

## HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Planning Committee held on 3 June 2021

Present

Councillor Crellin (Chairman)

Councillors Hughes, Patel, Patrick and Linger (Standing Deputy)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor(s):

### **23 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Branson and Mrs Shimbart.

### **24 Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interests relating to matters on the agenda.

### **25 Matters to be Considered for Site Viewing and Deferment**

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

### **26 APP/20/00990 (East Hampshire District Council Ref 51680/001) - Havant Thicket, adjacent to Sir George Staunton Country Park, Reservoir and Pipe Line, Middle Park Way, Havant**

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

Proposal: Hybrid application seeking:

- 1) Full Planning permission for Development of a reservoir for raw water storage, A pumped storage reservoir, with the minimum required total storage capacity of 8,700 million litres (Ml), to support the planned bulk supply transfer of at least 21Ml/d in extreme (currently defined as 1:200 year) drought conditions; Construction of an earth embankment adjacent to Staunton Country Park ; Construction of an overflow discharge/spillway at the south-western side of the reservoir and associated works; Construction of a new junction on the B2149 Manor Lodge Road and a new junction on Swanmore Road. Provision of viewing areas on the southern embankment and western edge of the reservoir.

- 2) Outline application for (matters to be considered outlined in Table 2.2 in the submitted Development Specification) control house partially incorporated within landscaped earth mounding adjacent to the south west embankment; together with provision of other earth embankments. Construction of a visitor centre / cafe, with storage areas and welfare facilities to the northwest of the reservoir to be used for recreational and education purposes; Provision of picnic area(s) and children's play area(s). Access routes from both junctions to the visitor car park; visitor car park comprising 193 car parking spaces and between 70 and 75 overflow spaces plus spaces for staff, coach/minibus and disabled drivers sited to the north west of the reservoir. Creation of a permanent wetland on the northern side of the reservoir and construction of bird watching hide/screen(s); recreational facilities for public amenity. Provision of perimeter tracks and a network of bridleways, cycle paths and footpaths; Construction of a slipway on the western bank of the reservoir for operational use only and a small section of the proposed pipeline (210m).

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

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

- (A) included written deputations submitted by an anonymous local resident, Borrow Investments Ltd, Mrs Bell, on behalf of Havant Climate Change Alliance and Havant Friends of the Earth, Mr Childs, Ms Codling, Ms Comerfield, Councillor Davies, Councillor Francis, Ms Harvey, on behalf of Havant Brough Tree Wardens, Mr Luck, Ms Morgan, Ms Saunders, Ms Schwager, Ms Stevenson, Ms Viney, Mrs Young and Portsmouth Water;
- (B) gave responses to questions submitted by Councillors prior to the meeting;
- (C) summarised eight further representations, including reference to a petition received after the report was published; and
- (D) Updated the planning considerations set out in the report.

In view of the public interest shown in this application, the Chairman, in accordance with the Committee's adopted deputation procedure, agreed to an extension of the time allowed for deputations as follows:

- 3 minutes for each objector
- 21 minutes for those speaking in support

The Committee was addressed by the following deputees:

- (a) Ms Brooks, who on behalf of the Havant Climate Change Alliance and Havant Friends of the Earth accepted that a reservoir was needed but, with reference to her written submission, objected to the proposal for the following reasons:
- (i) the size of the reservoir should be smaller retaining more ancient woodland and reducing the risk to Leigh Park in the event of the embankment failing;
  - (ii) although the planting proposed exceeded the amount of woodland that would be lost, this would not compensate habitat that would also be lost:
  - (iii) the carbon emissions generated by the proposal would have a cumulative effect with others locally and nationally, which would run counter to the government's target of cutting emissions;
  - (iv) a commitment to the long term ecological monitoring and management of new woodland and pasture habitats was essential to its maintenance and encouragement of biodiversity
  - (v) the visitors centre should be placed further away to the south where it could still be by the water's edge for views and built as an example of the highest standards of sustainability with net zero carbon emissions.
  - (vi) the cycle and pedestrian paths should be surfaced with tarmac which would last longer and be more comfortable to use by wheelchairs and pushchairs. Joint use paths should also clearly separate cyclists and pedestrians.
- Mrs Brooks requested that a decision on the application be delayed until:
- (1) firm commitments on emissions and biodiversity had been resolved; and
  - (2) there is a viable plan to mitigate/compensate for these emissions
- (b) Mr Childs supported his written representation objecting to the proposal by highlighting the following concerns:
- (1) the 72 alternative sites investigated did not reference any options created by a new pipeline or a second or third reservoir; the new pipeline allowed for two or more smaller reservoirs and this should be investigated thoroughly;

