenuation measures are therefore proposed. These will potentially include pervious paving, swales and attenuation structures/basins and controlled discharges into the watercourse located to the west of the site.
- 7.110 The illustrative scheme indicates water run off from the roof structures is to be piped to attenuation features. Limited infiltration from pervious paving areas would also occur. Runoff from the access / internal road would be attenuated by swales where technically possible, or piped into local SuDS features. Patios and footpaths of private dwellings would drain to lawns and soft landscape areas. The drainage strategy confirms that it is proposed to make full use of the attenuation capacity within the SuDS features for all storm events up to 1 in 100 year +40% climate change. The drainage strategy indicates the use of surface water pipes, porous paving, attenuation tanks and Swales. Many of these features would be linked and would lead to the attenuation basin in the west of the site and from there discharge at a controlled rate of 12.5 l/s into the existing ditch running along the western boundary of the site.

- 7.111 The drainage strategy incorporating SuDS is designed to manage the increase in

runoff from the site over the lifetime of the development. The scheme has been designed to ensure that runoff rates are compatible to the existing greenfield position with sufficient capacity within the system to take account of flood events and climate change. The SuDs system will need to be suitably managed and maintained and would be secured through the associated S106 Agreement.

7.112 The Local Lead Flood Authority have confirmed that following the receipt of additional information they have no objections to the proposals. An appropriate condition in relation to Surface Water Drainage is recommended and subject to this and the S106 agreement requirements it is considered that acceptable and appropriate surface water drainage can be provided.

Water Environment

7.113 The Flood Risk Assessment confirms that the scheme will provide measures to ensure that surface water entering the ditch will pass through SuDS features that will ensure that water is passed through a 'Treatment Train' as it flows through the system. The level of treatment that will be achieved via each SuDS component is summarised below.

Interception/Primary treatment (level 1) - rainwater harvesting, down pipe filters, silt traps for driveways, catch-pit gullies, permeable paving, petrol interceptors

Secondary treatment (level 2) - permeable paving, bio-retention areas

Tertiary treatment (level 3) - Attenuation Basin

This approach is considered acceptable and subject to the surface water drainage condition should ensure appropriate water quality in relation to the water entering the wider environment.

7.114 In relation to ground water, Portsmouth Water have provided comments in relation to the Source Protection Zone 1c, the sensitive groundwater catchment and the potential significant risks associated with groundworks in this area. They have recommended a condition in relation to the potential for piled foundations. A condition is recommended to ensure that if piling is proposed the impacts on the water environment are fully assessed and if necessary mitigated to avoid impacts on the water environment.

Foul Drainage

7.115 In relation to Foul Drainage, the proposal is to link the foul drainage into an existing Foul Drainage system running across the northern part of the site within the East Hampshire part of the site. The Flood Risk Assessment states that *All new foul pipe networks will be independent of any surface water drainage and any upgrades required in the local network would be carried out prior to the completion of the development. Therefore, the probability of flooding from a failure in the existing sewers is assessed as low.*

7.116 Southern Water are the statutory undertaker in relation to foul sewerage and have confirmed that their initial investigations indicate that Southern Water can provide foul sewage disposal to service the proposed development. They also confirm that a public foul sewer crosses the site (this appears to be routed outside the housing area but needs further determination on site). Conditions and informatives are recommended in relation to Sewer protection and connection to the public sewerage system. These are recommended for inclusion together with a Foul drainage condition to secure the final scheme.

