

APPENDIX A

Earlier Consultation Replies

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

Further Comments:

Clearing of Condition 8 Drainage

The approach appears reasonable BUT the final outcome should comply with The Building Regulation Approved Document H guidance

Not being an expert in this field I am unable to state if the design will work or not.

Further Comments:

Building Regulation consent will be required for this work

Fire access point previously raised has been cleared

However still unable to confirm if Gaps between properties / notional boundaries also to comply with Approved Document B requirement (Unprotected areas) Not easy to confirm on site plan

AI or LABC to deal with as part of plan check upon application submission

Original Comments:

Building Regulation consent will be required for this work

Access to Plots 45 & 46 to comply with Approved Document B5 Fire Authority vehicles (45m rule all points of the building)

Gaps between properties / notional boundaries also to comply with Approved Document B requirement (Unprotected areas) Not easy to confirm on site plan.

Community Infrastructure

Original Comments:

The dwellings are CIL Liable, in accordance with our CIL Charging Schedule:
<http://www.havant.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/HBC%20CIL%20Charging%20Schedule%20Full%20Document%20Feb%202013.pdf>

The amounts in the Charging Schedule are indexed according to the year in which permission is issued, if a permission is issued in 2021 the amount of indexation would be 48.66%. This could vary if permission is issued in 2022.

CIL Form 10: Charitable and/or Social Housing Relief Claim Form is needed to confirm the sum of Mandatory Social Housing Relief, however this can be dealt with any time up to the Commencement date.

Further information on CIL including relief in respect of affordable housing can be found on the Planning Portal.

Please note the current CIL Charging Schedule is under review and The Council has considered the representations made on the Draft Charging Schedule, together with the evidence supporting the Schedule. Some modifications have been made as a result, and the schedule has now been submitted for examination.

Following the examination, the Council will consider any recommendations made by the examiner and plans to adopt the new schedule alongside the emerging Local Plan.

S106

APP/19/00007 has a S106 dated 2 October 2020 between HBC, EHDC, HCC and 'the Whites', at paragraph 18.2 it is confirmed that: '*...this agreement shall apply to any planning permission subsequently granted...*'

Any changes required as a result of a reserved matters application would need a Deed of Variation to this agreement.

County Archaeologist

Original Comments:

I note that the application requests approval of details pursuant to condition 17, 18 and 19 (archaeology) but in the Planning Statement, para 4.24, it states that archaeological investigations are ongoing and details will be submitted following submission of the Reserve Matters. It is not clear therefore what definitive comment I might make.

However to assure you that I am aware that preliminary archaeological survey has been completed and did not find any archaeological remains which would merit further investigation. I anticipate that reports to this effect will be submitted in due course.

Southern Water

Further Comments:

Southern Water has no objection to discharge condition 08 relating to foul disposal. The submitted drainage layout (6383-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-801 Rev PL6) shows easement to existing public foul sewer which would be satisfactory to Southern Water.

All other comments in our previous response dated 16/08/2021 remain unchanged and valid.

Original Comments:

Southern Water cannot recommend discharge of condition 8 relating to drainage.

The submitted landscape masterplan (Drawing No.100 Rev D) shows proposed tree planting within the easement of foul sewer which is not acceptable to Southern Water.

No new tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public foul sewer without consent from Southern Water.

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

(<https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/3027/ds-tree-planting-guide.pdf>) and the

Sewerage Sector Guidance (<https://www.water.org.uk/sewerage-sector-guidance-approved-documents/>) with regards to any landscaping proposals and our restrictions and maintenance of tree planting adjacent to sewers, rising mains and water mains.

Should the applicant wish to offer the sewers for adoption under section 104 of the Water Industry Act, the drainage design should comply with the Sewerage Sector Guidance ([water.org.uk/sewerage-sector-guidance-approved-documents/](https://www.water.org.uk/sewerage-sector-guidance-approved-documents/)) standards and Southern Water's requirements. Please note that non-compliance with the Sewerage Sector Guidance standards will preclude future adoption of the foul and surface water sewerage network on site. The design of drainage should ensure that no groundwater or land drainage is to enter public sewers. Applications for adoption of sewers by Southern Water can be made via the online service, Get Connected: developerservices.southernwater.co.uk

The developer has not submitted documents relating ownership and maintenance Attenuation Basin.

Under current legislation, Southern Water can consider the adoption of SuDS if they are to be designed and constructed in line with the Design and Construction Guidance ([water.org.uk/sewerage-sector-guidance-approved-documents/](https://www.water.org.uk/sewerage-sector-guidance-approved-documents/)). No new soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses, associated attenuation tanks or any other surface water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5 metres of a public or adoptable gravity sewer, rising main or water main.

