



Library Ref: MIQ04

Havant Borough Local Plan Examination Statement

Matter 3: Hayling Island



Havant Borough Local Plan Examination Statement

Matter 3: Hayling Island

This statement has been produced as part of the examination of the Havant Borough Local Plan. It answers the Inspectors' questions relating to matter 3.

Any queries about the report should be sent to the programme officer:

Address: Ms Charlotte Glancy
Banks Solutions
80 Lavinia Way
East Preston
West Sussex
BN16 1DD

Email bankssolutions@gmail.com

Telephone 01903 776601

Website: <https://www.havant.gov.uk/local-plan-examination>

Matter 3: Hayling Island

Contents

Hayling Island transport assessment & addendum	1
3.1 Are the methodologies and modelling assumptions used for the assessments robust?	1
3.2 Is the approach of not having regard to the summer and weekend tourist traffic justified? ...	2
3.3 The assessments set out that journey times would increase as a result of the proposed package of mitigation, is this justified?	2
3.4 Can the package of highway mitigation be delivered, including having regard to any landowner constraints and how will it be funded?	2
3.5 Can it be reasonably concluded that there would not be any severe impacts on highway safety as a result of the Plan and its allocations?	3
Flood risk.....	6
3.6 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment acknowledges that Hayling Island has only one access on and off the island, and the access itself is at risk of flooding. Is the allocation of more housing on Hayling Island therefore justified and can such flood risk to the sole access be appropriately managed in the future?	6
3.7 Is the delivery of any flood related infrastructure required on Hayling Island required to deliver the Plan and if so, how will this be delivered and funded?	7
3.8 Can the site areas identified in Policy KP3 all be developed without unacceptable flood risk?	7
3.9 The Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency (EA) states that the remaining flood risk associated with the sites set out within Policy KP3 would be managed by requiring a robust Flood Response Plan. Is this an appropriate means of managing any flood risk and does the EA consider that Policy KP3 remains unsound in this regard?	7
3.10 Is there sufficient evidence to be able to conclude that the proposals at West Beach, Eastoke Corner, Southwood Road and Beachlands meet the flood risk exception test (part b), as set out in Paragraph 160 of the NPPF? Further, does Paragraph 162 of the NPPF allow part b) of the test to be considered at the application stage?	8
3.11 How can the potential for flooding of the access road to Northney Marina be addressed? ...	8
3.12 A number of proposed changes to Policy KP3 associated with flood risk are suggested by the Council (Ref CD27a). In each case are these justified and necessary for soundness? ..	9
Policy KP3	10
3.13 Do the proposals in Policy KP3 represent an appropriate strategy when taking into account reasonable alternatives?	10
3.14 How will the regeneration projects set out in Policy KP3 be delivered and funded?	10
3.15 Is the Hayling Island Seafront Regeneration Analysis and Feasibility Study robust?	11
3.16 Can the site areas identified in Policy KP3 be developed without unacceptable impacts on sites of biodiversity importance?	11
3.17 Is the requirement for public art within criterion g. justified?	12
3.18 To be effective, does Policy KP3 need to refer to linking and enhancing the Hayling Billy Trail?	12
3.19 A number of proposed changes to the supporting text of Policy KP3 associated with the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy are suggested by the Council (Ref CD27a). In each case are these justified and necessary for soundness?	12
West Beach.....	13

3.20 Is West Beach subject to coastal erosion and could this affect development at the site? ...	13
3.21 Can development at West Beach be delivered without unacceptable impacts on the Sinah Common SSSI? Would the benefits of the development clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs, in accordance with national policy?	13
Northney Marina.....	14
3.22 Are the proposals at Northney Marina, particularly for residential development justified? ..	14
3.23 Given the location of Northney Marina in the AONB, what confidence can there be that any major development of the site would be justified by exceptional circumstances and that are within the public interest?	15
3.24 Is the statement at Paragraph 3.76 that ‘There is high potential for previously unidentified archaeological deposits’ justified?	15
3.25 Is the requirement of rr. justified?	16
3.26 Is the limitation of uses to residential and Class E at Northney Marina justified?	16
Eastoke Corner	17
3.27 Are the proposals at Eastoke Corner justified?	17
Southwood Road	18
3.28 Is the proposed development of the Nab car park justified?	18
3.29 To be effective, should Policy KP3 set out that the Nab Car Park is used as plant access for beach management activities and require replacement provision to be made if access would change?	18
Beachlands.....	19
3.30 Is the allocation of about 100 dwellings at Beachlands justified and does this figure maximise the potential of the site in accordance with the national policy?	19
3.31 Is the requirement in criterion cc to ensure there is no net loss in the number of jobs when compared to the current or last occupation of Beachlands justified and consistent with national policy?	19