(viii) Ecological Impacts

- 7.117 The site is located close to Bartons Copse, a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and approximately 2.7km from the Chichester and Langstone Harbour SPA and Ramsar Site, the Solent Maritime SAC and Chichester Harbour SSSI. Prior to the submission of the application a Screening Opinion was requested, and the Council confirmed on the 1st November 2018 that the development was not considered Environmental Impact Assessment development. Nonetheless the application has been submitted with ecological information in the form of Stage 2 Ecology Surveys, a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, an Appropriate Assessment Screening Statement, a Nutrient Budget (and addendum), and a Lighting Impact on Dark Corridor.
- 7.118 The application has been considered in detail by Natural England and the Council's Ecologist and this has involved several rounds of consultation and the submission of further details to address issues raised during the process, including to address issues in relation to Bats and nutrient neutrality.
- 7.119 The Council's Ecologist has confirmed that the site *comprises a large field of arable land which has been improved grassland in the recent past. The site is of limited ecological value in terms of vegetation communities.*
- 7.120 The Council's Ecologist identifies the key constraint as the presence of Bechstein's bats. The application included survey and trapping effort including trapping surveys to identify mouse-eared bats. No Bechstein's bats were recorded within the application site in 2018. However, trapping and radio-tracking surveys undertaken by Portsmouth Water in July 2018 recorded a roosting female within Bartons Copse. In addition, a maternity roost of at least 38 bats was recorded at Bartons Copse in 2009. Despite the absence of Bechstein's bats during the surveys related to this application, Bartons Copse is clearly an important component of the wider landscape for this rare species and the species was found to roost in the Copse in summer 2018. The Council's Ecologist confirms the surveys by Portsmouth Water demonstrate the functional link for the species between Bartons Copse, Southleigh Forest and Havant Thicket and provides evidence that the bat species is reliant on dispersed woodland blocks and critically the habitats between them.
- 7.121 The bat surveys recorded high percentages of mouse-eared species on the site and other diverse bat species and these additional interesting bat records highlight the importance of the site and the surrounding landscape, which must be considered to be of at least County importance. The Council's Ecologist has confirmed that the primary ecological interest of the site is its bat assemblage. It is imperative that the proposed development does not compromise the continued presence of bat species. As a result of the issues raised further ecological information has been provided in relation to the bat issues. There are a number of mitigation measures that would be secured with the development. There is a proposed 18m wide buffer between the development area and the ancient woodland edge and this would need to be devoid of lighting to provide a dark corridor. It is also proposed to plant the woodland buffer with a native shrub mix, creating a softer edge than at present. This should provide additional bat foraging habitat whilst preventing informal access to the woodland. In addition, fencing would be provided to the ancient woodland to help discourage public access. Finally, further provision of bat boxes within Bartons Copse is proposed.
- 7.122 The Council's Ecologist has reviewed the proposed mitigation and is now content with the proposals in relation to impacts on bats.

7.123 In terms of other protected or notable species, the Council's Ecologist confirms that the site is relatively unconstrained. Some evidence of Badger activity has been recorded from the woodland edge, but no setts have been identified. Surveys have recorded the probable absence of hazel dormice and great crested newt. Bird surveys have recorded a typical assemblage of woodland bird species at the site boundaries, but no evidence of ground-nesting farmland birds. Reptiles appear to be absent. Representations have been received in relation to Deer and Foxes using the site these are not included in standing advice for protected species on the Gov.uk website and are not listed as protected species. The proposals seek to mitigate impacts on the Ancient Woodland habitat.

7.124 Overall, it is considered that the impacts on protected species on site or nearby and in particular in relation to bats can be appropriately mitigated and addressed in the development proposal subject to appropriate conditions and S106 requirements.

(ix) Relationship to land in East Hampshire and associated planning application

7.125 As the application site includes land in both Havant Borough and East Hampshire District, applications have been submitted to both authorities. The East Hampshire planning application reference is 53322/003 *Outline planning permission for green infrastructure including community orchard in association with 72 dwellings on land within Havant Borough Council. (Reference APP/19/00007)*. The residential development would be located within Havant Borough with the exception of some road terminations and small parts of gardens. The East Hampshire area would however provide supporting infrastructure in relation to the development, for example the Community Orchard, surface and foul drainage links and landscaping including to the Crematorium access road, planting to the edge of the Ancient Woodland and ecological mitigation. The current application to Havant Borough Council the subject of this report is therefore reliant on land within East Hampshire. As such any recommendation to grant permission must be subject to Planning Permission being granted by East Hampshire District Council as the elements within East Hampshire are considered critical to securing sustainable development.