- (2) no wildlife corridors had been proposed in the reservoir plan. The applicant should redesign the proposal with a corridor and use ancient soil from the destruction of the Avenue to kick start recovery;
- (3) smaller trees should be relocated from the Avenue to accelerate growth of the woodland corridor;
- (4) planting of satins in clay was unacceptable;
- (5) the applicant had not accounted for loss of any of the approx. 3 km<sup>2</sup> ephemeral surrounding waterways in its calculations;
- (6) the applicant had not shown how the reservoir would look during summer and autumn;
- (7) the location of visitor centre was not based on environmental concerns;
- (8) an isolated visitor centre with two roads would be a magnet for vandalism and impossible to police; and
- (9) The use of the roads by cars and coaches would drive out wildlife

*During his deputation Mr Childs corrected a typographical error in his written deputation relation to the size of the corridor.*

*(Mrs Childs failed to complete his verbal deputation within the time allowed)*

- (c) Ms Harvey supported her written representation objecting to the proposal by highlighting that:
  - (1) this was an opportunity to prevent the destruction of four areas of ancient woodland which were under threat by this proposal;
  - (2) there were numerous other sites that could be used; and
  - (3) Havant Thicket was one of many small woodlands which were under threat. The protection of this and other small areas of woodland were as important as retaining the rainforests to ensure climate control.
- (e) Mr Smith, on behalf of Havant Tree Wardens, supported the Wardens' submission by highlighting the following concerns:

- (1) the loss of the Ancient Woodland would threaten the habitat of 'species of conservation concern' which could not be found elsewhere. In many cases these woodlands were the last stronghold of threatened species;
- (2) Ancient Woodlands were rich in complex communities of trees, plants, fungi, and microorganisms and which had taken hundreds of years to grow but could be easily degraded;
- (3) the soil created by Ancient Woodlands had its own rich nutrient character which made it the perfect environment for everything that lived within it. The soil could not be simply be dug up and relocated, any more than the rich flora and fauna of Ancient Woodland could be mitigated for by planting saplings nearby in plastic tubes;
- (4) Ancient woodland habitat could not be recreated;
- (5) the project's aim to have 'no net loss of biodiversity' ignored the loss of particular ecosystems and skewed the statistics, which made the compensation plans look more effective on paper than they really were;
- (6) there was also a failure to take account of the additional damage from 'Edge Effects' (e.g. woodland opened up to additional intrusion, lighting & trampling) and pollution from construction, additional traffic etc. Neither did it take into account the cumulative impacts of this further fragmentation of Ancient Woodland in the area;
- (7) a study showed that a mere 7% of Britain's native woodlands were currently in good ecological condition. including many Ancient Woodlands. Conservation of Ancient Woodlands and restoration of those in poor condition was an urgent national priority;
- (8) studies also showed that Biodiversity was declining faster than at any time in human history. Current extinction rates, for example, were around 100 to 1,000 times higher than the baseline rate, and they were increasing. Such declines were undermining Nature's productivity, resilience and adaptability, and were in turn fuelling extreme risk and uncertainty for our economies and well-being;
- (9) the additional destruction of Havant Thicket and other local woodland from the proposed pipeline to Otterbourne had not been mentioned;
- (10) there was no overriding reason for the permanent loss of Ancient Woodland, particularly since:

- The reservoir capacity was excessive and it was intended to export water elsewhere in the Southeast
  - Local Communities would not benefit from the new water supply, but suffer the impacts of increased traffic, woodland loss etc.
  - The depth of stored water would prevent recreational use.
  - There were no details as to how Leigh Park would be protected from flooding. It would not protect local chalk streams such as The Ems from current overabstraction.
- (11) Havant Thicket, which was a public asset, would be lost to a private venture whose purpose was to generate profit
- (f) Ms Saunders, supported her written submission by highlighting the following issues:
- (1) the need for the reservoir had been framed as water scarcity (water resource deficits). However, a total of 65% of the water provided by the plan would not be from the reservoir, if these targets were increased, they could cover the 35% expected from the reservoir offering an alternative solution;
  - (2) although there had been an in-depth consultation process in previous years (2004, 2008), the content was out of date. The 4000 people who had signed the petition 'Prevent the Destruction of Ancient Woodland at Havant Thicket and Surrounding Areas' and the objections noted in the application from the Woodlands Trust outweighed the 239 people who supported the proposal in the applicant's spring 2021 consultation; and
  - (3) an alternative option which would prevent the loss of ancient woodland had been offered to the applicant and referred to in the submission made by Borrow Investment's deputation particularly points 4 and 7
- (g) Ms Stevenson, supported her written submission by focussing on the following three issues:
- (1) the proposal would lead to an unacceptable destruction of trees and area of primary pastureland. The importance of the valuable native species trees to be lost was recognised by the fact they many of these trees were protected by Tree Preservation Orders. The planting of saplings will not compensate for the loss of these trees. The felling of these trees would release carbon dioxide and affect climate change;