Hayling Island transport assessment & addendum

3.1 Are the methodologies and modelling assumptions used for the assessments robust?

1. Yes. The Hayling Island Transport Assessment (HITA) (EB03) and its Addendum (EB04) are based on robust methodologies and modelling assumptions.
2. As well as commissioning experienced consultants Systra to undertake the highways modelling for the Hayling Island TA and its Addendum, the Council sought an independent review of the approach taken from consultants Campbell Reith. Their review was submitted as Appendix 2 to the Council's letter CR10. This confirms that:
 - Micro-simulation is a suitable and robust model for assessing the individual constraints that the Hayling Island network represents;
 - It allows tweaks to the model to accurately represent existing travel behaviour;
 - Robust and reliable traffic modelling depends on good data input. A lot of emphasis was placed on this in terms of data capture to inform the model. That data captured represent a suitable and robust dataset by which to inform the transport model.
3. The model development report published as part of the Hayling Island TA (EB03) also confirms that the model reflects the available count data very well in all periods. It meets the Web Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTAG)¹ and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)² criteria on all journey time paths and the model was calibrated to provide a realistic representation of queueing, routing and vehicle behaviour on the network as observed during the survey programme.
4. The Statement of Common Ground with Hampshire County Council (HCC) as the Local Highway Authority and the Council (SCG10) confirms that:
 - The use of a microsimulation model in the Hayling Island TA for assessing the impact of the local plan development on Hayling Island was appropriate and sufficient.
 - There was sufficient engagement and consultation with HCC conducted by Havant Borough Council (HBC) throughout the preparation of the HITA and its Addendum.
 - The methodology and process for undertaking the transport assessments is sound and has been agreed by the Local Highway Authority.

¹ www.gov.uk/guidance/transport-analysis-guidance-tag

² www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/

3.2 Is the approach of not having regard to the summer and weekend tourist traffic justified?

5. Yes. The model reflects a neutral, non-holiday weekday. This approach is standard practice in the transport planning industry for model network appraisal and development impact appraisal purposes.
6. While increased traffic on Hayling Island on sunny weekends and holiday periods is a long standing pattern of traffic on the island, which is fully acknowledged by the Council, this traffic arises mainly from visitors rather development on the Island. The Local Plan allocations have greater potential to have an impact on weekday AM and PM peak periods than on weekends or holiday periods. As the purpose of the HITA to test the impact of the Local Plan, the neutral weekday approach is considered to be the most appropriate for the purposes of this particular TA.

3.3 The assessments set out that journey times would increase as a result of the proposed package of mitigation, is this justified?

7. The Council acknowledges that the TA shows an increase in journey times on some of the Island's Strategic Routes of up to 90 seconds, with mitigation. While this is not ideal, journey time increases per se do not indicate an unacceptable impact on the highway network as defined by paragraphs 108-109 of the NPPF.
8. A number of combinations and iterations of mitigation measures have been tested and presented in the TA to understand what measures have, collectively, the most significant reduction in journey times over the key strategic routes, while also taking into consideration the needs of other road users.
9. The suggested increase in journey times on the strategic routes, while inconvenient to drivers, is not considered sufficient to trigger the 'severe' test in its own right.
10. Any increase in journey times must also be balanced against other benefits arising from the mitigation measures. EB04, Section 8 and Appendix E shows that while highway interventions may not improve journey times for motorised users, there are wider societal benefits in terms of reduced severance, safety, air quality and journey consistency. This is explored more fully in relation to safety in matter 3.5.
11. Overall, the effects on the network of the proposed Local Plan development, including journey times are justified and the Council considers them to be acceptable.

3.4 Can the package of highway mitigation be delivered, including having regard to any landowner constraints and how will it be funded?

12. Yes. The delivery of the mitigation package generally is addressed through Section 9 of the Hayling Island Transport Assessment Addendum (HITAA) (EB04).

13. With the exception of the West Lane junction upgrade, all of the mitigation measures can be delivered on highway land. A set of plans of the proposed mitigation measures can be found at Appendix 1 of this statement showing the relationship between the initial designs which are in the HITAA and the extent of highway land.
14. Delivery of the West Lane upgrade would necessitate use of third party land. The West Lane upgrade would bring a number of benefits including safety upgrades, and introducing a point where pedestrians and cyclists can safely cross the A3023. Nonetheless, the Highway Authority has been clear in the Statement of Common Ground (SCG10) that the identification of measures in a TA does not necessarily mean that these are the only way of mitigating a severe highway impact that development would otherwise cause. Indeed, the HITAA sets out a range of other non-highway measures that could be employed alongside the highway based ones.
15. As is set out in the HITAA, the Council proposes that the measures as a complete package would be funded by a mixture of Section 106 contributions, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and, where possible, external grant funding. Measures designed to mitigate the impact of development specifically would be funded through Section 106 and CIL. Some of the measures identified in the HITAA, in particular those around the Langstone Roundabout, are strategic in nature, and relevant to the Borough as a whole, rather than just Hayling Island. As such, it is entirely relevant that CIL be used to fund these, including that collected from elsewhere in the Borough.
16. Analysis took place during preparation of the HITA to ensure that it was possible for planned development to deliver the mitigation package. The HITAA notes in paragraph 1.7 that the predicted cost of the initial measures is £10.634m. Allowing for S106 contributions from new developments on the basis assumed in EB48 and 49, together with CIL, including from elsewhere in the Borough if necessary, will enable those measures to be viably delivered.
17. The HITA represents a wider strategy for the improvement of Hayling Island's transport network. However, in terms of the measures directly related to the mitigation of the development allocated in the Havant Borough Local Plan, it is possible for these to be delivered without external funding, relying solely on development.