The Council's technical staff and the relevant authority for land drainage consent should be consulted regarding surface water disposal.

Southern Water would have no comments to make with regards to other conditions being subject of consultation.

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119).

Website: southernwater.co.uk or by email at: SouthernWaterPlanning@southernwater.co.uk

Hampshire Fire & Rescue

Original Comments:

Regarding the above planning update, information has been seen, there are no further comments to made and refer you to letter sent 05-02-2019 by my self

Hampshire Highways

Further Comments:

The applicant has submitted additional information in the form of a Technical Note (TN) to address the requirement for dedicated cycle facilities to be provided internal to the site to connect the wider strategic provision on Bartons Road. This was a matter raised within our response dated 18th August 2021. The Highway Authority have reviewed the note and wish to make the following comments.

The TN seeks to provide justification for why the proposed internal layout meets the cycling requirements of the site and the wider Outline Planning Permission. It makes reference to Condition 34 of planning permission APP/19/00007 which requires that "the reserved matters layout shall make provision for potential future vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access to the northern area of the site beyond the existing residential part of the site". This specific requirement refers to the need to ensure future connectivity to the potential further northern parcel of the site (within East Hants District Council's area) by designing the internals to cater for the links should the second phase of development forward. Under section 2.1.6, the TN goes on to note that there are no planning conditions which require a shared surface for pedestrians and cyclists, nor the need to connect the provision at the site access and emergency access.

As set out in the Highway Authority's responses throughout the application history, there is a wider strategic requirement to provide off road cycle provision along Bartons Road between Emsworth and Havant to cater for the additional housing developments along Bartons Road and the change in nature of the main purpose of the route and associated increases in travel demand from additional residential properties. This has been recognised throughout all the applications along the Barton's Road corridor and that there is a cumulative need which is to be delivered collectively through fair and proportional works required through planning and delivered by each parcel of land.

The Camp Field site plays a vital role in the delivery and completion of this link in providing shared use pedestrian and cycle provision along the northern section of Bartons Road between Eastleigh Road and the existing provision implemented by Linden Homes.

Representation was made throughout the pre-application and outline application stages for the provision of this shared use provision and matters were discussed in detail at the outline stage. The applicant at this time wished to avoid unnecessary S278 works and wished to provide the necessary shared use provision internal to the site. This was therefore suitably conditioned, and the current applicant appears to have missed this key element both within the conditions themselves and the submitted internal design.

Section 2.1.3 of the TN refers to one of the Highway Authority's responses from the outline planning application which requires the link to connect the infrastructure secured through planning applications within the area. Formal written representation was also made during a pre-application consultation on the Reserved Matters application (not mentioned within the TN) and also the first response to the Reserved Matters application (referred to in section 2.2.2 of the TN).

Under planning reference APP/19/00007, the applicant is obligated under the S106 agreement to provide shared use facilities between the site access on Bartons Road and the Bartons Road/Eastleigh Road junction. The Highway Authority did not extend the obligation to construct shared use facilities adjacent to the carriageway between the site access and emergency access through a S278 agreement on the understanding that the route would be provided internal to the site and as secured in condition 34. It is therefore considered that the works meet the 3 test of CIL in that:

- The link is of strategic importance through the connection it provides to wider shared

use infrastructure on Bartons Road and is therefore considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;

- It is directly related to the development in that it was identified through the outline application and subsequently secured by the LPA in Condition 34; and
- The scale of the works required is proportionate to the development via the prior acknowledgement that the link would be provided internally through the site rather than continuing along Bartons Road.

The Highway Authority does not dispute the requirement referred to within the TN for Condition 34. However, the applicant has only quoted one bullet point from the conditions list in isolation and does not refer to one of the other specific requirements under the condition from the LPA for the provision of the following: "details of shared use connection between the emergency access and the main site access internal to the development".

It is clear therefore that there is a planning requirement for shared provision and also the need to connect the two points of cycle access to the site. Therefore, as per our previous response on this application, the Highway Authority maintain that it is a requirement of the internal design to provide shared use footway/cycleway facilities to connect the wider infrastructure being provided on Bartons Road, reaffirmed through the wording of Condition 34.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the shared use connection provided internally through the site is considered a requirement of planning (identified through Condition 34). The Highway Authority remains open to discussions with the applicant to achieve a suitable design. Until a suitable design has been put forward, the Highway Authority recommends a holding objection to the planning application until this matter is resolved to our satisfaction.

