

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 29 June 2017

Present

Councillor Satchwell (Chairman)

Councillors Hughes, Patrick, Perry, Lloyd (Standing Deputy), Quantrill (Standing Deputy) and Guest (Standing Deputy)

15 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Buckley, Keast and Bowerman.

16 Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting held on 18 May 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

17 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising

18 Site Viewing Working Party Minutes

The Minutes of the Site Viewing Working Party, held on the 22 June, were received.

19 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Satchwell and Cllr Quantrill advised they had been nominated to the Chichester Harbour Conservancy, which were a consultee for one of the matters agenda. It was advised that this was not a pecuniary interest.

20 Chairman's Report

The Chairman advised that:

- Cllr Bowerman would no longer be a full member of the Committee and would act as a Standing Deputy. Cllr Lloyd had been appointed as a full member of the Committee.

- All members of the Development Management Committee and Standing Deputies had been appointed to the Local Plan Panel. The first meeting was to be held on the 3 July.

21 Matters to be Considered for Site Viewing and Deferment

No matters were considered for Site Viewing or Deferment.

22 Deputations

The following deputation requests were noted by the committee:

- 1) Hon Ald Gibb-Gray - (APP/16/00774) – Land North of Havant Road
- 2) Mr A Norton - (APP/16/00774) – Land North of Havant Road
- 3) Mrs A Wright - (APP/16/00774) – Land North of Havant Road
- 4) Cllr R Bolton - (APP/16/00774) – Land North of Havant Road
- 5) Cllr L Bowerman - (APP/16/00774) – Land North of Havant Road
- 6) Cllr R Cresswell - (APP/16/00774) – Land North of Havant Road
- 7) Mr R Hitchcock – (APP/16/01234 – Stables adjacent to Hollybank Cottage
- 8) Mr C Ashe – (APP/16/01234 – Stables adjacent to Hollybank Cottage
- 9) Cllr R Bolton– (APP/16/01234 – Stables adjacent to Hollybank Cottage
- 10) Cllr L Bowerman – (APP/16/01234 – Stables adjacent to Hollybank Cottage
- 11) Cllr R Cresswell – (APP/16/01234 – Stables adjacent to Hollybank Cottage
- 12) Mr T Peters – APP/17/00347 – Aura House, New Road

23 APP/16/00774 - Land North of Havant Road and West of Selangor Avenue, Emsworth

(The Application Site was Viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party)

The Committee considered the written report, in addition to the supplementary information, and recommendation from the Head of Planning Services to grant permission.

The Committee was addressed by the following deputees:

- 1) Honorary Alderman Gibb-Gray, who objected to the proposal for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposal was premature as the site was not included in the Local Plan Allocations and should await adoption of the new Local Plan 2036.
 - b. There are other, more suitable, identified sites that would be a better fit for the proposal
 - c. The proposal seeks to develop a greenfield site, which should be avoided. The proposal should instead seek to develop more urban areas and brownfield sites.
 - d. The level of affordable housing contributions in the proposal was 30% and this should be higher
 - e. The proposal would have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the local area, with specific negative impacts on the immediate neighbouring residents
 - f. The proposal was an over intensive use of the site and the potential increase in traffic could create a significant danger to the neighbouring roads, specifically Selangor avenue.

- 2) Mr A Norton, who objected to the proposal for the following reasons:
 - g. The Council's lack of a 5 year housing land supply should not dictate that policies are out of date. The proposal is in breach of policy CS17.
 - h. The site should be deemed a wildlife corridor and planning permission should be refused if these cannot be mitigated or avoided.
 - i. The officers report had highlighted drainage issues with the site.
 - j. The officer's report did not take into account that the noise impact assessment cited was conducted over 5 years prior.
 - k. The traffic prediction created by the modelling forecast did not appear to be justified or realistic.
 - l. The construction of the proposal posed significant issues and risks to the neighbouring residents due to a significant increase large heavy vehicles.

- 3) Mrs Wright, who supported the proposal for the following reasons:
 - m. The application was subject to a rigorous consultation forum which had taken into account the views of the public and planning officers. The proposal sought to mitigate the concerns that had been raised and as such had been reduced from 192 dwellings to 161.

- n. The proposal made contributions to affordable housing in the amount of 48 affordable homes.
- o. The proposal was sympathetic to the local area, taking into account the impact on greenery, by including large open spaces and play stays.
- p. Although not included in the adopted local plan, the principle of development was still supported by the Local Plan 2016 and reinforced a plan lead planning system.
- q. a consultation process had been followed and the proposal would include a robust traffic control system.
- r. The Council's policies regarding car parking had been met, with 353 spaces being designated for parking. This was well over the parking allocation for a proposal of its size.
- s. The site was situated within a flood zone 1 and was therefore not at any immediate risk of flooding. Additionally there would be a net reduction of flooding the local area due to a rain water storage system being installed on the site. Also Southern Water had raised no concerns with the proposal.
- t. The proposal would make a significant contribution via a s106 agreement.
- u. The proposal would make efficient use of the land available and include a green cycle link to the benefit of local residents.
- v. The proposal was of high quality, in accordance with adopted policies and the adopted local plan and would be of great benefit to the local area.

In response to questions raised by the committee, the deputies advised that:

- 1. If the proposal were approved, a construction management plan would be submitted to the Council for approval prior to commencing development.
- 2. a containment system for controlling run off water would be installed to the south of the site.
- 3. A traffic control system would be put in as part of an early phase of development. A traffic light system would be activated once occupation of the dwellings begins.
- 4. The applicant was confident in the limited noise levels on the proposed site.

4) Cllr Ray Bolton, who objected to the proposal for the following reasons:

- w. The noise levels reported in the impact assessment within the officers report were of a serious concern.
- x. There were significant highways issues that had not been addressed.
- y. The potential increase in traffic at peak times would have a significant detrimental impact on congestion in the local area.
- z. The proposed traffic management system had raised concerns over its viability and usefulness.