7.126 East Hampshire District Council is reviewing its Local Plan and a Draft Local Plan 2017-2036 (Regulation 18) has been produced. The land to the North of the current application site has been identified as site SA40 for 50-60 dwellings with a timeframe of 2034-2035/36. Whilst the East Hampshire Local Plan Review is at a less advanced stage than the Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 the current application needs to take account of and not fetter the possible future development of land within East Hampshire. The current layout allows for potential road access to this land. A condition is required to ensure that potential access remains available.

(x) Impact on the Crematorium

7.127 It is considered that the preservation of the peace, tranquillity and attractiveness of the Crematorium environment is a critical aspect of any residential development at the application site. Policy H18 of the Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 requires that the development *minimises visual and noise disturbance from the dwellings and open space to ensure that the crematorium remains a tranquil place where mourners can expect a respectful experience; Includes a landscape buffer between the development and the access road to the Crematorium, and a buffer to the Ancient Woodland and SINC;*

There are a number of issues to be considered as follows:

The principle of development in proximity to the Crematorium

Impact of the access proposals

The setting of the crematorium including the access road and community orchard

Landscaping requirements

Potential noise impacts from the development

Construction phase impacts

The principle of development in proximity to the Crematorium

7.128 The Cremation Act 1902 relates to the regulation of the burning of Human Remains, and to enable Burial Authorities to establish Crematoria. The Act states that:

'No crematorium shall be constructed nearer to any dwelling-house than two hundred yards, except with the consent, in writing of the owner, lessee and occupier of such house, nor within fifty yards of any public highway, nor in the consecrated part of the burial ground of any burial authority.' Cremation Act 1902, Section 5: Site of crematorium

7.129 The Act is concerned with the construction of a crematorium rather than the construction of housing near a crematorium. There is therefore no requirement under the Cremation Act to maintain a buffer between the existing crematorium and the proposed housing.

Impact of the access proposals

7.130 The proposal provides the vehicular access to the site via the existing crematorium access road. This followed extensive discussion at the pre-application stage with Hampshire County Council as the Highways Authority. The use of the existing access onto Bartons Road reduces the number of access points onto Bartons Road which is beneficial from a highways safety point of view especially bearing in mind the proximity of the site to the Horndean Road/Bartons Road junction, the new access to land to the South of Bartons Road (175 houses), the access to the Linden Homes Development and other access points to Bartons Road.

7.131 Given the requirement to utilise a shared access point with the Crematorium it is necessary to ensure that this remains an attractive access and does not result in hindrance to vehicles entering the Crematorium. The road would split a short distance after entering from Bartons Road, with the Crematorium access route swinging to the east on its original route and the housing site access carrying on to the north. The indicative layout shows that the access would retain wide landscaped verges with planting to either side. The existing attractive entrance walls would be re-located/rebuilt at the new entrance point to The Oaks Crematorium. A planning condition to secure this is recommended. It would also be necessary to ensure that vehicles turning into the crematorium are not unduly hindered. Therefore, a clearway is being explored with Hampshire County Council as highway authority who have stated *Consideration may also need to be given to the inclusion of 'keep clear' road markings by the crematorium junction to prevent vehicles obstructing access. Should these alterations be required, they should be picked up and addressed at the detailed design stage of the Section 278 process.* This requirement can be secured through S278 requirements within the S106 Agreement and at the time of writing this report these matters are being explored further with Hampshire Highways. The applicants agent has confirmed that this would be acceptable.

The setting of the crematorium including the access road and community orchard

7.132 The access to the Crematorium and the residential development would diverge within a short distance of the junction with Bartons Road. This allows the existing route to the Crematorium to be left unchanged for most of its route including wide landscaped verges and swale features. This attractive approach would be further enhanced by the provision of a further landscaped buffer on the housing development side of the development including further planting and a landscaped bank. It is considered that this would result in the retention of an attractive and tranquil route to the Crematorium. The Reserved Matters application will need to ensure this acceptable level of landscaping and detailing.