3.5 Can it be reasonably concluded that there would not be any severe impacts on highway safety as a result of the Plan and its allocations?

18. The Hayling Island Transport Assessment (HITA) (EB03) and more particularly its addendum (EB04) considered the mitigation measures holistically – not just in terms of their impact on journey times, but safety was one of the explicit considerations. The work concluded that there would not be an impact on highway safety as a result of the plan and its allocations, and rather improvements in safety are likely.
19. Between 1 August 2013 and 31 July 2018, 40 of 76 accidents occurred at junctions, and therefore incidents at junctions were more common than those on the open stretches of the A3023 (EB03, paragraphs 8.21-8.23). In clarifying the mitigation package, safety was a key consideration in the HITA Addendum (EB04, paragraphs 4.80-4.90 and Appendix

E). Appendix E sets out a matrix highlighting the wider societal benefits of the package of mitigation measures. The section which relates to highway safety is replicated in figure 1 for ease. This summarises the impact that the mitigation package would have on highway safety. Whilst some measures do not have a discernible impact (●), most have a positive (✓) or very positive (✓✓) impact. None have a detrimental impact.

20. As the HITAA discusses the mitigation projects (paragraphs 4.10-4.50), the safety aspects of each are explored as part of the commentary. Several proposed measures involve features such as right turn aprons or revised junction layouts. Invariably, the initial designs (included at Appendix 1) offer the opportunity to include pedestrian and cycle crossing opportunities. Today, there are few opportunities to cross the A3023 at a controlled (traffic signalled) or uncontrolled (traffic island) point. The measures proposed would greatly increase the number of crossing points, with an improvement in safety.

Location		Scheme		Safety			
TA Map	Location	Brief Description	Report Reference	safer for motorists	safer for cyclists	safer for pedestrians	OVERALL SAFETY RATING
Various	Various	Bus stop lay-bys (Package M1A)	4.10 ff	✓	✓	✓	
Various	Various	Right turn lanes (Package M1A)	4.10 ff	✓✓	✓✓	✓	
A	A3023 (Manor Rd / Havant Rd / Church Rd junction)	Light controlled junction	4.16 ff	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	
B	West Lane north (Junction with A3023)	'Phase 1': Blocking of northern end of West Lane; new West Lane entrance further south	4.23 ff	✓✓	✓✓	○	
B	West Lane	'Phase 2': Link to avoid sharp bends	4.97	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	
C	A3023 / Northney Rd junction	Option a: dedicated left turn southbound to Northney	4.30	✓✓	✓✓	○	
C	A3023 / Northney Rd junction	Option b: option a plus Folded Right turns to and from Northney	4.31	✓✓	✓✓	○	
C	A3023/ Northney Rd junction	Option c: option a plus Light controlled junction	4.32	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	
C	A3023 / Northney Rd junction	Option d: Gyratory	4.33	○	○	○	
D	Woodbury Avenue/ Langstone Technology Park	Extend two lanes on A3023 southwards (TCF scheme)	4.38	✓	○	○	
D	Woodbury Avenue/ Langstone Technology Park	Ban right turns onto A3023; signal control	4.39	✓	✓	✓✓	
E	Langstone roundabout	Southbound bus lane extending to Woodbury Av bus stop	5	○	✓	○	
F	Park Road South	Widening approaches to / from roundabout	5	✓	○	○	
n/a	Length of A3023	Heavily Restricted Parking and Loading	6.48 ff	✓✓	✓✓	✓	
n/a	Length of A3023	Bus service improvements (frequency and / or cost)	6.3 ff	○	○	○	
n/a	Sea Front / Ferry Road	Shuttle from Beachlands to Ferry	6.12 ff	○	○	○	
n/a	Southbound from Langstone	Southbound Visitor Park & Ride with dedicated route	6.54 ff	○	○	○	
n/a	Length of A3023	Walking and cycling improvements in accordance with LCWIP	6.24	✓	✓✓	✓✓	
n/a	Length of A3023	A3023 consistent 30mph speed limit south of A27	4.47 ff	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	
n/a	Billy trail	Hard Surfacing	7	○	✓✓	✓✓	

Figure 1: Extra from Appendix E of the HITAA

Flood risk

3.6 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment acknowledges that Hayling Island has only one access on and off the island, and the access itself is at risk of flooding. Is the allocation of more housing on Hayling Island therefore justified and can such flood risk to the sole access be appropriately managed in the future?

21. Given the Borough's substantial housing need, the Council is in a position where areas with greater constraints must be considered, including sites on Hayling Island. The Council acknowledges and has taken full account of the flood risk to the access road and is satisfied that allocations for development on the island are justified.
22. The Council has prepared a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the Local Plan sites (EB33) and worked closely with the Environment Agency on this process. The Environment Agency, in their 2019 Regulation 19 response (R146 C01) expressed support for the flood risk evidence that has been produced to underpin the Local Plan, and that it 'demonstrates that there is a reasonable prospect of development on proposed allocation sites being safe from flooding during their lifetime, along with the identification of mitigation measures that may be required. We are therefore very supportive of this evidence and the way it has been used.' This support is confirmed in the Statement of Common Ground between the two bodies (SCG01).
23. The SFRA shows that, with the exception of the regeneration sites allocated under KP3 (see questions 3.8 – 3.12), the sites proposed for allocation on Hayling Island are in Flood Zone 1. As such, these sites are not themselves at risk of flooding, so residents would be safe from flooding in their homes during a flood event.
24. Nevertheless, the Council acknowledges the flood risk to the access road and has developed an Emergency Response Plan and Hayling Island Emergency Planning Framework³. The Council is satisfied that, with these plans in place, the risks associated with having just one access from on to the Island can be managed appropriately.
25. In addition, the Council is taking active steps to safeguard the A3023 from flooding through the Langstone Coastal Defence Scheme. Work on the scheme is well advanced, with the options appraisal completed, and the next step being the detailed designs for the leading options. The Council has also already committed significant funding through the Community Infrastructure Levy (see <https://coastalpartners.org.uk/project/langstone-coastal-defencescheme/> for full details).

³ www.havant.gov.uk/emergency-advice

3.7 Is the delivery of any flood related infrastructure required on Hayling Island required to deliver the Plan and if so, how will this be delivered and funded?

26. No. While flood risk management infrastructure is required for Hayling Island, and the Council is actively working to deliver those measures through a Coastal Defence Strategy for Hayling Island and the Langstone Coastal Defence Scheme (further information on both at EB30), these would be progressed with or without additional development on Hayling Island, and are not required specifically to deliver new development (see also answer to 3.6 above).

3.8 Can the site areas identified in Policy KP3 all be developed without unacceptable flood risk?

27. The Council has prepared a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the Local Plan sites (EB33). This assessment acknowledges that further work at a site specific level to support a planning application is required before the conclusion can be reached that they can be delivered without unacceptable risk. This is also made clear in the KP3 policy requirements.
28. However, at a strategic level, the SFRA has concluded that there is a reasonable prospect that the sites within KP3 can be delivered safely through a combination of off-site strategic, on-site and adjacent off-site measures. This is considered sufficient at the Local Plan level, especially when considering that there are wider sustainability benefits in allocating the sites as part of a regeneration strategy for Hayling Seafront (part a of the exception test). The purpose of this allocation is to provide regeneration and new facilities for the Hayling Seafront. This cannot take place anywhere but Hayling Seafront, all of which is at risk of flooding.

3.9 The Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency (EA) states that the remaining flood risk associated with the sites set out within Policy KP3 would be managed by requiring a robust Flood Response Plan. Is this an appropriate means of managing any flood risk and does the EA consider that Policy KP3 remains unsound in this regard?

29. In their 2019 Regulation 19 response (R146 C04) and the subsequent Statement of Common Ground with the Council (SCG01), the Environment Agency did identify a soundness issue in relation to KP3, but this related to wording in the policy, rather than reliance on a Flood Response Plan per se. Wording changes have been agreed between the two parties to address the soundness concern raised and have been proposed as a change to the Plan through CD27a (see also question 3.12 below).
30. The SFRA (EB33) and the proposed wording of Policy KP3 do indicate that Flood Warning & Evacuation Plans will be required for the site allocations within KP3. Alongside this, the SFRA indicates that there is a reasonable prospect that a combination of off-site strategic, on-site and adjacent off-site measures could make development safe at these sites. The

exact package will need to be confirmed at application stage, and permission will only be granted if the safety of the development has been robustly demonstrated.

3.10 Is there sufficient evidence to be able to conclude that the proposals at West Beach, Eastoke Corner, Southwood Road and Beachlands meet the flood risk exception test (part b), as set out in Paragraph 160 of the NPPF? Further, does Paragraph 162 of the NPPF allow part b) of the test to be considered at the application stage?

31. The Sites SFRA (EB22) has concluded that there is a reasonable prospect that these sites can be made safe. The Council considers that this is sufficient to pass part b of the exception test (paragraph 160 NPPF) at the plan-making level. Paragraph 162 then allows for the exception test to be re-applied at the application stage 'if relevant aspects of the proposal had not been considered when the test was applied at the plan-making stage, or if more recent information about existing or potential flood risk should be taken into account.' The Council considers that at the application stage additional factors will come into play, such as the detailed design of development proposals, as well as the bespoke package of proposed flood management measures, which are not known at this stage. Permission for development will only be granted if the applicant can demonstrate that both parts of the exception test are met.

3.11 How can the potential for flooding of the access road to Northney Marina be addressed?

32. Substantial information has been provided to accompany representations, made during the plan making process, by the owner and operator of the marinas (Marina Developments Limited (MDL) (R135)). This includes a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The Council has also assessed the site as part of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (EB33, p.46). A prior approval application was submitted in 2017 for the change of use of The Rotunda (now known as The Round House) from class B1(a) office use to C3 residential use) (reference: APP/17/01042) and this included a detailed site specific FRA.
33. The above FRAs/SFRA all conclude that the road network providing access to the site is at risk of flooding from the present day 1 in 200m year event. This will prevent emergency vehicles accessing the site in times of flood. As flooding would be predictable many days in advance of the event and the duration of flooding on the access road is likely to be for less than 24 hours, it is proposed to mitigate this risk with a robust Flood Risk Management Plan. Criterion pp. viii of Policy KP3 requires a Flood Risk Assessment and Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan to be submitted to support a planning application.
34. The above FRAs conclude that the Flood Risk Management Plan will need to be prepared and linked to the Environment Agency's Flood Warning Service. The plan will provide a framework for residents to assess their own vulnerability to flooding and develop a strategy based on either evacuating the site in advance or seeking refuge within their dwelling.
35. In the FRA accompanying the landowner's representations, it is also proposed (para 3.5.6) that a specific jetty will be provided for the use of RNLI and other emergency rescue craft,

and that the jetty would be connected to the main development by means of an access way set above the design level.

36. The Council therefore considers that it is possible to pass the exception test and ensure that the development will be safe, notwithstanding the flood risk associated with the access road.

3.12 A number of proposed changes to Policy KP3 associated with flood risk are suggested by the Council (Ref CD27a). In each case are these justified and necessary for soundness?

37. The changes are proposed as a result of changes requested by the Environment Agency (see R146 C04, and SCG10) to make the plan sound. The Council is content with these changes and recommends the changes as Main Modifications to the Inspectors. See also question 3.9 above.

Policy KP3

3.13 Do the proposals in Policy KP3 represent an appropriate strategy when taking into account reasonable alternatives?

38. Yes. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (CD10) (p.233) assesses the package of development sites within Policy KP3, and also the proposed sites individually later in the document. The sites proposed to be allocated under Policy KP3 are all included within the Council's Regeneration Strategy (EB34) and the Hayling Island Seafront Regeneration Analysis and Feasibility Study (EB35) (with the exception of proposals for Northney Marina).
39. Given the limited options to accommodate development available to the Council, the SA (CD10) did not assess alternative regeneration proposals for Hayling Island as it considers that there are not any realistic alternatives that would also meet the tests for soundness in the NPPF (para 35). The Council considers that it would be unnecessary and potentially misleading to have assessed theoretical alternatives that were not included in the Regeneration Strategy. The choice that is open to the Council is whether to include the proposals within the Regeneration Strategy within the Local Plan, or not to include them.
40. The Hayling Island Seafront Regeneration Analysis and Feasibility Study (EB35) includes a Sustainability Options Appraisal at Appendix H (p.124). This considers three alternative proposals:
- The proposals outlined in the report (recommended option)
 - Maintenance and minimal investment in existing facilities (maintaining the status quo)
 - Do nothing (assumes Local Plan is not adopted).
41. The appraisal concludes that the proposals outlined in the report (i.e. the recommended option which has been included in the Local Plan) make a positive contribution to each of the sustainability appraisal objectives, whereas options two and three are assessed as having a negative, possibly negative or uncertain contribution to all sustainability objectives.

3.14 How will the regeneration projects set out in Policy KP3 be delivered and funded?

42. A key part of the Council's Regeneration Strategy (EB34) is the regeneration and development of Hayling Island seafront. This is described in more detail on p17 of the strategy.

43. Nonetheless, one of the first parts of implementing this strategy has been the disposal of the Brockhampton West Site⁴ (Policy C10) for employment development⁵.
44. This asset disposal has created a capital receipt, the forward funding of the Regeneration Strategy's implementation was considered, with Resolution 6 setting out "Cabinet recommends that the capital receipt raised be earmarked for future regeneration in the Borough".
45. The remaining early implementation projects of the Regeneration Strategy are on Hayling Island. The capital receipt provides the opportunity to fund work required to bring these schemes to market to take place.
46. Following the disposal of further assets at Southwood Road and Eastoke Corner (north) (Policy KP3), further investment can take place into the Regeneration Programme to move forward the remaining projects on Hayling Island seafront (Policy KP3). In relation to the Beachlands site, this will need to take place in collaboration with the other landowners on the site. Discussions have already taken place in relation to this. Northney Marina is wholly owned by the private sector and is expected to come forward in due course as per the housing trajectory in the Strategy Topic Paper (TP01).