- (2) the provision of two access routes with two entries would double the impact on trees on the site within the Thicket and the application site and as a result there would be no tranquillity in the countryside and meadows that the local residents currently benefited from. The same routes would be required to service the conflicting needs of car users, walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The proposal represented a loss of their current level of access to the countryside; and
  - (3) the application should not be considered in isolation from other development plans in the area. The reservoir would consume the last pocket of countryside in the area.
- (h) Mrs Young, supported her written submission by highlighting the following issues:
- (1) the proposal would destroy a unique and precious ecosystem and thousands of mature trees, whose carbon capture could never be replaced by planting young saplings which take 30 years to mature. Many the trees planted last year had died because they had not been watered;
  - (2) the loss of the trees would increase the risk of flooding to nearby properties. Killing and all this woodland, flora and fauna, and wildlife was inexcusable;
  - (3) this proposal represented a loss of an Ancient Woodland which were being destroyed constantly for numerous housing developments;
  - (4) Portsmouth Water had chosen this site for economic and not environmental reasons;
  - (5) the removal of the trees would have a detrimental impact on air quality for everyone in the vicinity;
  - (6) the proposal would create a flood risk for nearby properties and other properties in Havant and lead in an increase in insurance costs. The real risks created by dams nearby residential areas had been demonstrated recently in areas such as Whaley Bridge;
  - (7) the dam would be overbearing to properties in Winterslow Drive;
  - (8) the public relations campaign for the development of the reservoir in 2008 was so effective that people still believed that the newly proposed reservoir would be available for activities such as fishing, boating and swimming;

- (9) the siting of a reservoir close to properties in a deprived area would encourage youths to use this reservoir as a swimming area and thereby increase the risk of drownings. The proposal should incorporate safety measures to discourage swimming and help those who did run into difficulties trying to swim in the reservoir;
  - (10) this was the wrong location for a reservoir and needed to be somewhere else. Portsmouth Water had 70 potential sites as detailed in a map they produced. Some of them were, in no doubt more suitable, or they wouldn't have been considered otherwise;
  - (11) the reservoir should be sited nearer to where the water would be supplied;
  - (12) the application should be considered in relation to the proposals for Otterbourne Waterworks.
- (i) Mr Taylor, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application. With reference to the applicant's written submission, Mr Taylor highlighted:
- (1) the applicant's long-standing track record of delivering to the local communities they served and their continuing commitment to engage to shape the reservoir;
  - (2) that the proposal would meet the demand for water in the South East and was a response to the Government's calling for investment in regional water resources to support the country's increasing need for resilient water supplies in face of climate change and population growth;
  - (3) that the Water Resources South East Group had identified this as a preferred scheme which had also been approved by Defra;
  - (4) that the proposal was an environmentally-led scheme with a vital role to play in securing resilient supplies and safeguarding two of Hampshire's world-famous chalk streams: the rivers Test and Itchen;
  - (5) that the proposal would allow the applicant to store an excess of sustainable water from Bedhampton Springs during winter and be used to supply the applicant's customers and Southern Water's customers;
  - (6) the additional benefits that would be provided by the proposal, especially for local communities and wildlife;