- 5) Cllr Bowerman, speaking on behalf of Cllr Cresswell, who objected to the proposal for the following reasons:
- aa. The proposed development of the green field site would instantly remove the local gap and Emsworth unique position. It would also have a negative impact on Emsworth historic value within the Borough.
 - bb. The increase in traffic and congestion could cause dangers to nearby residents and place additional pressure on local infrastructure, specifically Selangor Avenue and neighbouring roads.
 - cc. The local amenities would be significantly detrimentally affected, placing additional pressure on both Doctor's Surgeries and school places which were already overcrowded and congested. The additional traffic and population would lead to the loss of the attractive village status.
- 6) Cllr Bowerman, who objected to the proposal for the following reasons:

See appendix A.

In response to questions raised by the Committee, the depute advised that:

- 1) 1 Local School had reported a shortage of spaces for students. This was St James'.

In response to questions raised by the Committee, officers advised that:

- A noise impact assessment had been undertaken by a specialist in 2014.
- The design of the proposal was due to the site having a number of constraints including a gas main running along one of the borders; noise and landscaping features.

The Committee discussed the application in detail together with the views raised by the Deputies. During the course of the debate, members raised the following points:

- Whilst noise had been raised as a concern by deputies, the committee were satisfied that this was not unacceptable
- The layout and design of the site made efficient use of the space whilst being sympathetic to neighbouring properties
- The proposal would make positive contributions to the local area via traffic calming and traffic control features
- The proposal made a significant contribution to the housing need of the local area.

It was therefore

RESOLVED that That the Head of Planning be authorised to GRANT PERMISSION for application APP/16/00774 subject to:-

- (A) confirmation from the Local Lead Flood Authority and Council's Ecologist that no objections are raised to the revised scheme;
- (B) a Section 106 Agreement as set out in paragraph 7.35 of the officer's report; and
- (C) the following conditions (and any others that the Head of Planning considers necessary to impose prior to the issuing of the decision):
 - 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
 - 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

Planning

Application Form

Letter to HBC addressing consultee and third-party comments 3rd March 2017

Infrastructure Delivery Statement March 2017

CIL Assumption of Liability Form

CIL Additional Information Form

Planning Design & Access Statement March 2017

Affordable Housing Statement April 2017

Statement of Community Involvement July 2017

Architect's Plans

Building for Life 12 Assessment

Topographical Survey

Planning Layout 18-259-100 Rev C

Storey Heights Plan 18-2059-102

Affordable Housing Plan 18-2059-103

External Finishes Plan 18-2059-104 Rev A

External Enclosures Plan 18-2059-105

Bin & Cycle Storage Plan 18-2059-106

Parking Strategy Plan 18-2059-107

Enclosure Details 18-2059-108

Housetype Plan 18-2059-109

Location Plan 18-2059-109

Sub Station Elevations & Floor Plans 18-2059-SUB-101

Constraints and Opportunities 18-2059-900 Rev A

Plots 53-61 (OPP) FRONT AND SIDE ELEVATIONS 18-2059-2BFA-2BFB-1BFA-101 Rev A

Plots 53-61 (OPP) REAR AND SIDE ELEVATIONS 18-2059-2BFA-2BFB-1BFA-102 Rev B

Plots 53-61 (OPP) GROUND FLOOR PLAN Floor Plans 18-2059-2BFA-2BFB-1BFA-103
Plots 53-61 (OPP) FIRST FLOOR PLAN 18-2059-2BFA-2BFB-1BFA-104
Plots 53-61 (OPP) SECOND FLOOR PLAN 18-2059-2BFA-2BFB-1BFA-105
GARAGE ELEVATIONS AND FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-GAR-101
GARAGE ELEVATIONS AND FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-GAR-102
PLOT 63 (AS) 3BH ELEVATIONS 18-2059-3BH-101 Rev A
PLOT 63 (AS) 3BH FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-3BH-102
PLOTS 6(AS) 7(AS) 50(AS) & 51(OPP) BUCHANAN ELEVATIONS 18-2059-BU-101
PLOTS 6(AS) 7(AS) 50(AS) & 51(OPP) BUCHANAN ELEVATIONS 18-2059-BU-102
PLOT 38(AS) ALVERTON (SPECIAL) ELEVATIONS 18-2059-AL+-105
PLOT 38 (AS) ALVERTON (SPECIAL) FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-AL+-106
PLOT 48 (OPP) ALVERTON (SPECIAL) ELEVATIONS 18-2059-AL+-103
PLOT 48 (OPP) ALVERTON (SPECIAL) FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-AL+-104
PLOT 52 (OPP) TYPE 73 ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T73-103
PLOT 52 (OPP) TYPE 73 FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-T73-104
PLOT 62 (AS) TYPE 73 ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T73-105
PLOT 62 (AS) TYPE 73 FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-T73 106
PLOT 64(AS) TYPE 73 ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T73-107
PLOT 64 (AS) TYPE 73 FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-T73-108
PLOT 65(OPP) TYPE 69 ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T69-103
PLOT 65 (OPP) TYPE 69 FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-T69-104
PLOT 70 (AS) ALVERTON (SPECIAL) ELEVATIONS 18-2059-AL+-109
PLOT 70 (AS) ALVERTON (SPECIAL) FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-AL+110
PLOT 110 (OPP) ALVERTON (SPECIAL) ELEVATIONS 18-2059-AL+-101
PLOT 110 (OPP)ALVERTON (SPECIAL) FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-AL+-102
PLOT 117 (AS) ALVERTON (SPECIAL) ELEVATIONS 18-2059-AL+-107
PLOT 117 (AS) ALVERTON (SPECIAL) FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-AL+-108
PLOT 129 (OPP) TYPE 73 ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T73-101
PLOT 129 (OPP) TYPE 73 FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-T73-102
PLOT 156 (AS) ESKDALE ELEVATIONS 18-2059-ES-101
PLOTS 1 (AS), 5 (OPP), 85 (AS) & 100 (OPP) TYPE 64 ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T64-102 Rev A
PLOTS 1 (AS), 5 (OPP), 85 (AS), 100 (OPP), 121 (AS) & 133 (OPP) TYPE 64 ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T64-103
PLOTS 2 (AS), 131 (AS) & 132 (OPP)TYPE 69 ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T69-105
PLOTS 2 (AS), 131 (AS) & 132 (OPP)TYPE 69 FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-T69-106