3.15 Is the Hayling Island Seafront Regeneration Analysis and Feasibility Study robust?

47. Yes. It (EB35) provides a robust assessment of tourism and visitor activity on Hayling Island, now and into the future. The report includes a comprehensive impact assessment of the development sites to inform an achievable vision for the seafront's regeneration.

3.16 Can the site areas identified in Policy KP3 be developed without unacceptable impacts on sites of biodiversity importance?

48. Yes. All development sites with policy KP3 would need to undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment to ensure no likely significant effect occurs from development on any internationally designated sites. This requirement ensures that mitigation would be required if there is a likely significant effect. Planning permission would therefore only be granted if the mitigation fully addresses that effect.
49. Any development proposals would need to meet the requirements set out in Policies E14, E15, E16, EX1 and E17 which aim to protect, enhance and conserve the environment, and include specific criteria which would have to be met. It is worth noting that Policy E14 specifically requires development to provide biodiversity net-gain in line with the emerging Environmental Bill.

⁴ <https://havant.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=128&MID=11246#AI17311>

⁵ This has subsequently been sold to a third party and a planning application for the development of commercial premises is currently being considered (APP/21/00189)

3.17 Is the requirement for public art within criterion g. justified?

50. Yes. The allocation of Beachlands is a significant regeneration site as set out in the Hayling Island Seafront Regeneration Analysis and Feasibility Study (EB35). The requirement for public art has been included because Beachlands provides the main gateway and destination on the seafront (Appendix D, paragraph 2.5.3 of EB35).

3.18 To be effective, does Policy KP3 need to refer to linking and enhancing the Hayling Billy Trail?

51. No. The focus of KP3 is on specific regeneration sites on Hayling Island. The policy does not preclude enhancements to the Billy Trail, and indeed supports convenient routes by sustainable modes.
52. While the Council has not specifically safeguarded the Billy Trail in the Local Plan, it forms part of package of the Hayling Island Transport Assessment, which is referred to in Policy IN2 at criterion h. In addition, it is included in both the draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (EB08) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (EB50).
53. If it is considered necessary to safeguard the Billy Trail more explicitly through the Plan, it is suggested that IN2 would be the appropriate policy, as opposed to a reference in Policy KP3.

3.19 A number of proposed changes to the supporting text of Policy KP3 associated with the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy are suggested by the Council (Ref CD27a). In each case are these justified and necessary for soundness?

54. Yes. The Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy is based on survey data, which is regularly updated, particularly the classification of sites.
55. As such, the Council proposed changes in supporting text in relation to site classification to ensure the policy remains effective through the lifetime of the plan.

West Beach

3.20 Is West Beach subject to coastal erosion and could this affect development at the site?

- 56. Development will only be acceptable when the risk of coastal erosion is mitigated. This is addressed under criterion ll., of the policy which requires development proposals to take the Coastal Change Management Area into account in line with Policy E4.
- 57. The Council recognises that West Beach is subject to coastal erosion, but with the provision of sound coastal defence measures and funding from development the risk of coastal erosion can be managed.
- 58. The Council propose a modification (CD27b) to add an additional criterion to the policy for any proposed development to take account of the emerging Hayling Island Coastal Management Strategy and the Shoreline Management Plan (EB29).

3.21 Can development at West Beach be delivered without unacceptable impacts on the Sinah Common SSSI? Would the benefits of the development clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs, in accordance with national policy?

- 59. Yes, Policy KP3 requires development under criterion jj. to protect the special flora and fauna of the Sinah Common SSSI, and where possible enhance it through a costed Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan. Also, criterion kk. requires development to carry out a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to inform any package and avoidance mitigation measures in line with Policy E17. All criteria of the policy including those mentioned above would need to be met in order for permission to be granted.
- 60. The Council is having proactive discussions with Natural England about the detail that is required as part of any planning application to ensure that any likely significant impact from the development is mitigated.
- 61. Overall, the Council considers that development at West Beach could provide a Costed Habitat Management and Monitoring Scheme which will mitigate the harm from development on the SSSI and protect and enhance the international designated sites. Development will also provide income which can be used to implement it and maintain the SSSI in the future.

Northney Marina

3.22 Are the proposals at Northney Marina, particularly for residential development justified?

62. Yes. The Council has limited options for land to allocate to meet housing needs. Whilst the Council does not propose allocating land for major development on a greenfield site in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the proposed allocation is on a brownfield site and would support the future viability of both Northney and Sparkes Marinas.
63. While the Sustainability Appraisal (CD10) (p250) notes that the site was assessed having a 'negative effect' against objectives 5 and 7, it is considered possible to overcome these through design and mitigation.
64. Substantial information has been provided to accompany representations, made during the plan making process, by the owners and operators of the marinas (Marina Developments Limited (MDL) (R135)). The Council considers that the proposed allocation would facilitate enhancement of the marina and boatyard facilities at Northney Marina by allowing for their redevelopment and refurbishment, which would be unlikely without the enabling residential development to fund the investment.
65. The Council acknowledges the importance of marina and boatyard facilities to the local economy, through the provision of direct marine-related employment and indirect tourism benefits. The allocation would enable investment in the existing facilities at Northney, provide a further 1,000 sqm of employment floorspace and provide funds which could repair the sea wall at Sparkes Marina in the southeast of Hayling Island.
66. The Council considers that there is the potential to achieve an improvement to the appearance of the site in the landscape and that the allocation for major development is compatible with the AONB status of the land. It should be noted that that the majority of the site is currently used for a combination of boat storage and car parking with some supporting commercial uses.
67. MDL has submitted an illustrative masterplan to accompany representations (R135). This shows that the existing vegetation would be complemented with substantial planting to screen both the development and existing buildings. MDL has also submitted a Landscape and Visual Appraisal, based on the illustrative masterplan, to accompany representations. Policy KP3 includes a specific criterion (pp. i.) that requires a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal to support a planning application.
68. The Council considers that on the basis of the evidence submitted by MDL, the allocation at Northney Marina is an appropriate strategy that will provide 40 dwellings, 1,000 sqm of employment floorspace, secure investment in marina facilities and provide green infrastructure and landscaping.

3.23 Given the location of Northney Marina in the AONB, what confidence can there be that any major development of the site would be justified by exceptional circumstances and that are within the public interest?

69. Yes, the Council has confidence that the site would be justified by exceptional circumstances. This is because the development would help retain existing employment at Northney and Sparkes Marinas (supporting the local marine and tourist economies), and provide new employment floorspace and 40 additional dwellings, the latter of which would contribute towards meeting the Borough's housing need. The Sustainability Appraisal (CD10) (p.242) notes a strong positive effect against two sustainability objectives and a positive effect against a further three sustainability objectives.
70. The exceptional circumstances that would apply are related to the fact that the site is currently a brownfield site, with large areas of hardstanding and buildings that are visually conspicuous in the landscape.
71. The Sustainability Appraisal (CD10) (p246) notes that, "the site is previously developed land comprising commercial buildings and operations, some of which are dated and do not contribute to the appearance of the AONB". The Sustainability Appraisal goes on to note, "while the sites location within the Chichester Harbour AONB is acknowledged, it is considered likely that the design and layout of built form can mitigate impacts on, and possibly enhance, the landscape providing that development accords with the provisions of the policy and Chichester Harbour AONB SPD".
72. On this basis, the Council considers that it is likely that development would be able to take place without any detriment to the visual appearance of the site in the AONB landscape, and with the potential to secure an improvement to its visual appearance, through extensive planting to screen both new and existing development.

3.24 Is the statement at Paragraph 3.76 that 'There is high potential for previously unidentified archaeological deposits' justified?

73. Yes, initial screening work (EB44) carried out by the Council's Archaeologist noted that the site has high archaeological potential. This conclusion was drawn because the site sits on Duckard Point which is associated with the discovery of Bronze Age cremation and bronze tools. It seems likely that this was a significant location at the time and the site therefore has high archaeological potential. However, as the site is previously developed land, any archaeological potential may have been compromised to some degree.
74. It is noted that the landowner has commissioned an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment which has concluded that "archaeology is unlikely to be present as an overriding constraint' and that 'due to the development of Northney Marina and the processes involved in its construction, it is likely that the majority of further archaeological deposits will have been removed. Some archaeological remains may still be present within the study site but are likely to be fragmentary and of little archaeological context. As such a low archaeological potential has been determined for all archaeological periods".

75. Given the nature of previous archaeological discoveries in the vicinity of the site there is still high archaeological potential, although the previous construction activities have led the Council to conclude that the archaeological significance is moderate and can be mitigated.
76. Notwithstanding the differences between the Council's and landowners' conclusions on the archaeological potential of the site, the landowner is not seeking to change the requirement in Policy KP3 that a Heritage Impact Assessment be submitted to support a planning application.

3.25 Is the requirement of rr. justified?

77. Yes, the Council considers that the specific circumstances of the two marinas being within the same ownership and the proposal by MDL that enabling development at Northney Marina could fund investment in the sea wall repairs at Sparkes Marina have contributed to its view that the proposed development would be in the public interest.
78. The Council considers that criterion rr. of Policy KP3 represents an appropriate strategy that is justified by the evidence that has been submitted by the site promoter.

3.26 Is the limitation of uses to residential and Class E at Northney Marina justified?

79. Yes, the Council considers that residential use is appropriate due to the need to allocate land to meet housing need, and that this development would enable investment in marina facilities and the provision of additional employment floorspace. The employment floorspace would need to be for a use compatible with the adjoining residential uses and hence employment uses within Class E would be appropriate, rather than those within Class B2 or B8.
80. The Council would also want to secure incidental uses that would support the marina operation and the limitation to Class E would allow a shop and/or a restaurant/café. It should be noted that Policy KP3 requires the employment, commercial and service uses to support the function and operation of the marina.

Eastoke Corner

3.27 Are the proposals at Eastoke Corner justified?

81. Yes, due to the need to find sites to allocate to meet housing need and as part of the Regeneration Strategy for Havant Borough (EB34) which seeks to drive economic and social regeneration.
82. The Regeneration Strategy (EB34) aims to diversify the housing market by developing Council owned sites (including on Hayling Seafront) for homes that increase densities, are aimed at a new demographic and provide new products on the market. This will, in turn, enable the generation of capital receipts which the Council can reinvest in the key regeneration areas. Hayling Seafront is a phase 1 priority area in the Regeneration Strategy and as a Council owned site offers the opportunity to bring forward development in the short term and generate income to facilitate more complex longer term projects.
83. Development at Eastoke will contribute to the improvement in the urban environment on Hayling Island through some limited residential development together with retail, leisure and food and drink uses that will encourage activity at this part of the seafront all year round and into the evening. The provision of new leisure and retail facilities will aid and support the existing retail and cafes/restaurants at Eastoke by creating a stronger offer as a destination for this part of the seafront.
84. Eastoke is one of three interconnected sites – West Beach, Beachlands and Eastoke. Criteria within Policy KP3 aim to facilitate linkages between the sites through securing safe and convenient routes by foot, cycle, public transport or miniature railway and the provision of visitor information/wayfinding. Public realm improvements will enhance connection between the site and the beach.
85. The focus on a new leisure offer at Eastoke over Beachlands will enable delivery of modern leisure facilities with sufficient critical mass to be sustainable, rather than spread across both sites. It will also utilise the seafront location and improve the visual appearance of the built environment through the provision of new buildings and attractions.
86. It is considered that the proposals for Eastoke Corner will enable the Council to meet wider regeneration objectives: to deliver a positive contribution to the visitor economy of Hayling Island and to help transform the seafront by enhancing the quality and range of attractions and improving the urban design and public realm.

Southwood Road

3.28 Is the proposed development of the Nab car park justified?

- 87. Yes, for the same reasons as Eastoke Corner (above) regarding regeneration.
- 88. The existing Nab car park is a relatively underused car park located some distance away from the main seafront tourist attractions surrounded by existing residential development. Given the residential character of this part of the seafront, and the surrounding residential uses, redevelopment of the car park for residential use is considered appropriate.

3.29 To be effective, should Policy KP3 set out that the Nab Car Park is used as plant access for beach management activities and require replacement provision to be made if access would change?

- 89. No, Coastal Partners, the organisation that manages beach management activities on behalf of Havant Borough Council, has confirmed that it does not use the Nab Car Park for coastal management beach access and there would therefore be no change with respect to the current access arrangements.

Beachlands

3.30 Is the allocation of about 100 dwellings at Beachlands justified and does this figure maximise the potential of the site in accordance with the national policy?

90. Yes. This location would be expected to provide for a minimum of 40 dwellings per hectare (dph)) as the site lies outside of any of the Town and District Centres and opportunity areas as defined by Policy H3.
91. Based on a net developable area of 2.2 hectares, a 100 unit scheme would provide a density of 45.5 dph. The identified site capacity for the allocation takes account of the initial design work undertaken by the site promoter which appears to be deliverable without prejudice to any subsequent planning application (in line with the Council's approach to site yields set out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) (EB42, para 3.3)).
92. In addition, it should be noted that the site capacity identified by the allocation does not represent a ceiling to the quantum of development, and all allocations in the submitted Plan are set as 'about' reflecting the fact that different numbers of homes could be achieved depending on the proposed development form (see CD01, para 1.10).

3.31 Is the requirement in criterion cc to ensure there is no net loss in the number of jobs when compared to the current or last occupation of Beachlands justified and consistent with national policy?

93. Yes. The requirement is similar to criterion b. of Policy C1 which seeks to ensure the proposed redevelopment would provide new full time equivalent jobs of a similar number and quality when comparing the current or last occupation of the site. The allocation is for a mixed use development of about 100 dwellings, leisure, retail, food and drink uses, and so there would be ample opportunity to re-provide jobs as part of the redevelopment.
94. Whilst the requirement would normally apply to traditional employment uses, the Beachlands site itself does provide employment, comprising a tourist office, funfair and food outlets and amusements. According to the Hayling Island Seafront Regeneration Feasibility Study (EB35), the local tourism sector supports 4,400 jobs with good quality employment being critical to attracting a younger generation of families to settle on the island.
95. As such, the requirement is considered to be consistent with national policy in terms of encouraging sustainable economic growth (NPPF, para 81), having regard to the Council's objectives to focus business growth and inward investment on key sectors, including food and accommodation (EB34, page 12).