- (7) that while not proposing large scale water sports to maintain the tranquillity of the area for wildlife, the applicant was open to local water sports involving local community groups to be provided by a specialist partner;
- (8) that the applicant was looking to provide local job opportunities, including apprenticeships, volunteering and wide-ranging education;
- (9) that the proposal presented an opportunity to improve wellbeing and mental health in the area.;
- (10) that the proposal provided an opportunity to create a wetland on the northern edge, providing a tranquil haven for a wide variety of birds, including threatened species;
- (11) that the materials for the wetlands, where possible, be sourced from the application site;
- (12) the plans to create or restore up to 180 hectares of woodland and woodland pasture on the reservoir site and nearby, with a focus on increasing biodiversity and species-rich habitats;
- (13) the plans to improve 5.5km of local streams and get local environmental projects off the ground with a grants scheme;
- (14) that although the nature of the site would change and woodland would be lost, the applicant had adapted its plans to reduce this to an absolute minimum;
- (15) arrangements to mitigate and compensate the ecological impact;
- (16) the consultation and customer research undertaken in development of this proposal and support expressed for this proposal;
- (17) that the applicant would continue to involve local community groups and residents in the development of the reservoir;
- (18) the controls in place to approve the design and construction of reservoirs;
- (19) that the Environmental Agency had signed off the Environmental Statement and Flood Risk Assessment;
- (20) that the operation of the reservoir would differ from the management of other reservoirs as in this case the applicant would have control on the amount of water that could be pumped into the reservoir;

- (22) the emergency measures that would be in place to prevent the reservoir from flooding nearby properties; and
- (23) the importance of safety to the applicant and that its safety record had been recognised by ROSPA.

In response to questions from the Committee, officers advised that

- The reservoir would be mainly used by Portsmouth Water customers.
- The creation of the reservoir would enable Portsmouth Water to give the water they extract from the western region to Southern Water. However, if needed water from the reservoir could be transferred to Southern Water.
- The proposal met the Government's aim of water companies working together to provide regional water resources to support the region's increasing need for resilient water supplies.
- The primary access route to the site would be from the north (74%) and signage would be installed encouraging visitors to use this access.
- The number of passing points on the proposed northern route would be agreed under a reserved matters application.
- The application was supported by a robust assessment of alternative access routes from the north as set out in the report.
- An alternative option (2A) had been put forward by a third party as an alternative access route from the north. However, this was ruled out for the reasons set out in the report.
- The amount of water to be supplied to Southern Water from the reservoir would depend upon the level of capacity and the need.
- The basis on which the size of the reservoir was determined was covered by the report. In essence a number of factors including the need to be viable and a requirement to meet the needs of Portsmouth Water Company and Southern Water. Details of alternatives were also set out in the report.
- It was unfortunate that the proposal would lead to a loss of ancient woodland but this loss had been reduced to an absolute minimum and mitigation plans had been carefully developed with the support of Natural England, the Environment Agency and Hampshire County Council

- The decision to use the traditional planning application process was made by the applicant
- The stakeholder group had a wide variety of views and the individual members had submitted individual responses to the proposals; a majority of the members of the group were in favour of the application as submitted.
- The application was outline in nature so the siting of the visitors centre would be determined under a reserved matter application. The applicant was committed to look at alternatives before submitting a reserved application
- The design of the visitors centre to accommodate disabled visitors would be a matter for the reserved application.
- The management of the visitor centre would be the subject of a legal agreement.
- The application did not propose any improvements to the river Ems but the closest watercourses. One of the primary objectives of the proposal was to safeguard the internationally recognised chalk streams of the Test and Itchen.
- Conditions were proposed to secure details of safety measures to be put in place.
- There would be enhanced land and environment management for biodiversity on the wider site through collaboration with Forestry England and Hampshire County Council, including a long-term site management plan
- It was hoped that part of the woodland creation would involve the planting of native species

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

During the debate, one member of the Committee acknowledged that although there was a need to protect chalk streams and there was need for reservoir, she felt that the benefits of a reservoir of the size proposed did not outweigh the loss of the ancient woodland and the disruption to existing wildlife habitats and countryside.

However, a majority of members were minded to grant permission for the following reasons:

- the strategic management of water from one company to another was not unusual.

- Alternative sites had been considered and this site was the best location
- Conditions would adequately address the safety concerns and the applicants had expressed a commitment to work with the local groups to also address their concerns
- Although this would involve a loss of trees, the benefits of a strategic arrangement for the supply of water across the region outweighed the loss of the ancient woodland
- The scheme had been supported by the Environment Agency, Natural England and the Campaign of the Protection of Rural England.

In response to comments made during the debate, the officers acknowledged that it was regrettable that the proposal would lead to the loss of ancient woodland. However, the size of the reservoir had been justified and that the alternative sites were not considered suitable because they were not in close proximity to Bedhampton springs or local watercourses that could accommodate the capacity of water likely to be generated if the emergency measures were invoked.