PLOTS 3(AS) 4(OPP) 86(AS) 91(OPP) 92(AS) 99(OPP) 122(AS) & 130 (OPP) TYPE 69 ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T69-101
PLOTS 3(AS) 4(OPP) 86(AS) 91(OPP) 92(AS) 99(OPP) 122(AS) & 130 (OPP) TYPE 69 FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-T69-102
PLOTS 8(OPP) 15(AS) 27(OPP) 35(OPP) & 149(OPP) ENNERDALE ELEVATIONS 18-2059-EN-101
PLOTS 8(OPP) 25(AS) 16(OPP) 23(AS) 26(AS) 27(OPP) 32(OPP) 35(OPP) 120(AS) 137(OPP) 142 (OPP) 149(OPP) & 157 (OPP) ENNERDALE FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-EN-103
PLOTS 9(AS) 10(AS) 11(OPP) 12(OPP) 13(OPP) 14(OPP) 17(OPP) 22(AS) 33(AS) 49(AS) 78 (AS) 80 (OPP) 119 (AS) 138 (AS) &143 (AS) MAIDSTONE ELEVATIONS 18-2059-MA-101 Rev A
PLOTS 9(AS) 10(AS) 11(OPP) 12(OPP) 13(OPP) 14(OPP) 17(OPP) 22(AS) 33(AS) 49(AS) 78 (AS) 80 (OPP) 119 (AS) 138 (AS) &143 (AS) MAIDSTONE FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-MA-102 Rev A
PLOTS 16(OPP) 23(AS) 26(AS) 32(OPP) 120(AS) 137(OPP) 142(OPP) & 157 (OPP) ENNERDALE ELEVATIONS 18-2059-102
PLOTS 18(OPP) 21(AS) 30(OPP) 31(AS) 139(OPP) & 141 (AS) WOODCROFT ELEVATIONS 18-2059-WO-101
PLOTS 18(OPP) 21(AS) 30(OPP) 31(AS) 139(OPP) & 141 (AS) WOODCROFT FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-WO-102
PLOTS 19(OPP) 20(AS) & 140(OPP) WOODCROFT FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-WO-104
PLOT 19 (OPP) 20(AS) & 140(OPP) WOODCROFT ELEVATIONS 18-2059-WO-103
PLOTS 24 (OPP), 25 (OPP), 150 (OPP) & 151(OPP) FOLKSTONE ELEVATIONS 18-2059-FO-101
PLOTS 24 (OPP) 25(OPP) 150(OPP) & 151 (OPP) FOLKSTONE FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-FO-102
PLOTS 28 (AS) 82(OPP) 83(AS) 84(OPP) 101(AS) 102(OPP) 103(AS) 106(AS) & 107(OPP) FOLKSTONE ELEVATIONS 18-2059-FO-103
PLOTS 28 (AS) 82(OPP) 83(AS) 84(OPP) 101(AS) 102(OPP) 103(AS) 106(AS) & 107 (OPP) FOLKSTONE FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-FO-104
PLOT 29 (AS) ENNERDALE ELEVATIONS 18-2059-EN-104
PLOTS 29 (AS) 69 (OPP) 81(OPP) & 104 (AS) ENNERDALE FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-EN-106
PLOTS 34 (OPP) & 161(OPP) KINGSLEY ELEVATIONS 18-2059-KG-101
PLOTS 34 (OPP), 144 (OPP), 160 (AS) & 161 (OPP) KINGSLEY FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-KG-103
PLOTS 36(OPP) 37(AS) 66(AS) 108(OPP) 109(AS) 134(OPP) 136(AS) 145(OPP) 148(AS) 155 (AS) & 152 (OPP) ROSEBERRY FLOORPLANS 18-2059-RO-102
PLOTS 36(OPP) 37(AS) 66(AS) 134(OPP) 136(AS) 145(OPP) 148(AS) 155(AS) & 152(OPP) ROSEBERRY ELEVATIONS 18-2059-RO-101 Rev A
PLOTS 39-47 (AS) COLEFORD, HORNSEA & LOUGHTON FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-CO-HO-LO-103
PLOTS 39-47 COLEFORD, HORNSEA & LOUGHTON ELEVATIONS 18-2059-CO-HO-LO-101 Rev A

PLOTS 39-47 (AS) COLEFORD HORNSEA & LOUGHTON FLOOR
PLANS 18-2059-CO-HO-LO-104
PLOTS 39-47 (AS) COLEFORD HORNSEA & LOUGHTON FLOOR
PLANS 18-2059-CO-HO-LO-105
PLOTS 39-47 (AS) COLEFORD HORNSEA & LOUGHTON
ELEVATIONS 18-2059-CO-HO-LO-102 Rev A
PLOTS 67(OPP) 68(AS) 135(OPP) 146(AS) 147(OPP) 153(OPP) & 154
(AS) ROSEBERRY FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-RO-104
PLOTS 67(OPP) 68(AS) 135(OPP) 146(AS) 147(OPP) 153(OPP) & 154
(AS) ROSEBERRY ELEVATIONS 18-2059-RO-103
PLOTS 69(OPP) 81(OPP) & 104(AS) ENNERDALE ELEVATIONS 18-
2059-EN-105
PLOTS 71-76(AS) & 111-116(AS) AMBERSHAM & MALDON FLOOR
PLANS 18-2059-AM-MN-103
PLOTS 71-76(AS) & 111-116(AS) AMBERSHAM & MALDON
ELEVATIONS 18-2059-AM-MN-101 Rev A
PLOTS 71-76(AS) & 111-116(AS) AMBERSHAM & MALDON
ELEVATIONS 18-2059-AM-MN-102 Rev A
PLOTS 71-76(AS) & 111-116(AS) AMBERSHAM & MALDON FLOOR
PLANS 18-2059-AM-MN-104
PLOTS 77(OPP) 79(AS) 105(OPP) & 118(OPP) ESKDALE
ELEVATIONS 18-2059-ES-102 Rev A
PLOTS 77(OPP) 79(AS) 105(OPP) & 118(OPP) ESKDALE FLOOR
PLANS 18-2059-ES-103
PLOTS 87(OPP) 90(AS) 93(OPP) 95(AS) 96(OPP) & 98(AS) TYPE 67
ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T67-101
PLOTS 87(OPP) 90(AS) 93(OPP) 95(AS) 96(OPP) & 98(AS) TYPE 67
FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-T67-102
PLOTS 88 (AS) 89(OPP) 94(AS) & 97(OPP) TYPE 67 ELEVATIONS 18-
2059-T67-103
PLOTS 88 (AS) 89(OPP) 94(AS) & 97(OPP) TYPE 67 FLOOR PLANS
18-2059-T67-104
PLOTS 108(OPP) & 109(AS) ROSEBERRY ELEVATIONS 18-2059-RO-
105
PLOTS 121(AS) & 133(OPP) TYPE 64 ELEVATIONS 18-2059-T64-101
PLOTS 123-128(OPP) 2BFC & 2BFD ELEVATIONS 18-2059-2BFC-
2BFD-101 Rev A
PLOTS 123-128(OPP) 2BFC & 2BFD FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-2BFC-
2BFD-103
PLOTS 123-128(OPP) 2BFC & 2BFD ELEVATIONS 18-2059-2BFC-
2BFD-102 Rev A
PLOTS 123-128(OPP) 2BFC & 2BFD FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-2BFC-
2BFD-104
PLOTS 144(OPP) & 160(AS) KINGSLEY ELEVATIONS 18-2059-KG-
102 Rev A
PLOTS 158(OPP) & 159(AS) MAIDSTONE ELEVATIONS 18-2059-MA-
103
PLOTS 158(OPP) & 159(AS) MAIDSTONE FLOOR PLANS 18-2059-
MA-104
STREET SCENES 18-2059-SS-101 Rev A
STREET SCENES 18-2059-SS-102 Rev A