7.133 The main housing development would be set well off the boundary with the Crematorium site which itself includes landscaped grounds set closest to the proposed development. The proposed community orchard would be sited adjacent to the southern boundary of the Crematorium and this would provide an attractive relatively low key land use. It is considered that the layout of the development has been sensitively designed to ensure that a suitable relationship to the Crematorium is achieved.

Landscaping requirements

7.134 The application is supported by indicative landscaping proposals, which are considered to be generally acceptable, however, landscaping is a reserved matter. A landscaping condition is recommended to secure the final details.

Potential noise impacts from the development

7.135 The proposed residential development is set well off the crematorium with the community orchard set closest and the application is supported by an acoustic report. This states that *9.2 Given the nature of the proposed local community orchard, as set out in the Stainsby Architect Master Plan and Design and Access Statement, it is not expected to generate adverse noise impact on existing sensitive receptors or future occupants of the residential development.* It is noted that the Council's Environmental Health Officer has raised no objection to the proposed development.

Construction phase impacts

7.136 It is recognised that the construction phase of the development has the potential to cause impacts to the Crematorium use. It is considered critical that the construction phase is appropriately managed to minimise impacts as far as is possible. A construction management plan is required, and this would need to ensure that construction traffic does not use the crematorium access in relation to the construction of the dwellings, roads and associated works. Access would need to be taken from the Emergency Access route on Bartons Road and this would be secured through the S106 Agreement. There is also a need to restrict radio noise on the site. Any piling would require the submission of further details both in relation to potential for impacts on the water environment and in relation to noise/vibration.

7.137 It is noted that works will be required to connect the new access to the crematorium access, together with alterations to the junction and pedestrian/cycleway routes to the Bartons Road frontage. The Crematorium have advised that there is a need to retain access to their site 7 days a week. These works will therefore need careful management/phasing to minimise impacts and these requirements would form part of the Construction Management Plan requirements including phasing of the works.

7.138 Overall, and subject to environmental controls / conditions it is considered that the development would not be detrimental to the peace and tranquillity of the Crematorium and its setting.

(xi) Impacts on Trees

7.139 The application site is mainly open agricultural land. There are however a row of important oak trees running across the site from north to south. Only one of these trees is within the area to be developed within the residential area of the site and this tree would be located within the on site public open space and retained as part of the scheme as shown in the indicative layout. The tree is subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

7.140 The site frontage to Bartons Road includes mixed groups of trees especially along the western part of the frontage. These trees would be retained with the exception of those located at the position of the proposed emergency access (including cycle and pedestrian link). The frontage to Bartons Road will therefore continue to provide an attractive green frontage to much of the site.

7.141 To the west of the site is a narrow belt of significant trees which are important in forming a screen between the development and the Linden Homes residential development to the west. This belt of trees is also important in terms of ecology and in particular in relation to bat routes. The trees would be retained with the indicative layout ensuring development is set off this boundary and tree protection provided. The layout also demonstrates that the Ancient woodland beyond the site would remain and that further buffer planting would be provided.

7.142 The Council's Arboricultural Officer has confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal subject to tree protection and a finalised Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan. Conditions are recommended to secure these requirements.

(xii) Conformity with emerging policy

7.143 Whilst the emerging Local Plan 2036 has limited weight at this stage it does indicate the Councils 'direction of travel'. The site is coming forward in advance of the allocation of the land which is within the emerging rather than adopted plan. In these circumstances it is considered appropriate to consider the proposals against emerging policy and where appropriate to seek compliance with the emerging plan so far as possible. It is recognised that this is an outline planning application and conditions will be required to guide the reserved matters submission. As part of the current application consideration the agent has provided a conformity check with emerging policy.

7.144 The conformity check has been assessed by the Council's Planning Policy team. This raised comment in relation to the following emerging policies:

E9 Provision of public open space in new development

This policy states that residential development of 50 dwellings or more will be permitted where:

- a. High quality on-site public open space is provided to a standard of 1.5 ha per 1,000 population; and*
- b. On development where the open space requirement exceeds 0.5ha, an element of play space is provided; and*
- c. On greenfield sites, part of this requirement is provided in the form of community*

food growing space, to a standard of at least 0.2ha per 1,000 population.