The officers also drew the Committee's attention to the extensive consultations that had taken place and amendments made to overcome concerns raised during the consultation period and the educational opportunities proposed for the local communities under this scheme.

It was therefore:

RESOLVED that

- i) the Head of Legal Services be authorised to enter into a S106 Agreement to secure the Heads of Terms set out in paragraph 7.318 of the submitted report:
- ii) APP/20/00991 be granted permission subject to:
  - (A) the completion of the Section 106 Agreement as set out in paragraph 7.129 of the submitted report; and
  - (B) Full Planning Permission being granted for only the following part of the above proposal as described:

Full Planning permission for Development of a reservoir for raw water storage, A pumped storage reservoir, with the minimum required total storage capacity of 8,700 million litres (MI), to support the planned bulk supply transfer of at least 21MI/d in extreme (currently defined as 1:200 year) drought conditions; Construction of an earth embankment adjacent to Staunton Country Park ; Construction of an overflow discharge/spillway at the south-western side of the reservoir and associated works; Construction of a new junction on the B2149 Manor Lodge Road and a new junction on Swanmore Road. Provision of viewing areas on the southern embankment and western edge of the reservoir, and

- (C) Outline Planning Permission being granted with respect to the following part of the above proposal as described:

Outline application for (matters to be considered outlined in Table 2.2 in the submitted Development Specification) control house partially incorporated within landscaped earth mounding adjacent to the south west embankment; together with provision of other earth embankments. Construction of a visitor centre / cafe, with storage areas and welfare facilities to the northwest of the reservoir to be used for recreational and education purposes; Provision of picnic area(s) and children's play area(s). Access routes from both junctions to the visitor car park; visitor car park comprising 193 car parking spaces and between 70 and 75 overflow spaces plus spaces for staff, coach/minibus and disabled drivers sited to the north west of the reservoir. Creation of a permanent wetland on the northern side of the reservoir and construction of bird watching hide/screen(s); recreational facilities for public amenity. Provision of perimeter tracks and a network of bridleways, cycle paths and footpaths; Construction of a slipway on the western bank of the reservoir for operational use only and a small section of the proposed pipeline (210m).

- (D) the conditions set out in the submitted report (subject to such changes and/or additions that the Head of Planning considers necessary to impose prior to the issuing of the decision).

*[The voting on the resolution was recorded as follows:*

*For: Councillor Crellin, Hughes, Patel, Linger*

*Abstention: Councillor Patrick*

*Against: None]*

*(the meeting adjourned at 7.35 pm and reconvened at 7.43 pm)*

**27 APP/20/00991 - Pipeline from Proposed Reservoir Site, Middle Park Way to land adjacent to, West Street, Havant**

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

Proposal: Outline application for (matters to be considered outlined in Table 2.2 in the submitted Development Specification) development of a new pipeline to transfer water from Bedhampton Springs to fill the reservoir in the winter and draw it off to treat and supply when needed in the summer comprising: Construction of an underground, bi-directional pipeline linking the reservoir with the existing pumping station at Bedhampton; Emergency drawdown discharge structure at Hermitage Stream; Upgrades to existing culverts; Washout and air valve chambers (typically below ground).

The Committee considered the 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 written depositions submitted on behalf of Havant Climate Change Alliance and Havant Friends of the Earth, on behalf of Havant Brough Tree Wardens and Portsmouth Water;

The Committee was addressed by the following deputies:

- a) Ms Brooks, on behalf of the Climate Alliance and Friends of the Earth, advised that the main issues had been highlighted in the previous item and in the written submission but also raised the following concerns:
  - 1 it was important that everything should be done to avoid damage or removal of mature and veteran trees in the interest of biodiversity;
  - 2 the green space along the Hermitage Stream should be restored to its former state once the pipeline had been laid;
  - 3 the commitment to future restoration work on Hermitage Stream should be adhered to as a fundamental part of the Water Environment and Mitigation Package; and
  - 4 water flowing through the pipeline could be used to generate electricity
- b) Mr Smith, who, on behalf of Havant Tree Wardens, supported the points raised by Ms Brooks;
- c) Mr Taylor, who, on behalf of the applicant, highlighted the following issues set out in the written submission:
  - (1) the proposal took into account the environmental impact locally;

- (2) it was proposed to avoid damage to tree roots and other natural structures and plants;
- (3) Health and safety measures would be put in place;
- (4) The proposed route would minimise community impact and areas of local space and grass;
- (5) considerable consultation had been undertaken;
- (6) where possible works would be undertaken to improve watercourses; and
- (7) it was proposed to make the construction plan available to the public

In response to questions from the Committee, officers advised that:

- The Highway Authority were aware of the need to avoid conflict with the works for this proposal and the works associated with the AQUIND Interconnector scheme and that they would seek to ensure that there would be minimal disruption to traffic using the roads affected.