STREET SCENES 18-2059-SS-103 Rev A
STREET SCENES 18-2059-SS-104 Rev A
STREET SCENES 18-2059-SS-105 Rev A
STREET SCENES 18-2059-SS-106 Rev A
STREET SCENES 18-2059-SS-107 Rev A
STREET SCENES 18-2059-SS-108 Rev A
STREET SCENES 18-2059-SS-108 Rev A

Ecology

Biodiversity Checklist
Exhibition Board Notes
Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan Feb 2017
Bat Activity Survey Report Feb 2017
Wintering Bird Survey Report 28 Feb 2017
Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey 1 March 2017
Reptile Presence/Absence Survey Report 1 March 2017

Drainage

Drainage Layout Sheet 1 of 2 CLXX(52) 2001 P3
Drainage Layout Sheet 2 of 2 CLXX(52) 2002 P3
Drainage Strategy Indicative Details CLXX(52)2003 P1
Flood Risk Assessment 1012052-CL-RPT-001 Rev C

Landscaping

Gap Report
Landscape Visual Impact Assessment Feb 2017 BDWS20345lvia Rev C
Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan BDWS20345man Rev B
Landscape Masterplan BDWS20345 10D
Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 20D Sheet 1
Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 20D Sheet 2
Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 20D Sheet 3
Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 11C Sheet 4
Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 11C Sheet 5
Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 11C Sheet 6
Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 11C Sheet 7
Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 20C Sheet 1
Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 20C Sheet 2
Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 20C Sheet 3
Hard Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 12 Sheet 1
Hard Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 12 Sheet 2
Hard Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 12 Sheet 3
Hard Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 12 Sheet 4
Hard Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 12 Sheet 5
Hard Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 12 Sheet 6
Hard Landscape Proposals BDWS20345 12 Sheet 7
Play Area Proposals BDWS20345 21
Soft Landscape Specification Rev A BDWS20345 March 2017

Highways

Revised Travel Plan April 2017 041.0025/TP/5
 Addendum Transport Statement March 2017 041.0025/ATA/2
 Havant Road & Church Lane A27 Roundabout Mitigation Proposals
 041.0025.004 Rev F
 Emsworth Road A27 Roundabout Mitigation Proposals 041.0025.005
 Rev C
 Havant Road Development Access Junction
 Stage 1 Road Safety Audit April 2017
 Havant Road Signal Junction & Pedestrian Crossing 041.0025.012 Rev
 A
 Proposed Signal Junction Arrangement Refuse Vehicle Tracking
 041.0025.009 Rev D
 Updated Modelling Havant Road - Development Access v7.lsg3x

Miscellaneous

Noise Impact Assessment Covering Letter R3173-4-RP 3rd March 2017
 Noise Impact Assessment Technical Report R3173-3 Rev 2 17th Feb
 2017
 Economic Benefits Statement Draft Report March 2017
 Archaeological Desktop Assessment July 16
 Air Quality Assessment July 2016
 Proposed Site Layout and Levels Sheet 1 of 2 CLXX(11) 1001 P3
 Proposed Site Layout and Levels Sheet 2 of 2 CLXX(11) 1002 P3
 Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement BDWS20345aia-
 amsA Rev B
 Tree Protection Plan BDWS20345-03
 Tree Report (Tree Survey and constraint advice) BDWS20345tr
 External Lighting Report
 Utility Service Statement 1012052-RPT-00002 Rev B
 Minerals Assessment Letter Report 30/01/2017 J11145/DB/c07
 Minerals Extraction Constraints Plan
 Geophysical Survey Report Dec 11 LP1211L-GSR-v1.2
 Updated Preliminary Desk Study & Ground Investigations Letter Report
 26th July 2016 J11145/DB/c06
 SGN Tree Planting Guidelines

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding the submitted details no development shall take place until details of existing and finished floor and site levels relative to previously agreed off-site datum point(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and having due regard to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

- 4 No development shall take place until plans and particulars specifying the following matters have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

The provision to be made within the site for:

- (i) construction traffic access
- (ii) the turning of delivery vehicles
- (iii) provisions for removing mud from vehicles
- (iv) the contractors' vehicle parking during site clearance and construction of the development;
- (v) a material storage compound during site clearance and construction of the development.

Thereafter, throughout such site clearance and implementation of the development, the approved construction traffic access, turning arrangements, mud removal provisions, parking provision and storage compound shall be kept available and used as such.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and in the interests of traffic safety and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework

- 5 Prior to the commencement of groundworks within areas of the site that are 'brownfield' (previously developed land & land in its immediate vicinity as set out in Geophysical Survey Report Dec 11 LP1211L-GSR-v1.2 and Updated Preliminary Desk Study & Ground Investigations Letter Report 26th July 2016 J11145/DB/c06), an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination associated with previous land use in those areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall be undertaken by competent persons, and the findings presented as a written report.