The issue raised related to how food growing through the Community Orchard would be secured given that the proposed land is outside HBC's administrative area, a short way removed from the proposed development.

The Community Orchard would be secured through the S106 agreement to which East Hampshire District Council would be a party, the recommendation is subject to the S106 agreement being secured and a separate planning permission being considered by EHDC being granted.

7.145 Emerging policies E14 (Local Ecology Network) and E15 (Protected species) seek to ensure that ecological interests are protected. At the time of the policy comments being received there were outstanding ecology concerns that have now been addressed by the submission of further information. Ecological requirements shall be secured by the S106 agreement and conditions as required.

7.146 Emerging policy H18 (Camp Field) sets out the requirements for development on the site. This sets out a number of requirements. The following have been highlighted:

Residential development of about 90 dwellings will be permitted where (amongst other matters):

Opportunities have been explored for the prior extraction of minerals to the satisfaction of Hampshire County Council.

The design layout is required to (amongst other matters):

Minimise visual and noise disturbance from the dwellings and open space to ensure that the crematorium remains a tranquil place where mourners can expect a respectful experience.

In relation to prior extraction of minerals, further information has been provided and Hampshire County Council raise no objection to the proposals subject to a condition in relation to reuse of materials during the construction phase if appropriate. A condition is recommended.

With regard to the impact on the crematorium and its use, concern has been raised in relation to possible noise disturbance to the crematorium. The impacts on the crematorium are considered in full in part (x) above. The residential properties are set well off the crematorium boundary. The Community Orchard would be sited adjacent to the southern boundary of the site, however, this use would essentially be a quiet use. The submitted acoustic report states:

9.2 Given the nature of the proposed local community orchard, as set out in the Stainsby Architect Master Plan and Design and Access Statement, it is not expected to generate adverse noise impact on existing sensitive receptors or future occupants of the residential development.

The Environmental Health consultation response raises no objection to the proposed development in relation to noise disturbance.

It is considered that the minerals and noise issues have been appropriately addressed in this application.

7.147 Overall, and subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions and S106 requirements

it is considered that the development would be in general conformity to the emerging Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036.

(xiii) Infrastructure / S106 Requirements

7.148 Consultations have been carried out in relation to infrastructure requirements and these will be addressed in relation to the following areas:

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);
Affordable Housing;
Ecology;
Education;
Highways Requirements;
Health (Portsmouth Hospitals and SE Hants Clinical Commissioning Group)
Community Officer

Community Infrastructure Levy

7.149 With regards to CIL, this outline application is not CIL liable, however any subsequent Reserved Matters of Full Planning Application would be. The current CIL rate in relation to residential development in relation to the St Faiths Ward would be £111.79 / per square metre.

Affordable Housing

7.150 Affordable housing would be provided on site at a rate of 30% of the total units and secured through the associated S106 Agreement.

Ecology

7.151 The Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy contribution would be secured via the associated S106 agreement. The final quantum of the contribution would be based on the Reserved Matters application which would set out the final mix of the development.

7.152 In addition, requirements in relation to a landscaped buffer to the Ancient Woodland and bat box provision within Bartons Copse, additional fencing to the Copse and lighting would be secured via the associated S106 Agreement or planning conditions. The S106 Agreement would control the management of open space and other land to ensure that its condition fulfils requirements necessary to secure a nutrient neutral development.

Education

7.153 Contributions are required by Hampshire County Council as the Education Authority for Sharps Copse Primary School which is full and forecast to remain so. The school therefore requires expansion to cater for the proposed development and a contribution of £313,875 is required and would be secured via the associated S106 Agreement. Hampshire County Council have confirmed that there is no requirement for additional Secondary School provision.

Highways Requirements

7.154 The following requirements have been identified by Hampshire County Council:

Site Access Works - S278 Agreement

Delivery of Shared use path between the site access and Eastleigh Road via S278 Agreement

Delivery of shared use connection between the emergency access and Linden Homes development.

Payment of a contribution sufficient to cover the full or proportional (split with the remaining allocation should it come forward) cost of the identified improvement scheme at the Bartons Road/Petersfield Road junction.

Framework Travel Plan approval and monitoring (£1,500 and £15,000 respectively).

Provision of bond, or other form of financial surety, in respect of measures within the Travel Plan.

Health Contributions

7.155 The South East Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group have confirmed that the growth in local population from the development would result in additional registration with local GP surgeries and primary care services. Whilst the additional demand is not considered to warrant the commissioning of an additional GP surgery and demand will be accommodated within existing surgeries open to new registration from people living in the area of the proposed development, additional capacity within the premises will be required. The CCG considers that the application should be required to make a financial contribution to the capital investments that the NHS will make in this regard. A contribution of £11,520 has been calculated for the development and this would be secured through the S106 Agreement.

7.156 Portsmouth Hospitals NHS Trust have requested contributions be secured towards the cost of providing additional designed capacity for the trust to maintain service delivery during the first year of occupation of each dwelling to bridge the lag of funding from other sources in response to the direct impact on, and cost to their acute healthcare services as a result of additional pressure placed on the service by residents of this development. Using a cost / dwelling tariff a contribution of £87,254 is sought. It should be noted that the contribution is for revenue rather than capital investment. As such, it is sought on a different basis to that for Primary Care. Whilst the pressure of new development on the service is recognised, this is not unique to Havant Borough and is applicable to the Trusts wider catchment area. All new housing development will place pressure on the service. However, pressure on healthcare services is not limited to a simple rise in population but also the changing nature of the population, including its aging nature. It is considered that this pressure should be assessed and planned for at a strategic level (and not on a site by site basis) based on forecast housing growth within the catchment of the Trust. Whilst it is the view of officers that this important issue should be addressed at a strategic level and contributions are not secured as part of this development, Members of the Development Management Committee may form a different view.

Community Officer

7.157 Emerging Pre-Submission Draft Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 policy DR2 relates to regeneration. This states in part f. *Developments of 20 or more new homes will contribute towards a community officer, to help new residents in the development integrate into existing communities.* This would require a contribution of £18,000 based on the 72 dwellings proposed.

7.158 The following matters will be secured via the Section 106 Agreement:

Affordable Housing
Nitrate Mitigation Requirements
Ecological Mitigation Requirements
SUDS - including SUDs Bond
Children's Play Area
Common Parts Management and Maintenance
Community Orchard Management and Maintenance
Education Contribution £313,875
Health Contribution £11,520
Community Officer £18,000
Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy Contribution (based on Reserved Matters bedroom numbers)
Provision of Public Open Space
Permissive Paths
Highways Agreement
Highways Works
Travel Plan Requirements
Monitoring Fee

7.159 In addition to the above requirements, a S106 legal agreement dating from 1992 applies to the majority of the land between Denvilles and Emsworth, including the development site. Prior to any planning permission being granted for development at this site, a Deed of Variation will need to be entered into between the original parties to the legal agreement (i.e. the landowner and the Council). It would most likely seek to remove the site from the land covered by the original agreement so that the proposal/development can take place. This was similarly done recently to allow for the development of Land South of Bartons Road, for the Havant Crematorium and for the planning permission for Land West of Horndean Road Emsworth. The recommendation is made subject to this Deed of Variation.

8 Conclusion

8.1 In considering whether the presumption in favour of sustainable development is satisfied the economic, social and environmental aspects of the proposal have to be weighed. The development lies outside of the built up area and is not allocated for development in current adopted Local Plan policy - as a result the proposal is contrary to development plan policy. Although weight must be attached to this start point for considering the proposal, it is tempered by the findings that a number of material considerations also weigh in favour of recommending permission.

8.2 Notwithstanding that the site is located outside of the urban area it is proposed for development in the emerging Havant Borough Local Plan 2036. It is reasonably proximate to facilities, services and employment opportunities. There are no overriding environmental objections to its development. It would also deliver significant economic and social benefits. The site would make a substantial contribution to the Borough's five year housing land supply, and without the development on this site, there would not be a sufficient supply of new housing in the Borough. On that basis, officers consider that in the particular circumstances that prevail at this time, if the applicant's scheme is granted planning permission, it would constitute sustainable development, and this is a compelling material consideration, which indicates that a decision could be taken that departs from the development plan.

8.3 Any harmful visual impact of the development would be localised. The additional

landscaping that is proposed and would be required in the Reserved Matters application would reduce, and mitigate to a degree, the landscape impact of the development and overall the development would not unduly affect the character and appearance of the wider area. The indicative layout is considered to have demonstrated that impacts on neighbouring residents can be suitably addressed subject to the detailed designs and layout in the reserved matters submission. The development can also provide appropriate residential amenities for future residents. The highway impacts have been considered carefully and it is considered that safe and appropriate vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access can be provided to the site. The development also secures pedestrian and cycle links to the wider network. On site parking can be provided in accordance with the Councils parking standards with final details secured at the Reserved Matters stage.

- 8.4 The outline scheme provides a mix of dwelling types and sizes which are considered appropriate and secures Affordable Housing provision. Public Open Space including a Local Area of play is provided together with a Community Orchard meeting the emerging requirements for food production. The scheme demonstrates that surface water and foul drainage solutions can be suitably provided to address flood risk. The Ecological impacts of the development have been assessed and appropriate mitigation secured. Impacts on designated sites have been addressed in relation to nutrients and protected species.
- 8.5 The link to the 'partner application' within East Hampshire has been considered in detail as the details within that application are considered essential to the suitability of the housing development. The recommendation below is subject to that outline consent being granted planning permission. The proposals are considered to have taken appropriate account of the relationship of the site to the adjacent Crematorium use and the need to preserve its peaceful, setting. The impact on trees is considered acceptable subject to further details secured by condition. Infrastructure requirements will be secured where appropriate in relation to the development.
- 8.6 In conclusion, having regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the requirements of paragraph 11 of the NPPF, that planning permission should be granted for such development unless any other material considerations indicate otherwise, it is considered that there are public benefits from the environmental, social and economic dimensions that can be captured from this proposal, and as such the proposal does constitute sustainable development. Accordingly, in what is a challenging balance of sustainable development principles, and notwithstanding the development plan position in relation to the site, the application is recommended for permission.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT OUTLINE CONSENT** for application APP/19/00007 subject to the following:

(A) a Section 106 Agreement as set out in paragraph 7.158 above;

(B) a deed of variation to the S106 legal agreement dating from 1992 as set out in paragraph 7.159;

(C) the granting of planning permission reference 53322/003 by East Hampshire District Council;

(D) the following conditions (subject to such changes and/or additions that the Head of Planning Considers necessary to impose prior to the issuing of the decision):

Please Note: Planning conditions to be provided separately

Appendices:

Appendix A – Location Plan

Appendix B – Indicative Master Plan

Appendix C – Indicative Master Plan Dwelling Types


Appendix D – Dwelling Heights

Appendix E – Affordable Housing Plan

Appendix F – Highway Works

Appendix G – Highway Works Continued

LOCATION PLAN



This page is intentionally left blank

INDICATIVE MASTER PLAN



This page is intentionally left blank

INDICATIVE MASTER PLAN DWELLING TYPES




This page is intentionally left blank

DWELLING HEIGHTS




This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

HIGHWAY WORKS




KEY

Note 1 : The proposed layout assumes prior implementation of the access arrangements as approved for planning application (APP/15/01435) in drawing 14-018-002 and cycle provision improvements as shown in drawing 14-018-015.

- Proposed 2m Footway and 3m Footway/Cycleway
- Proposed Carriageway
- Proposed Traffic Island
- Proposed 0.5m Strip between Carriageway and Shared Footway/Cycleway
- Highway Boundary

This page is intentionally left blank

HIGHWAY WORKS CONTINUED



This page is intentionally left blank