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

During the debate, some members of the Committee expressed concern about the disruption to be created by the proposed works. However, a majority of the Committee were satisfied that measures would be in place to minimise this disruption.

It was therefore:

RESOLVED that:

- i) the Head of Legal Services be authorised to enter into a S106 Agreement to secure the Heads of Terms set out in paragraph 7.129 of the submitted report,
- ii) application APP/20/00990 be granted permission subject to:
  - (A) the completion of the Section 106 Agreement as set out in paragraph 7.129 of the submitted report; and
  - (B) the conditions set out below (subject to such changes and/or additions 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 five 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. No part of the development hereby approved in outline shall be commenced until an application or applications for written approval of the details of the route of the pipeline and the siting, scale and external appearance of the emergency drawdown discharge structure, and landscaping (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Application(s) for approval of the matters reserved by this planning permission must be made not later than the expiration of 5 years from the date of this decision notice; and Development must be begun not later than the expiration of 2 years from the final approval of reserved matters for the relevant phase, or, in the case of approval on different dates, the approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: The application was submitted as part outline part full application in accordance with the provisions of Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and in accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:

#### Drawings

HTR-ATK-ZZ-ZZ-GS-Z-0140 Site Location Plan  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0009 Overall Plan and Route  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0021 Red Line Boundary Drawing (Ch0-1600)  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0022 Red Line Boundary Drawing (Ch1600-3200)  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0023 Red Line Boundary Drawing (Ch3200-4500)  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0014 Site Plan (Ch0-800)  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0015 Site Plan (Ch800-1600)  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0016 Site Plan (Ch1600-2400)  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0017 Site Plan (Ch2400-3200)  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0018 Site Plan (Ch3200-4000)  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0019 Site Plan (Ch4000-4564)  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0010 Typical Stream Crossing Detail

HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0011 Typical Pipeline  
Construction Detail  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0012 Typical Under Track  
Crossing Detail  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0013 Hermitage Discharge  
Structure Detail  
HTR-ATK-PI-BR-DR-C-0020 Typical Culvert Detail

#### Documents

Engineering and Design Report  
Planning Statement  
Development Specification  
Environmental Statement (Volumes 1 - 4) including Non-  
Technical Summary. The Volume 4 Appendices include  
the following standalone reports:  
Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan  
including Record of Environmental Actions and  
Commitments or REAC  
(ES\_Volume\_4\_Appendix\_A2.1\_OEMP)  
Transport Assessment  
(ES\_Volume\_4\_Appendix\_A13.1\_TA)  
Flood Risk Assessment  
(ES\_Volume\_4\_Appendix\_A15.2\_FRA)  
Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment  
(ES\_Volume\_4\_Appendix\_A15.1\_WFD)  
Arboricultural Impact Assessment  
(ES\_Volume\_4\_Appendix\_A9.14\_AIA)  
HTR-ATK-RZ-RE-DR-L-113 Revised Tree Protection Plan  
Sheet 37 of 40 (revP01.1)  
Design and Access Statement  
Statement of Community Involvement  
Outline Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation Strategy  
Article 4.7 Statement

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED FEBRUARY 2021

A Summary of the Benefits of Havant Thicket Reservoir  
HTR TNPS02 Traffic Distribution Sensitivity revision\_V2.0  
dated 25/01/2021  
HTR TNPS03 Report on Northern Access Layout dated  
29/01/2021  
HTR Water Framework Directive Article 4.7 29/01/2021

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED APRIL 2021

Access for Non Motorised Users - Technical Note dated  
01/04/2021  
Access Strategy, Rat Running and Construction  
Management - Technical Note dated 01/04/2021

Framework Construction Management Plan dated 31/03/2021  
Article 4.7 Shortlisting Methodology dated 01/04/2021  
Transport Assessment Addendum - Framework Travel Plan dated 01/04/2021  
Implementation Plan for Off Site Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation dated 01/04/2021

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

#### Phasing

4. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed phasing plan for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing plan and no variation shall be made without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Approval will not be given if, in the reasonable opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed variation creates new environmental impacts which exceed the range or scale of those measured and assessed in the Environmental Statement (including the further information) and which the Local Planning Authority considers may require further or additional mitigation measures.