The assessment may comprise separate reports as appropriate, but unless specifically excluded in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall include;

1) Site investigation appropriate to both the previous & approved use of the site, to provide sufficient data and information to adequately identify & characterise any physical contamination on or affecting the site, and to inform an appropriate assessment of the risks to future occupants.

2) The results of an appropriate risk assessment based upon (1), and where unacceptable risks are identified, a Remediation Strategy that includes;

- appropriately considered remedial objectives,
- an appraisal of remedial &/or risk mitigation options, having due regard to
- sustainability, and;

- clearly defined proposals for mitigation of the identified risks.

3) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the Remediation Strategy (2) are complete, to include consideration of contingency action. All elements shall be adhered to unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: Having due regard to policies DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, Contamination may be present at the site as a result of both previous land uses (&/or activities) that could pose a risk to future residential occupants.

6 No dwelling hereby permitted shall be first occupied anywhere on the site until the road(s) including the emergency access serving that dwelling have been laid to at least base course in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure suitable access for residents and to avoid excess soil being deposited on the existing roads and having due regard to policies CS20 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework

7 No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological assessment in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation that has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. The assessment should take the form of trial trenches, some of which should be targeted upon the possible archaeological features identified by the geophysical survey. The remaining trenches should be spread across the site and located within the footprints of the proposed houses, garages and access roads so that any as yet unrecorded archaeological remains encountered are recognised, characterised and recorded.

Reason: To assess the extent, nature and date of any archaeological deposits that might be present and the impact of the development upon these heritage assets and having due regard to Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

8 No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological mitigation of impact, based on the results of the trial trenching, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation that has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To mitigate the effect of the works associated with the development upon any heritage assets and to ensure that information regarding these heritage assets is preserved by record for future generations and having due regard to Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 9 Following completion of archaeological fieldwork a report will be produced in accordance with an approved programme including where appropriate post-excavation assessment, specialist analysis and reports, publication and public engagement.

Reason: To mitigate the effect of the works associated with the development upon any heritage assets and to ensure that information regarding these heritage assets is preserved by record for future generations and having due regard to Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 10 Notwithstanding the submitted plans no above ground development hereby permitted shall be commenced until further details of the soft landscaping scheme for all open parts of the site not proposed to be hardsurfaced has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall specify the proposed finished ground levels in relation to the existing levels, the distribution and species of ground cover to be planted, the positions, specie sand planting sizes of the trees and shrubs to be planted and/or retained, and timing provisions for completion of the implementation of all such landscaping works.

The implementation of all such approved landscaping shall be completed in full accordance with such approved timing provisions. Any tree or shrub planted or retained as part of such approved landscaping scheme which dies or is otherwise removed within the first 5 years shall be replaced with another of the same species and size in the same position during the first available planting season.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

11 Notwithstanding the submitted details no above ground development hereby permitted shall commence until a specification of the materials to be used for the surfacing of all open parts of the site proposed to be hardsurfaced has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the implementation of all such hardsurfacing has been completed in full accordance with that specification. Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality and having due regard to policies CS11, CS16, and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

12 No development shall take place until plans and particulars specifying the following matters have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Minerals Planning Authority:

- i. a method for ensuring that minerals that can be viably recovered 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)

Reason: To encourage the identified opportunity for incidental mineral extraction, prior and as part of the proposed development and having due regard to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

13 No development shall take place until all trees and hedgerows that are to be retained within or adjacent to the site have been enclosed with temporary protective fencing in accordance with BS:5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations'. The fencing shall be retained throughout the period of construction and no activity prohibited by BS:5837:2012 shall take place within such protective fencing during the construction period.

Reason: To safeguard the continued health and presence of such existing vegetation and protect the amenities of the locality and having due regard to policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 14 No development hereby permitted shall commence until plans and particulars specifying the layout, depth and capacity of all foul and surface water drains and sewers proposed to serve the same, and details of any other proposed ancillary drainage works/plant (e.g. pumping stations) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use prior to the completion of the implementation of all such drainage provision in full accordance with such plans and particulars as are thus approved by the Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and ensure that all such drainage provision is constructed to an appropriate standard and quality and having due regard to policies and proposals CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 15 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.
Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 16 Notwithstanding the submitted details no part of the development shall be first occupied until further details of the type, siting, design and materials to be used in the construction of all means of enclosure including boundaries, screens or retaining walls, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved structures have been erected in accordance with the approved details. The structures shall thereafter be retained.
Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and or occupiers of neighbouring property and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 17 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 18 Before first occupation, post validation testing shall be undertaken by a competent person to determine compliance with the noise impact assessment as provided by 24Acoustic (Technical report: R3173-3Rev2), dated 17 February 2017. Such testing can be achieved using sample dwellings, as per the measurement positions (as based on measurements done in 2012). This must be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This report is to confirm the expected noise levels within the proposed dwellings have been achieved and are in line with those levels laid out in BS8233:2014, and recommended for indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings, especially in relation to living rooms and bedrooms i.e during the day (07:00 to 23:00) 35 dB L Aeq,16 hour and at night (23:00 to 07:00) 30 dB L Aeq,8 hour for bedrooms.

Reason: To ensure the residential amenity of the property is not impacted upon by any external noise levels and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 19 No development shall be carried out within 3m of the high pressure gas pipeline and no piling or boreholes within 15m without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Gas.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and or occupiers of neighbouring property and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 20 No development shall take place until a scheme showing the off-site surface water drainage connection point has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Southern Water and/or the Highways Authority. No part of the development shall be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented.

Reason: Without the provision of an appropriate surface water connection point the development cannot be appropriated mitigated and having due regard to policies and proposals CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

24 APP/16/01234 - Stables adjacent to Hollybank Cottage, Long Copse Lane, Emsworth

(The Application was viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party)

The committee considered the written report and recommendation from the Head of Planning Services to grant permission.

The committee was addressed by the following deputees:

(1) Mr R Hitchcock who objected to the application on the following reasons:

- a. The National Planning Policy framework dictates that Local Planning Authorities should avoid granting planning permission for dwellings situated outside the developed area and the proposal south to add to the urbanisation of the local area
- b. Access to the site is situated down a narrow road and an increase in traffic that the proposal would cause would be dangerous for local residents
- c. The proposal would cause a loss of visual amenity to local residents and would cause a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

In response to questions raised by the Committee it was advised that:

- Cemetery Lane was between 1 and 1.5 miles from the application site.

(2) Mr C Ashe who objected to the proposal for the following reasons:

- d. The site has been partially developed unlawfully and no enforcement action to prevent additional development had been taken by Havant Borough Council.
- e. Observations of the activities of the applicants had posed some concerns regarding the ruling of Hampshire County Council Gypsy Liaison Officer.

(3) Cllr R Bolton, who objected to the proposal for the following reasons:

- f. The application posed significant concerns regarding environmental and community matters.
- g. The application sought for use of both a static caravan and a touring caravan which should be deemed 2 pitches which was an over intensive use of the site.
- h. The reasons set out in the officers report at points 7.23-7.28 giving reasons to grant permission do not stand up to scrutiny
- i. The Senior Landscape Architect quoted in the officer report outlines that the development would unacceptably increase the foot print for the site

(4) Cllr Bowerman, speaking on behalf of Cllr Cresswell, who objected to the proposal for the following reasons:

see appendix 2

(5) Cllr Bowerman who objected to the application for the following reasons:

see appendix 3

In response to questions raised by the committee, officers advised:

- The number of pitches available in neighbouring Local Authorities was irrelevant. Havant Borough Council had an identified need for gypsy and traveller pitches
- The applicants own the site
- The difference between touring caravans, static caravans and mobile homes.
- The definition of a resident dependent
- Enforcement action is discretionary and taken on balance regarding each individual breach or offence

The members discussed the application in detail together with the views raised by the deputees. Members discussed the character of the local area and the impact the proposal would have to the amenity of the site.

Whilst some members of the committee felt that the application was reasonable and would not have any significant detrimental impact, the majority of the committee felt that it represented demonstrable harm. The Committee discussed how the proposal was not inline with Council policy, was a development outside the urban area and would be unsympathetic to the neighbouring properties due to it's features and design. It was therefore

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning be authorised to REFUSE PERMISSION for application APP/16/01234 for the following reason:

The site lies within a rural area and the siting of the caravans in the countryside would be detrimental to the rural character and to the visual amenity of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS11.1, CS 11.9, CS16, and CS17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Policy AL2 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, Paragraphs 25 and 26 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

25 APP/17/00347 - Aura House, New Road, Havant, PO9 1DE

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation from the Head of Planning Services to refuse permission.

The Committee was addressed by the following deputees:

- (1) Mr Tom Peters, who supported the proposal for the following reasons:
 - a. While the site has a number of constraints the design of the proposal seeks to make the best and most efficient use of space.
 - b. The design is in keeping and sympathetic to the local area and street scene. The materials used in the proposal reflect similar designs in the local area

- c. The Highways authority had raised no concern over the development or the increase in parking spaces provided
- d. The proposal would block a view from the substation and train line to the rear of the site and therefore make a positive contribution to the street scene
- e. The economic development team supported the proposal as it would contribute to jobs in the local area, specifically those for young people who may find it difficult to find employment in their immediate local area
- f. The proposal was supported by a robust business case which is in line with the Havant Borough Council Corporate Strategy
- g. The proposal had gathered no objections from members of the public and would cause no adverse effects to neighbouring properties

In response to questions raised by the Committee, officers advised that a full list of changes from the previous application could be found detailed in the report.

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

Members discussed that the proposal was highly sustainable, with good transport links and was an underdeveloped site. It was also discussed that the proposal would support the economic regeneration for the area and that jobs in the Borough should be encouraged. The majority of the committee considered that the proposal was an over intensive use of the site and the bulk of the design would be an incongruous feature to the street scene and was unsympathetic to the local area. It was therefore

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning be authorised to REFUSE PERMISSION for application APP/17/00347 for the following reason:

The proposed Office Extension would by reason of its prominent siting, design, size, height, mass and bulk have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area, detract from the appearance of the existing main building and represent an overdevelopment of this shallow and constricted site. The proposal 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.

26 Appointment of Chairman

RESOLVED that Cllr Paul Buckley be appointed as Chairman for the next meeting.

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and concluded at 9.45 pm

.....

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX A

I am speaking today both as a local Emsworth councilor and also as a local resident who has lived for over 20 years on the Havant Road - just to the east of Selangor Avenue.

The impact on the Emsworth area as a result of this development will be from losing the gap between Emsworth and havant and the detrimental effect this will have on the surrounding area. It will create one long urban sprawl and the last remaining open space north of the A259 or Havant Road will be gone resulting in a loss of identity for existing communities.

The new housing statement which effectively allocated over 2,000 new homes to the Emsworth/Denvilles gap north of A27 and is still a work in progress for this adjoining area, and should have postponed any development on this particular "piecemeal site" in order to allow a more integrated solution particularly with regards to the proposed 'trunk road' junction from the A27 at Emsworth..

This masterplan for infrastructure of the whole strategic area or SG3 may have an impact on the site we are considering this evening and This is acknowledged by the case officer in the report under section 5 "Co-ordination of development" and I quote –

"it should be noted that the land earmarked as a landscape buffer for this scheme may be affected by the proposal for a new junction and associated slip road."

Are we therefore in danger of a Premature development of this site??

Like the majority of residents who have objected to this development – I am a well qualified local road user who knows the many different characteristics of the Havant road

While I could be regarded or described as an 'amateur traffic watcher' - I believe that I have observed the Havant Road in all conditions both from a traffic perspective and also from weather conditions - so deserted under snow or at a standstill when we had extensive flooding. Everyday there are a number of sirens heard from the emergency services and quite frequently the road is at a standstill due to an accident on the M27/A3 network to Portsmouth and Chichester.

Most days – the traffic is heavily congested for over an hour at morning rush hour and over an hour at the evening rush hour. The traffic can be at a stand still from the roundabout by the M27 all the way into Emsworth. It is difficult to imagine for us 'locals ' the impact of traffic lights on an already congested road. Could it be possible that traffic from the Havant Road could in the future tail back in a queue to meet with the traffic from the South Leigh Road traffic lights to the west and then cause congestion up the slip roads to the fast moving traffic on the A27?

While I acknowledge the safety aspect of both the traffic lights and pedestrian crossing has been an essential part of the planning for the new junction – they may well cause different hazards within the traffic network both on the Havant Road and Selangor Avenue.

The calculations for the suitability of the new junction and traffic lights for the new development was carried out by Hampshire County Council using a computerized 'traffic model' from an office in Winchester so it appears no real count was done actually on site observing levels of traffic at different times of the day. HCC recently wrote to Havant Borough Council stating that a 'industry standard modeling software' had been used to review the operation of the signal junction with reference to "the design manual for roads and bridges". In theory – the effectiveness of the traffic signals has been assessed to 2026 and shows that there will be sufficient capacity on the Havant Road to allow the junction to clear in a single cycle with queues only reaching back 100metres and while this may be possible for some of the time – the congestion this proposed junction could cause at strategic times of the day is incalculable. Additional delay will obviously be experienced along the A259 corridor with the computerised model calculating the average delay of under ¼ minute per vehicle at peak times but doesn't say at what distance! Once this development has been built it will be too late to correct the situation and I would urge the traffic plan as a whole to be re-visited and additional access points to the site to be considered

Also –

While it is not a design check - The report for the road safety audit carried out by GM Traffic consultants consisted of a desktop study and a site visit on Monday 24 April 2017 at 10.30 in the morning where traffic was moderate and weather dry. How can this be a true and accurate interpretation of traffic on such a busy road?

There are 353 parking spaces planned for this development so it would seem safe to assume that there will be 353 cars accessing and leaving the site, most will be turning right across the traffic on the Havant Road in the morning to use the A27m or go into Havant for work. Some will be turning left to access Selangor Avenue to drop children to school which increases the volume of traffic in a quiet residential road. The safety aspects of this will be covered in another deputation shortly.

While The pedestrian traffic lights will provide a safe crossing for many people trying to cross the A259, and may allow some vehicles to leave/join the nearby roads such as Nore Farm Avenue the combination of the 2 sets of light will slow the flow of traffic down causing an even bigger build-up to the volume of the A259 in general.

I would like to share some of the residents' objections from the Council's website so that they too can have a voice and be heard

Here is An objection from Perry Dodgeson a local resident from Selangor Avenue who also works for the Fire Service based in Emsworth.

“I am amazed at the lack of concern for the immense increase in weight of traffic if this development proceeds. Minor road works on The Havant road and North Street in recent months have created daily traffic jams backing onto The A27 and into Havant and into Southbourne in the opposite/easterly direction.

This will mean that Selangor Avenue has been used as an alternative with traffic continuously breaking speed limits with no regard to public safety. Selangor Avenue is too small for the weight of traffic that will pass through if this development proceeds.

Traffic lights on The Havant road (as proposed) will only further increase the weight of traffic in all directions (including Selangor Avenue).

One of the local schools in Victoria Road (the extension of Selangor Avenue to the east) is Emsworth Primary School which has many concerns with the speed and amount of cars utilizing Selangor Avenue on a daily basis and are appealing for alternative arrangements re traffic calming measures (my concern is for the safety of the children during school pick up times).

Emergency services will struggle to attend many incidents on either road due to the amount of vehicles 'held up' in both directions. Has this been considered ?

Will there be consideration for the additional cars parking in Selangor Avenue which will also add to the dangers for children/residents who live there ? Will there be restricted parking or will there be an overspill from the residents living within the new development area ?

Why is there rarely consideration given to the people who already live in the immediate area?”

Another objection from a resident in Bath Road Emsworth – near the village centre

“My main objection is concerning the lack of forethought regarding the traffic on the A259. The traffic control suggested is not a small local issue, despite its appearance, and needs some serious and more sensible consideration. The volume of cars and commercial vehicles already leaving/joining the A27/A259 is already way beyond the amount which was at first visualised. It is almost non-stop except in the night hours, is extremely noisy, polluting, dangerous for cyclists (despite the more recent cycle lanes provided) and highly dangerous for pedestrians

In June 2016 - before Barretts, the applicant in this case, staged a very well attended Consultation Forum at the Civic Offices, local residents gathered over 500 signatures from local people from many different parts of Emsworth on a petition against this proposed development. As can be seen from the letters of objection on the Council's website – Their reasons are diverse but most focus on the loss of the last remaining gap and what that means to community identity both for Emsworth and for Warblington/Havant. The majority also voice strong concerns about the impact on the traffic that will be caused by the number of cars exiting and accessing this new site via a set of traffic lights so close to a roundabout and slip roads to the fast moving A27. I would ask the committee to consider carefully these 2 aspects of this application. While we can not hope for what one resident wrote

“please consider our future generations who may not be able to enjoy village life as we know it” – there must be a balance in decisions in planning that we make today.

END

APPENDIX B

LONG COPSE LANE

The name describes it – it is a country lane, not a busy highway. This proposal is the latest in an historic wrangle which started in 2014. In 2015 there was an enforcement complaint lodged regarding a mobile home being brought on to the site. The matter was investigated and a planning contravention notice was served. It was said at the time that the applicant had no intention of occupying the mobile home other than to stay as necessary for the horses welfare.

In 2016 an application was made for change of use from private equestrian yard to a mix use comprising equestrian yard , two private caravan pitches and two mobile caravan pitches. This was refused and is now pending appeal.

Currently the application is for one static and one touring van and an amenity block. But on the site there is a static van which is in use and a touring van neither of which are there with permission. The recommendation from the head of planning is to grant permission with 13 conditions attached .

I am strongly opposed to the application.

Long Copse Lane is an unlit, single track country lane, partially residential and which is totally unsuitable for caravans or heavy traffic.

The site was originally a simple field for grazing cattle and then Equestrian activity with a stable which sits well within the area. Now it has flood lights in use, although no authorisation has been granted. These lights are already causing a nuisance to the nearby residents.

A hedgerow has been removed from the roadside boundary which has obviously been done for better vehicular access to the site indicating that more vehicular traffic is anticipated.

It can be seen from the history of applications and use of the site that it has grown surreptitiously from a stable with one touring van unlive in, to an unauthorised static caravan, and now to an application for what can only be described as a caravan site.

Irrespective of the many letters of objection to the proposal from local residents and neighbouring areas the Head of Planning is recommending that permission is granted, but it is interesting that the permission has thirteen conditions imposed, several of them being conditions which have been broken before.

Who will ensure that these conditions will be met, and surely if thirteen conditions are needed and with the past history, the application should be refused.

I recommend that you reject this application

END

APPENDIX C

Firstly – I would like to say that this planning application is of a particularly sensitive nature and involves complex issues that can not be separated from each other both from the applicants perspective and also from local residents. However – in order to make the correct decision this evening it is important to focus on the key questions of planning and not of the other side issues. I propose to briefly outline the main points of this case

Long Copse lane is one of the few roads in the area recognised by Havant council for its rural charm and character. Apart from normal road traffic it is extensively used by young families, walkers, cyclists, joggers, dog walkers and horse riders not only at weekends but throughout the week.

It is a road composed of mainly high value single dwellings on either side and the proposed development is at the far end of Long Copse Lane – literally on the boundary with West Sussex - the green space gap between Westbourne and Emsworth.

This particular site has a history of planning applications and its lawful use is currently a “private equestrian yard”
In brief:

In 2010

Change of use of land and erection of stable block with tack room, entrance gate, landscaping and associated access/ground works (Part Retrospective). – Permitted

In 2014

Extension to existing private stable block to provide feed / cart store for continued private use.

Refused 04/06/14 on grounds of intensification of leisure development on the site and impact on the rural character of the area; however subsequently allowed on appeal

Subsequent Representations received in connection with the current planning application have questioned the validity of the permission granted that the application site extended beyond the

applicant's ownership to the east; consequently it has been asserted that the development - the subject of that permission should not be regarded as lawful as the location of the stable block shown on the application drawings is not as exists on site

An enforcement complaint was received on 23/12/15 - regarding a mobile home being brought onto the site. The matter was investigated and a Planning Contravention Notice was served on the owners of the land on 1/2/16 in order to understand the timelines and the use of the mobile home. There was to be No occupation of the mobile home until after the determination of the current pending planning application.

In spring 2016

An application was made for Change of use from private equestrian yard to a mixed use comprising private equestrian yard and two pitch, private gypsy and traveller site (including amenity block and two touring caravan pitches) -

The application was refused on 29/04/2016

The main Reasons given were:

Site is outside of the defined urban area

Having an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area

In an unsustainable location

Having an adverse impact on the highway network

An appeal was lodged on 7/11/16 with the Planning Inspectorate, and then was placed in abeyance on 1/2/17 pending the outcome of this revised planning application.

This current planning application was received on 28/11/16, however it was not made valid until 23/2/17 due to the requirement for further information.

Enforcement action and the planning appeal regarding the unauthorised residential use has been placed on hold whilst waiting for the outcome of this current application.

3 Proposal

3.1 This application proposes the change of use from private equestrian yard to a mixed use comprising private equestrian yard and single pitch, private gypsy and traveller site

(including amenity block and one touring caravan pitch). This is a revised application of the previously refused application
The main changes involve the reduction of the number of pitches and reduction in size of the amenity block.

A series of events has triggered processes and procedures to bring us to where we are today.

Subsequent to the planning application being refused in 2016 and an appeal lodged with the inspectorate, an additional revised application has been submitted by the applicants' agent with evidence of 2 interviews with the Barry Jordan Davies the Gipsy Traveller liaison officer at Hampshire County Council. These interviews through a series of question and answers alone have enabled the liaison officer to declare that the applicants meet all the criteria or components of need for Gipsy traveller status . within the meaning of Government policy
“in that they are a person of a nomadic habit of life, and is also an ethnic Romany Gypsy;”

As a result of this decision and the subsequent publication of the Hampshire Consortium Gipsy Traveller Accommodation Assessment or GTAA for short – May 2017 Havant Borough Council now have what is known as “Pitch Needs” as there are 2 adults who meet the criteria of Gypsies and Travellers that meet the Planning Definition. – although Chichester District Council did question whether sufficient information had been submitted to demonstrate the applicant is still a travelling gypsy/traveller.

Before May 2017 there had not been an identified need for a site. Now according to the Hampshire Consortium GTAA Havant has 1 household on an unauthorised development and therefore a current pitch need and yet there are possible sites closeby which could accommodate the applicants.

The officer's report states that The applicants have provided evidence that the pitch need can not be met elsewhere due to there being no sites available in Westbourne. However, Louise Steel – the clerk of Westbourne Parish Council wrote on 13 June that there are currently

" 5 vacant pitches on Cemetery Lane”, and she has the contact details of the owners.

There seems to be many reasons which have been presented to grant this revised planning application even though the catalogue of events since 2010 show applications have been granted retrospectively or on appeal as the site has been developed in its own way and to suit the requirements of the applicants

Under normal circumstances – the personal circumstances of the applicants can not be considered – however this is one of the aspects that forms part of the planning argument and therefore has to be taken into account. As a result of this consideration –the recommendations and conditions are very much focused on the applicants alone and their rights to live on site.

There is great concern locally that due to the planning history of this site – additional applications will be made in retrospect for further occupations or building and that further disregard will be shown to the existing residents and surrounding neighbourhood.

3 of the main Reasons given for refusal in 2016 are still relevant:

It is being argued that due to the adoption of the housing statement in December 2016 the Site will now be part of a defined urban area due to the proposed development of 260 houses in Long Copse Lane. As yet this planning application has not been submitted nevermind approved -- so is a planning decision on this site being made on the hope that the one for 260 houses will also be approved in the future

Having an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area

The application for this site seems totally out of keeping with the existing residential environment of Long Copse lane. The site is a greenfield site, and any development would be a further encroachment on the strategic gap between Emsworth and Westbourne and on the edge of the South Downs National Park.

Sustainability

Long Copse Lane is narrow and poor lit and local facilities are not closeby and even though the number of units has been reduced there will still be some increase in the number of vehicles due to the nature of the site,

Finally In his report The Case officer says

Currently this site has an unauthorised residential mobile home situated on the site and its only lawful use is as a private equestrian yard and it was refused planning permission in April 2016

The series of events and analysis of needs since last April have shown there is a requirement for a pitch in Havant Borough but I would ask the committee to consider carefully if this is the most suitable place for it to be located and the impact on the surrounding area and its residents and the balancing exercise that needs to be carried out in such circumstances

END

This page is intentionally left blank