Original Comments:

The applicant is intending to offer the internal site layout for adoption to the Highway Authority, a position which is strongly supported. The Highway Authority has reviewed the plans submitted as part of the reserved matters application and has a number of comments to make on the proposed design. Whilst a detailed audit report will be provided as part of the Section 38 process, the following comments must be addressed for the site to be considered suitable for adoption. The Highway Authority would welcome direct discussions with the applicant on the internal layout to ensure that a suitable design is achieved.

The internal layout does not provide any connections into the new shared use provision to the east and west of the site along Bartons Road. Dedicated cycle facilities must be provided from the emergency access, through the site to connect into the site access.

A 3m wide shared use path should be considered inline with the committed cycle improvements along Bartons Road. The 3m wide cycleway in the centre of the site will also need to be connected into any proposed provision.

Further details are sought regarding the widths of the internal access road. The current alignment appears tight, as demonstrated through the refuse vehicle tracking drawings. The refuse vehicle should be tracked alongside a family car to demonstrate that a car can pass with sufficient room given the lack of passing places along the spine road. Any overhang or overrun of the footways is not considered acceptable. The applicant is also required to confirm the design speed for the tracking and to provide additional tracking drawings for

refuse vehicles egressing the side roads to confirm that this manoeuvre can be undertaken.

The visibility for property no. 37 is poor and would require the driver to look over their shoulder when egressing the property. Visibility may also be obstructed by planting in the front garden. This matter will need to be addressed.

The swale and attenuation tank need to be re-located to at least 5m away from the highway.

As noted, the comments above are not an exhaustive list. The Highway Authority encourages the applicant to engage directly with the view to providing an updated design which is suitable for adoption.

Housing Havant Borough Council

Further Comments:

Housing:

Current planning policy requirements Core Strategy policy CS9. 2, the Havant Borough Housing SPD (July 2011), mean that developments of 15 units or more would be required to provide 30-40% affordable housing on site.

The Submitted Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 (HBLP 2036), which was approved by the Council on 30/01/2019, further reinforces this policy (see emerging Policy H2 / Affordable Housing) on sites resulting in a net gain of 10 or more dwellings, by setting out a requirement for 30% affordable housing, on sites outside of Havant, Waterlooville, and Leigh Park town centres; and 20% affordable housing requirement on sites within Havant, Waterlooville, and Leigh Park town centres (as defined through Policies KP1, KP2, and KP4).

The applicants have confirmed that the affordable provision will be 21 units with 15 available for rent, and 6 for Shared Ownership. This meets our policy requirements for a minimum of 30% to be provided as affordable housing and for a 70/30 tenure split in favour of rented units and helps meet the current demand from applicants to Hampshire Home Choice (HHC), the councils waiting list; as at 14/01/2022 there were 1780 active households seeking accommodation in our area. Of these 805 are waiting for a one-bedroom home, 565 for a two bed, 338 for a 3 bed, and 72 for a 4+ bedroom home.

The housing mix submitted is:

Bedroom size	Rented	Shared Ownership	TOTAL
1	6	0	6
2	8	1	9
3	0	5	5
4	1	0	1
TOTAL	15	6	21

Generally, the sizes of each individual house type detailed within the affordable provision is acceptable as they meet or exceed those noted within the nationally described space standards.

The applicants have provided a Garden Area Layout which suggests 65.55sqm of private area for each of the four Bromsgrove house types which are plots 29 to 32. I would appreciate clarification of whether each of the residents of these four new homes will have their own designated defensible space as this is unclear on the coloured layout.

Also, could the applicants confirm whether these 4 properties would be suitable for residents with mobility issues.

The location of the affordable housing is on the extremities of the site in two distinct groups; however, this is a small development and as the applicants have said in their Planning and Affordable Housing Statement, this arrangement fully integrates the affordable housing with the private accommodation, whilst providing clusters of accommodation that can be appropriately managed by the chosen registered provider (RP).

Havant Borough Council Housing would support this application for much needed affordable housing in our area, but would like confirmation of:

- Private space arrangements around plots 29 to 32
- Whether plots 29-32 would be suitable for tenants with mobility issues.

Original Comments:

Housing:

Current planning policy requirements Core Strategy policy CS9. 2, the Havant Borough Housing SPD (July 2011), mean that developments of 15 units or more would be required to provide 30-40% affordable housing on site.

The Submitted Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 (HBLP 2036), which was approved by the Council on 30/01/2019, further reinforces this policy (see emerging Policy H2 / Affordable Housing) on sites resulting in a net gain of 10 or more dwellings, by setting out a requirement for 30% affordable housing, on sites outside of Havant, Waterlooville, and Leigh Park town centres; and 20% affordable housing requirement on sites within Havant, Waterlooville, and Leigh Park town centres (as defined through Policies KP1, KP2, and KP4).

The applicants have confirmed that the affordable provision will be 21 units with 15 available for rent, and 6 for Shared Ownership. This meets our policy requirements for a minimum of 30% to be provided as affordable housing and for a 70/30 tenure split in favour of rented units.

The housing mix submitted is:

Bedroom size	Rented	Shared Ownership	TOTAL
1	6		6
2	8	1	9
3	0	5	5
4	1		1
TOTAL	15	6	21

Generally, the sizes of each individual house type detailed within the affordable provision is

acceptable as they meet or exceed those noted within the nationally described space standards.

House type Bromsgrove, a 2 bed, 3-person home, is an unusual design as it appears to be a back-to-back house. I would be grateful if it could be confirmed whether it is intended that this style of property has any private garden space for each of the residents, and whether these properties would be suitable for tenants with mobility issues.

The location of the affordable housing is on the extremities of the site in two distinct groups, however this is a small development and as the applicants have said in their Planning and Affordable Housing Statement, this arrangement fully integrates the affordable housing with the private accommodation, whilst providing clusters of accommodation that can be appropriately managed by the chosen registered provider (RP).

Havant Borough Council Housing would support this application for much needed affordable housing in our area, but would like confirmation of:

- Private space arrangements around plots 29 to 32
- Whether plots 29-32 would be suitable for tenants with mobility issues.

Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council

Further Comments:

From a landscape perspective we have the following comments in relation to the discharge of conditions:

Condition 7 landscaping

- There appears to be a significant change to the frontage of the site by the inclusion of a shared cycle path. This amendment will have a impact on the character of Bartons road by the reduction of the soft landscaping buffer between the Bartons road and the development site. We require a more robust soft landscaping scheme which introduces soft landscaping to mitigate this impact. This must consist of native tree and understorey planting to help retain the green corridor along the south of the site. At present the proposed amenity grass and pyracantha does not offer sufficient screening.

- We have concerns with the longevity of the small strip of grass which separates the shared footpath and the highway.

Condition 10 boundary treatments

- For security purposes all boundary treatments which will permanently abut open space, footpaths must be brick.

- All boundary treatments which are visible within the streetscape must also be brick and not a wooden fence.

Further Comments:

From a landscape perspective we have the following comments in relation to this application:

Condition 7- No further comments recommend to discharge condition no. 7.

Condition 10 - No further comments recommend to discharge condition no. 10.

Original Comments:

From a landscape perspective we have the following comments in relation to the discharge of the following conditions:

7 Landscaping

- We require the southern boundary vegetation to extend to the frontage of plots no. 1 & 2 to aid with the screening/softening of the site. This will also allow for greater privacy for the residents living in these properties.
- Soft landscaping needs to be introduced to break up the massing of car parking to the front of unit 60/64 this should be in the form of a tree with underplanting.
- There is a missed opportunity to frame the site entrance with larger legacy native trees. Given the site entrance previously solely serviced the Oaks crematorium it seems fitting to introduce Oak trees.
- Given the toxicity of the *Hedera colchica* 'Dentata Variegata' and *Hydrangea anomala* subsp. *petiolaris* it is not deemed appropriate to have in climbing the boundary treatments of the rear gardens. Furthermore the Ivy is vigorous and could be detrimental to the longevity of the boundary treatments.
- It would seem appropriate to formalise a hard surfaced footpath connecting the footway at the site entrance to the units 5-1 to mitigate the inevitable unsightly desire lines.

10 Boundary Treatments

- No further comments recommend to discharge condition no. 10.

Natural England

Original Comments

Deterioration of the water environment

A nitrogen budget was agreed at outline stage, the development achieved nutrient neutrality based on the existing and proposed land uses at the site. Provided Havant Borough Council, as competent authority, is satisfied with the assumptions included in the assessment and that this reserved matters application does not affect the land use change figures, Natural England raises no concerns. Should the design of the scheme change, a recalculation should be undertaken and a revised Habitats Regulations Assessment will be necessary.

Landscaping and lighting

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

Nutrient Team HBC

Original Comments

A European Sites Avoidance and Mitigation Checklist is required to provide the Council with

the information needed to undertake a Habitat Regulations Assessment.

I have reviewed the Nitrogen Budget report dated 20th May 2022 and can advise the following information and/or corrections are required:

- Stage 1 - an average occupancy rate of 2.4 persons has been used. The Council has produced a calculator to ascertain the average occupancy of the site by the number of bedroom per dwelling type (based on the submitted housing mix). This document needs to be submitted alongside any revised nutrient budget.

- Stage 2 - there is no area(s) for the existing land use type(s). In addition, it is noted that the incorrect land use type has been identified as 'cereals' compared to the historic photograph evidence which indicates the land is in 'arable' use. This should be updated within the nutrient budget calculator.

The applicant is requested to submit a revised nutrient budget using Natural England's nutrient budget calculator spreadsheet in the interests of transparency and ease of checking.

In terms of mitigation, the covering letter indicates the applicant wishes to use an off-site mitigation solution, and has indicated that they wish to use 'the Meon Springs facility' (albeit the Nitrogen Report does not indicate which third party mitigation site is to be used and this should be updated for consistency). In such cases, we require confirmation of which third mitigation scheme is to be used with scientific evidence which shows that the mitigation site can provide mitigation for the development site. The information we would require is similar to that in chapter 6 of the Warblington Farm Study and it would need to show that it meets the mitigation principles set out by Natural England:

<https://cdn.havant.gov.uk/public/documents/Havant%20BC%20Nutrient%20Neutral%20Warblington%20Mitigation%202020%20June%20FINAL%20Combined.pdf>

<https://cdn.havant.gov.uk/public/documents/Nutrient%20Neutrality%20Mitigation%20Principles.pdf>

The nutrient team should be re-consulted once revised/additional information has been received.

Planning Policy

Original Comments:

Policy Status:

The Local Plan (Core Strategy) and the Local Plan (Allocations), together with the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan, provide the development plan for the borough. The Havant Borough Local Plan (HBLP) was submitted for Examination on the 12th February 2021 and can be afforded limited weight.

Policy Comment:

The principle of development has been established by outline consent APP/19/00007. This permission was based on the emerging site allocation in the Pre-Submission Local Plan under policy H18, so while that plan has only limited weight ahead of its adoption, there is an expectation that the policy requirements within it are met. The table below sets out the requirements of the plan and the degree to which they have been met.

Policy	Requirement	Comment
Internal Space Standards (Policy H1)	A requirement for dwellings to meet the nationally described internal space standards	An accommodation schedule has been provided in square feet. The NDSS is in square metres and so a revised schedule will need to be provided.
Enhanced Accessibility Standards (Policy H1)	30% of proposed dwellings to meet enhanced accessibility standards (M4(2)) and 2% of the total proposed dwellings to meet wheelchair accessible standards (M4 (3))	No information provided.
Private Amenity Space (Policy H1)	Requires sufficient private and/or communal outdoor amenity space to be provided.	A garden is provided for all of the houses. The maisonettes do not comply and there is no private amenity space provided.
Housing Mix (Policy H4)	Development proposals should provide a range of dwelling types and sizes to meet identified housing. This should incorporate approximately 35% as two-bedroom homes as part of the overall housing mix (both market and affordable).	The design and access statement confirms that 19 of the homes would be two bedroom, equating to 27%. To achieve 35% a total of 25 homes would need to be two bedroom.
Low Carbon Design (Policy E12)	Residential development is expected to achieve a 19% reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate.	The design and access statement confirms that Part L would be complied with as opposed to the 19% enhanced standard required of E12. It should be noted that a water efficiency standard of 110L/P/D will be required.
EV Charging Infrastructure (Policy IN3)	Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure should be provided for each new residential unit with private off-street parking.	No information provided.
Management Plans (Policy IN5)	A management plan is likely to be required through a legal agreement to establish the whole life management and maintenance of the common parts within the development.	It is noted that the public highways are proposed for adoption, which is supported.
Provision of new open space	New open space is required through Policy E9 at a standard of 1.5ha per 1000 population	The open space requirement based on the accommodation schedule would be 0.25ha. The scheme provides 0.12ha of open space. If a

compliant mix is provided, this may render this acceptable.

Parking

Whilst it is noted in the Planning Statement that the applicant states that the Parking SPD standards will be complied with, detail of the amount of parking spaces to be provided is not set out. This could be done through the revised accommodation schedule. Detail of visitor parking should also be provided.

Summary

At this time, there are a number of policy areas where the scheme as submitted falls short of the requirements in the emerging Local Plan. There are a number of others where no or limited information has been provided and this needs to be addressed. Once this has taken place, a fuller understanding of the compliance of the scheme with the development standards can be undertaken.

Traffic Management Team

Original Comments:

The traffic team would raise concerns that there appears to be shortfall of visitor spaces for this proposed development.