Reason: The Environmental Impact and merits of the proposed development have been assessed on this basis.

#### Construction Environmental Management Plan

5. No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a phase specific Construction Environmental Management Plan for that parcel has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall be based upon, and be in broad accordance with, Volume 4 Appendix A2.1 of the application Environmental Statement (Outline Environmental Management Plan). It should demonstrate that the risk to controlled waters will be appropriately managed, and include both temporary and permanent construction features and detail information on locations of proposed techniques such as cofferdams, culverting and piping and the associated flood risks and mitigation measures. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the construction process is carried out in a manner which will minimise disturbance, pollution & nuisance to neighbouring properties or within the public realm. To avoid inappropriate parking practices, and turning and manoeuvring of construction vehicles which adversely impact either the use- or safety- of the public highway. This condition is imposed having due regard to policies DM10 & CS15 (Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011), and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

#### Highways and amenity

6. No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a Construction Method Statement (CMS) for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the construction process is carried out in a manner which will minimise disturbance, pollution & nuisance to neighbouring properties.

#### Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)

7. A) No development shall take place until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Hampshire County Council as local highways authority). B) No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a phase specific CTMP for that parcel has been approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CTMP(s) shall include all commitments set out in the Framework CTMP, dated 31/03/2021, submitted with the planning applications and will include a Construction Traffic Management Strategy and Construction Worker Travel Plan. The CTMP shall include the following:
  - Vehicle routing plans
  - proposed programme and duration
  - number of construction personnel including travel arrangements and mitigation where necessary
  - alterations to the highway, including temporary and / or permanent, to enable construction
  - details of the number of construction and delivery vehicles using the public highway (no abnormal loads are anticipated at this stage)
  - traffic management details
  - compounds and laydown area details
  - highway condition surveys

- methods for managing the site to prevent mud onto the highway
- details of on-site contractor parking.

The CTMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the safe and efficient operation of the highway network.

8. No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a phase specific Traffic management and construction measures for that parcel has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This shall include the following:
  - a) Vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist diversion plans
  - b) Details of type of traffic management
  - c) Details of highway reinstatement
  - d) Construction methodology and details
  - e) Material and spoil storage

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the safe and efficient operation of the highway network.

9. No construction on the pipeline site shall take place outside the hours of 08:30- 18:00 Monday to Friday, 09:00-13:00 on Saturday and no Sunday working, except works on the adopted highway, where alternative arrangements are to be agreed between the Highway Authority and Local Planning Authority, with the exception of specific works that shall have been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in advance and shall include details of the task, the date and duration of works. No works shall take place on Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of local residents.

10. No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a revised and updated assessment of potential noise and vibration arising during construction shall be prepared in accordance with BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014. The assessments shall include likely eligibility for noise insulation or temporary re housing and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and construction carried out in accordance with the agreed recommendations.

Reason: To minimise potential noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors.

11. Subject to Condition 10 [ABOVE], no night time working shall take place, except works on the adopted highway, where alternative arrangements are to be agreed between the Highway Authority and Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Night-time works to be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To avoid potentially significant impacts of noise and vibration upon residential receptors.

#### Archaeological Evaluation (Written Scheme)

12. No phase of development approved under Condition 4 hereby approved shall commence until an Archaeological Management Plan (AMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The AMP will provide appropriately for all aspects of archaeological recording and will serve as an over-arching Written Scheme of Investigation for all archaeological works.

Reason: To record important archaeological features.

#### Archaeological Evaluation (Programme)

13. No development within a Development Phase shall commence until the applicant has submitted, and the Local Planning Authority has approved, a written scheme for the programme of archaeological mitigation within that Development Phase area. The programme for archaeological mitigation shall then be implemented in accordance with the agreed written scheme.

This condition may be discharged on an individual Development Phase basis or on a section by section basis.

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. This is a pre-commencement requirement because of the need to secure satisfactory archaeological protection in advance of each individual Development Phase commencing.

#### Archaeological Evaluation (Recording)

14. No development within a Development Phase shall commence until the applicant has submitted, and the Local Planning Authority has approved in writing, a Written Scheme for recording all historic assets within that Development Phase area. The recording of all historic assets shall then be implemented in accordance with the agreed scheme.

