

APP/X1735/W/20/3259067: Bedhampton Heritage Alliance

Update re Statement of Common Ground 22.12.20.

The appellants have refused to agree to the draft BHA prepared and suggest that BHA see what can be agreed and is disagreed in their exchange with Havant Borough Council (HBC). This is that response. At the time of writing, no contact has yet been made by HBC on this issue.

Using the same paragraph numbers as Luken Beck:

Para 2.1. BHA accepts that the site does not lie within an area *designated* for its heritage importance but believe the site to have special historic interest of *non-designated* importance. {BHA supported the recommendation of the heritage consultant who carried out the original review but Havant Borough Council did not follow this.}

Para 3.2. BHA does not agree that the layout has been designed to **fully accommodate** Narrow Marsh Lane.

Para 5.1. BHA notes that in including the Pre-submission Local Plan 2036 there is no reference to the number of unresolved challenges to the soundness of the Draft based upon the inclusion of Policy H20.

Para 6.1. BHA notes that there can be other than technical grounds on which to dismiss the appeal. BHA believes that material harm will arise to the amenities of existing residents to justify dismissal of the appeal.

Para 6.2. BHA notes the disagreement and believes that little weight can be given to the emerging plan. (See also para 7.2).

Para 6.3. BHA agrees with HBC that the development does not contribute positively towards environmental objectives.

Para 7.3 & 7.4. BHA agrees with the HBC position.

In addition: It appears likely that there will be **no** agreement with the appellant concerning

- (i) The risk assessment related to the dangers on the bends,
- (ii) The impact upon The Elms (Grade II*).
- (iii) The status and width of Narrow Marsh Lane.

BHA previously commented upon the application of 2 planning conditions with reasoning. This is repeated here for ease of reference. BHA does not feel qualified to suggest suitable wording

Conditions:

Regarding possible conditions, **if** the appeal were allowed, the Alliance would wish to see two related matters set out below brought under control either by enforceable planning condition or a legal agreement introduced for the purpose and reasons set out below.

- A. The proposals are based upon and rely on the introduction of screen planting on 3 sides and the retention of the residual hedging along the Lower Road frontage. The management of these would become the responsibility of a management company run by volunteers who may be pressured by occupiers to reduce costs and the levels of screening or its removal to open up views from the adjacent dwellings, which would increase the urban intrusiveness of the development. This needs to be prevented.
- B. The proposed layout places the rear of several properties to face east, south and west around the perimeter of the development. To overcome the relative small size of the dwellings, residents may seek use permitted development (PD) rights to increase the size of their property and take advantage of sunlight and/or views of the surrounding landscape especially towards Langstone Harbour. Until screen planting reaches maturity, this will result in decades of intrusive visual clutter with a variety of dormers, balconies and two storey extensions seen in views from the surrounding footpaths, highway network and railway. PD rights should be removed from these properties.