This condition may be discharged on an individual Development Phase basis or on a section by section basis.

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. This is a pre-commencement requirement because of the need to secure satisfactory archaeological protection in advance of each individual Development Phase commencing.

#### Archaeological Evaluation (Publishing)

15. Following completion of archaeological fieldwork within a Development Phase, a report shall be produced in accordance with an approved programme including, where appropriate, post-excavation assessment, specialist analysis and reports, publication and public engagement related to that Development Phase area and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

This condition may be discharged on an individual Development Phase basis or on a section by section basis.

Reason - To contribute to the knowledge and understanding of past uses and activities on site by ensuring that opportunities are taken to capture evidence from the historic environment and to make this publicly available.

#### Landscape

16. Any reserved matters application for layout or landscaping submitted pursuant to Conditions 2 and 4 shall include:

- a) The submission of a Tree Survey and updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (including a Tree Constraints Plan), Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan showing the tree or group of trees, the Root Protection Area(s) and the crown spread(s) in relation to the proposed development. All tree root protection areas identified, shall be protected by protection fencing in accordance with BS 5837:2012.
- b) The approved tree protection measures shall be implemented before any equipment, machinery, or materials are brought on to the site in connection with the works. They shall be retained intact for the duration of the construction works and shall only be removed or altered following completion of that phase.
- c) A landscaping reinstatement scheme for all open parts of the site, where loss occurs due the development, which shall include the planting and maintenance of a number of semi-mature native broad leaf trees (UK grown and sourced in line with current biosecurity guidelines) to be planted in a sustainable location as per the British Standard guidelines. The information shall include:
  - i) Written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment,
  - ii) Planting methods, tree pits & guying methods,
  - iii) Schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate,
  - iv) Retained areas of grassland cover, scrub, hedgerow, trees and woodland,
  - v) A timetable for implementation of the soft and hard landscaping works.

The scheme of Landscaping Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable. Any plant which dies, becomes diseased or is removed, within 10 years shall be replaced with another of similar type and size, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To preserve the amenity visual amenity of the locality.

## Flood risk and drainage

### Contamination

17. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site. In line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### Flood risk

18. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (ref HTR-ATK-XX-XX-RP-Z-0042, titled A15.2 Flood Risk Assessment Report, compiled by Atkins on behalf of Portsmouth Water Ltd dated 01/09/20) and the mitigation measures it details. These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to operation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed throughout the FRA shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason:

- To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants
- To ensure flood risk off site is not increased as a result of the proposed development in line with paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

19. No phase of the pipeline development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until a detailed scheme, to ensure the development will not increase the risk of flooding, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Specifically, further details should be provided where relevant to that phase including:
- Detailed information on the proposed emergency drawdown discharge structure.
  - Detailed information surrounding the proposed upgrading of the culverts, in order to not increase flood risk associated with the Emergency discharge and as detailed in table 4.2 and section 4.17 of the FRA
  - Detailed information including the long term maintenance scheduled for the proposed development, including but not limited to the proposed pipeline and culverts.
  - Detailed information for the crossing of watercourses where these are proposed.

The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and its future users. This is in line with paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

20. Prior to construction of the development approved under Condition 4 above, an On-site Emergency Flood Plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved.

Reason: To ensure that residual flood risks on site are safely managed in accordance with the NPPF.

Ecology

21. No phase of the development approved under Condition 4 shall commence until full details of all ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures (to be informed as necessary by up-to-date survey and assessment) and on-going monitoring of mitigation measures required for each reserved matters application (including both ecological works directly related to that Development Phase reserved matters area and any works associated with that area but lying outside of the boundary of that area) shall be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall be in accordance with the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed within the Outline Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation Strategy (ECOSA, September 2020), the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Atkins/Portsmouth Water, September 2020) and the Implementation Plan for Off Site Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation (Atkins, April 2021). Any such approved measures shall thereafter be implemented in strict accordance with the agreed details and with all measures maintained in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, NERC Act 2006, NPPF and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

22. An Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) shall be appointed, to be full time on site during site preparation and clearance and during any works in sensitive areas, and to undertake regular monitoring visits throughout the construction programme.

Reason: To protect and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, NERC Act 2006, NPPF and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

[The votes on the resolution were recorded as follows:

For Councillor Crellin, Hughes, Patel, Linger  
Abstention: Councillor Patrick  
Against: None]

**The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and concluded at 8.10 pm**

.....

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank