

Appendices: Bedhampton Heritage Alliance.

1. 'The voice of the public'. Key representations on the application.
2. Extract from Decision Notice APP/19/01083.
3. Extract from Inspector's Report 7.7.2014 on current Local Plan.
4. Deputation to Development Management Committee (DMC) 23.1.20 with committee minute and deputation on 5.3.20. and committee minute.
5. Extracts from the Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology Report.
6. Notes of a meeting held on 13th August 2018 at HBC.
7. (a) Extracts from Murphy Associates Final Report.
(b) Extract of report to Council 25.9.19.
(c) Deputation by BHA to Council 25.9.19 on Conservation Area Review.
(d) Deputation by Ward Councillor Ed Rees to Council on Conservation Area Review.
8. (a) Email from Dr Dominic Fontana FRGS FSA.
(b) Letter from Mrs Margaret Gray 14.11.20.
9. Extracts from Drainage Strategy Drawing reference location and size of Narrow Marsh Lane.
10. Position statement regarding probability of accidents at Lower Road bends.
11. Junction Assessment prepared by Hampshire County Council to change from mini roundabout at Bedhampton Road/Bedhampton Hill Road to traffic lights.
12. Extract from English Heritage comments on the Draft Local Plan.
13. Letter from Richard Pratt 17.11.20 on behalf of the Manor Trust.
14. Letter from Dr Richard Jones MBBS MSc FRCP regarding impact upon health and welfare.

APP/X1735/W/20/3259067 Land at Lower Road Havant

Appendix 1.

Evidence by Bedhampton Heritage Alliance

The voice of the public.

From the many representations (441 pages) made on application APP/19/00427, for ease of reference, the list below (158 pages) has been selected from those posted on the Borough Council web site to identify those that the Alliance consider best represent the range of concerns and objections. It is not intended to examine any of these at the Inquiry but simply to give the Inspector a guide and focus to this background material.

HBC Reference

Topic(s) raised

REPS1:

pp 1-5, Conservation Area boundary, accessibility, setting, wildlife, Local Plan, protect for future, access and road safety, shelterbelt, Narrow Marsh Lane, public amenity, Allocations Inspector's decision, heritage protection, Bechstein's Bats, Case histories, consistency in decisions.

pp 9-10, traffic, housing provision, errors, shared streets, safety, 'green' issues.

pp 11-13, pedestrian safety, landscape impact, traffic nature and growth, conservation review.

pp 14-15, conservation review and heritage assets.

pp 105-107, highway capacity, character, The Elms and safety, wide appreciation. HBC policy agenda.

REPS2A:

pp 8-11, Highway capacity and safety.

pp 27-28 FoE biodiversity.

pp 29-30. CPRE need v conservation, protected sites, archaeology, character, environmental capacity of area.

REPS2B:

pp 2-4, Soundness.

pp 6-7, Soundness.

pp 10-12, Soundness.

pp 14-15, Soundness.

pp 19-20, Soundness.

pp 23-24, Soundness.

pp 26-31, Soundness, sustainability appraisal.

pp 34-36, Soundness.

REPS2C

All, Conservation Area Review, heritage, entry/exit experiences.

REPS2D:

pp 6-20 Soundness of the Draft Local Plan and Sustainability Appraisal.

REPS2E:

pp 4-10 Heritage protection, Petition, Conservation Area Review, Bats, safety, alternative footpaths, house type, Narrow Marsh Lane, hedgerow and character, Lower Road junction, parking provision, safety on bends, public transport, miscalculation, main road access, previous decision, environmental impacts, screening, sustainable location, wildlife, surrounding development impact.

pp 23-33. Dangers, Current Local Plan, mixed use of carriageway, Traffic analysis, landscape character, coastal zone, shared streets.

REPS2F:

pp 6-9 mini roundabout, hedgerow, sunken lane character, inadequate up to date material for analysis.

pp 12-30. Heritage Statement, Design and Access Statement Part 1 & 2, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, L-P Archaeology. Statement of Community Involvement: Deputation to Development Consultation Forum on initial proposal.

REPS2G:

p 6, Narrow Marsh Lane maps.

p 8 Tithe map.

p13. Aerial photographs on Narrow Marsh Lane.

REPS2H:

pp 9-21. Traffic and Highways Analysis.

REPS2I:

pp 1-4, General, Off site and on site issues.

pp 5-12 Presumption against development, mitigation equates with harm, traffic growth implications, pedestrian options, safety, landscape impact and lack of integration, Narrow Marsh Lane size, layout.

pp 27-31. Strategy for Conservation Area, protection of designated and non designated assets.

REPS2J:

pp 23-32. Implications of Local Plan policies in relation to proposals.

Havant

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire PO9 2AX

T 023 9247 4174
F 023 9249 8031

www.havant.gov.uk

To:
Ms White
Henry Adams LLP
Rowan House
Baffins Lane
Chichester PO19 1UA

For: Mr Goddard

**The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England)
Order 2015
Refusal of Planning Permission**

Application Number: APP/19/01083

Site Address: Land adjacent Old Manor Farm, 15 Lower Road, Havant

Proposal: Retrospective change of use of existing building from B8 to mixed use of B1/B2/B8 and retention of six external storage bays; and proposed change of use of agricultural land with associated hardsurfacing to form circulation and loading area.

Further to your application received on 04 November 2019, which was valid from 04 December 2019, Havant Borough Council, as Local Planning Authority, **Refuses Planning Permission** for the above proposal.

The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse planning permission are:

- 1 The proposal represents development in a non-urban area beyond the identified settlement policy boundary for which there is no overriding justification. The exception criteria are not met and therefore the proposal is considered contrary to policy CS17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, policy AL2 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, emerging policy E3 of the Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed development is immediately adjacent to a designated heritage asset (Old Bedhampton Conservation Area) and the application fails to assess the significance of this asset, including the contribution made by its setting, and the impact that the development will have on the designated heritage asset as advised by paragraph 189 of the NPPF. It is considered that the change of use, including its associated hard surfacing, results in an industrialisation of the site, resulting in an erosion of the rural character and harmful to the significance of the adjacent designated heritage asset, failing to enhance or preserve the heritage asset. It is therefore considered contrary to policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, emerging policy E13 of the Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036, and the National Planning Policy Framework.



Report to Havant Borough Council

by Sue Turner

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date: 7th July 2014

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 (AS AMENDED) SECTION 20

REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO HAVANT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN (ALLOCATIONS)

Document submitted for examination on 20 December 2013

Examination hearings held between 29 April and 1 May 2014

File Ref: PINS/X1735/429/6

trips, and the likelihood that the Council would consider favourably an application for a hotel, restaurant and filling station on the site within the Emsworth urban area boundary.

67. However as concluded in section 3 above there is no need for additional employment land to be allocated. Furthermore whilst discussions have commenced, there is no certainty that vehicular access to serve employment use of the site can be secured. On this basis, whilst some employment development may be appropriate, there is no justification for the allocation of this site in the Plan.

Emsworth – Site UE39: Land North of Long Copse Lane

68. This site was identified in the 2012 SHLAA and was considered suitable for housing subject to highway improvements to provide vehicular access. The landowner contends that the necessary improvements can be secured through a section 278 agreement and satisfactory access provided. In addition it is argued that all the potential adverse effects identified in the 2012 Sustainability Appraisal Addendum (SAA), which included appraisal results for this site, can be overcome.
69. I note that the SAA incorrectly identifies the site as being within Landscape Character Area (LCA) 23 rather than LCA21. However it is clear that regardless of this inaccuracy the SAA recognises the open character of the site, its contribution to the landscape and its location within an undeveloped gap. Furthermore whilst planning permission has been granted for housing development to the west and east of the site, the environmental, ecological and archaeological issues raised in the SAA support the Council's conclusion that this site is less sustainable than the allocated sites in Emsworth.

Havant – UE30: Land South of Lower Road, Bedhampton

70. The evidence leading to non-allocation of this site is confused and fragmented. It was identified in the SHLAA as a potential housing site and is recommended for development in the Gaps review. SA identified loss of agricultural land as a strong adverse effect, as well as noting adverse effects on the landscape, biodiversity, the adjacent conservation area and features of archaeological importance. However the site continued to feature in SHLAAs from 2010 to 2013 albeit the 2013 SHLAA, whilst retaining an estimate of 250 dwellings, indicated that access through the conservation area could limit large scale residential development. It was then discounted because the cumulative adverse effects would not be outweighed by a contribution of only 15 dwellings, with no explanation of the reduction to 15 dwellings.
71. The landowners have submitted a winter waterfowl survey undertaken between November 2013 and March 2014 which shows no use of the open fields by waterfowl. In addition they contest the Council's view that the site is grade 1 agricultural land. They argue that the site is capable of accommodating 50 dwellings.
72. Some of the adverse effects identified in SA can be overcome whilst others, such as the site's biodiversity and the grading of the land, remain matters of disagreement between the Council and the landowner. However it is clear that the sites proximity to Old Bedhampton Conservation Area through which it

would be accessed is a strong factor weighing against development. This, together with uncertainty of impact on biodiversity and agricultural land, justify the non-allocation of this site.

Hayling Island – UE47: Tournerbury Farm

73. This site is identified in the SHLAA but has not been allocated as it has a number of uncertainties relating to flood risk, biodiversity and designated sites. The landowner contends that all of these matters can be overcome. However the uncertainty that remains regarding whether or not these sensitive issues can be satisfactorily addressed is sufficient to justify non-allocation.

Hayling Island – UE17: Land at Rook Farm/Hayling Island – UE35: Land North of Rook Farm

74. These sites are adjacent to each other and in the same ownership. The Council acknowledges that it had earlier supported the allocation of UE35, but justifies its omission from the Plan on the grounds it would lead to the delivery of too much housing on Hayling Island as well as their classification as being "uncertain" for Brent Geese and waders through Policy DM23.
75. The landowner has objected to the omission of these sites from the Plan on the grounds that additional housing is needed on Hayling Island and that the classification under Policy DM23 is not supported by robust evidence. However the housing restraint on Hayling Island is justified by evidence and consistent with distribution of housing set out in the CS. The classification of these sites under Policy DM23 is supported by evidence and whilst it does not preclude development, it is a matter that would need to be addressed through further study and potentially through mitigation in any future plans for development.

Sites that have not been subject to sustainability appraisal or consultation

76. Havant Magistrates Court, land at Avenue Road, Hayling Island and Northney Marina have all been promoted as suitable for housing or mixed use development. However the fact that they have been put forward at a late stage in the Plan preparation process means that they have not been taken through the appropriate legal processes that would enable them to be allocated. On this basis their allocation in this Plan would not be sound.

Issue 6 – Are the development management policies soundly based and do they build on the CS policies to complete the suite of policies needed to meet the requirements of the NPPF?

Should Policy DM17 provide for the effect of mitigation costs on viability be taken into account when considering planning applications for development on contaminated land?

77. The representation proposing this change refers to a specific site which is not allocated in the Plan but has a former B2 use and is protected for employment use under CS Policy DM3. It is argued that this Policy should address the issue of viability when decontamination or mitigation is required in order to develop a site. This would be consistent with Paragraph 173 of the NPPF which provides for such matters to be taken into account when considering development requirements. However this objective is reflected in CS Policy CS21 which,

APPENDIX 4.

Deputation re APP/19/00427 Lower Road January 23rd 2020.

Good evening members.

Sections underlined in red are not included in the minutes.

I have lived in Bedhampton for 40 years. I speak on behalf of the Bedhampton Heritage Alliance. At Council in September, I confirmed we wished to work with you to fulfil our mutual responsibility as guardians of our heritage assets.

Two years ago a petition by 1,760 residents to remove this site from the Draft Plan was presented. It has yet to be considered.

This site allocation raised 22 material issues regarding the soundness of the Draft Plan. In the light of these many challenges you cannot attach weight to the draft before the EiP.

The allocation is based upon a flawed Landscape Report, outdated Conservation Area Guidance and no transport assessment or archaeological appraisal.

The Draft Plan appraisal failed to identify (i) the shelterbelt as an alien feature (ii) the 'sunken lane' character of Lower Road (iii) the ancient historic significance of Narrow Marsh Lane and (iv) the local significance of Old Manor Farm buildings. The proposal substantially harms all of these features.

At this most sensitive location the developers have failed to show a sustainable development proposal. The harm is not outweighed by the benefits.

Evidence of traffic movements on the blind corners and the right turn into Brookside Road confirmed current existing serious safety concerns especially the conflicting nature of the mixed users of the shared highway.

The potential black spot is on the bends. Transport absurdly suggest the absence of any accident records means there is *an impeccable safety record*. Their risk assessment suggests two cars will meet a pedestrian here less than once a century. Using their figures, such incidents will happen every other day. You do not have this within the report. If the agents' traffic forecasts are to be proved right no Travel Plan, to monitor and enforce them, has been submitted.

Safety measures have already been introduced but no further improvements are possible. Development at the former barn has now added medium and large commercial vehicles into this mix. 63% more dwellings will mean more traffic and increased dangers. In the last 6 months, two cyclists were knocked from their bikes by cars here.

The Heritage Report is flawed. It suggests that no archaeological records mean no findings are likely. English Heritage guidance suggests that where sites have an archaeological interest the benefits of conserving them are a material consideration. There has been no attempt to do this.

Experts believe Narrow Marsh Lane dates from the Middle Stone Age. It linked the harbour with the Forest of Bere and crossed the east west route that survives in the sunken lanes. This intersection became the focus for the location of the origin of Bedhampton.

The proposal realigns and narrows the Lane. It destroys 60% of it. The character of the Conservation Area partly derives from its open setting. The Lane reinforces this. The layout has not been changed to prevent any harm.

Inside the Conservation Area, The Elms, the only domestic grade II* building in the Borough, will bear the brunt of increased traffic and danger. Much of the areas roadways lack pavements. Greatly increased movements will include 'rat running' around Bidbury Mead. The heart of the Conservation Area will lose its relative tranquillity and the visitor experience will suffer.

Old Manor Farm buildings are now included in the Conservation Area. The proposal takes no account of this. The open farmland connection will be lost.

The report uses the words *mitigate*, *moderate* and *minimise* 26 times. This acknowledges the 'harm' created by the proposals.

There will be cumulative irreparable substantial harm to...
the whole of the Conservation Area and its open setting, The Elms, the character of the sunken lane, Narrow Marsh Lane, Old Manor Farm buildings, highway safety and the habitats of migrating birds and Bechstein bats.

In the Summary of Representations the report has 75 bullet points that are material considerations.

Old Bedhampton has an eclectic mix of development. Proposed are 50 dwellings of a single suburban character surrounded by screening as intrusive as the development itself. Houses, plain and box-like, with contrived period features. The clutter of permitted development at the rear of properties will be seen in the wider surroundings.

This is not an innovative, prize-winning piece of place-making. There is no need to add to the open space and allotments already serving the area. It will not add great value to the heritage of Bedhampton or benefits to be enjoyed by the wider public.

It is not sustainable development. It does not justify the harm to the heritage assets.

Refuse permission.

- (3) updated the number of representations and gave a summary of those representations received since the report was published;
- (4) amended condition 2 of the report: and
- (5) recommended a conditional removing the permitted development rights for plots 1,10,11, 22, and 28.

The Committee noted that the information set out in the supplementary information did not affect the conclusions and recommendations of the submitted report. The Committee was advised that the cards received in support of the application referred to in the supplementary information had not been received by the Council in response to the statutory consultation but were forwarded to the Council by the applicants.

The Committee was addressed by the following deputees:

- (a) Mr Tate, on behalf of the Bedhampton Heritage Alliance and local residents, who objected to the application for the following reasons:
 - 1. there was a lack of supplementary evidence to support the application;
 - 2. the heritage statement did not adequately address the impact on the area's heritage assets and its conclusions were unsupported;
 - 3. the proposals fell short of a sustainable development;
 - 4. the transport assessment was inaccurate, inconsistent and flawed;
 - 5. the traffic likely to be generated by this proposal would exacerbate the existing traffic problems in the area and cause undue interference with the safety and convenience of vehicles and pedestrians;
 - 6. the development would destroy the historic Narrow Marsh Lane, which ran across the application site;
 - 7. the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the tranquillity of the area and deter visitors;
 - 8. the development would have a detrimental impact on the nearby heritage assets (including The Elms listed building), the Conservation Area, the ecology of the area and existing wildlife habitats;
 - 9. the principle of the development of this site should be determined at the forthcoming Local Plan Enquiry before an application for development of the site is considered; and
 - 10 The proposal would harm the character of Bedhampton.

Deputation to HBC re APP/19/00427: 5.3.20.

Good evening members.

*Sections underlined in red are
not included in the minutes.*

I refer you to the contents of my last deputation.

I am a retired Fellow and Past President of the Royal Town Planning Institute. Situations like this bring Planning into disrepute.

Planners are taught Survey, Analysis & Plan. There is a danger here of 'cart before the horse'. Inadequate and inaccurate survey material followed by a flawed sustainability appraisal to support an allocation in an unsound draft plan that runs counter to the NPPF and the policies of the draft plan itself.

Here is an attempt to exploit the 'window of opportunity' before the Examination in Public brings rigour to the analysis and protects the setting of the raft of heritage assets located here. Not all heritage assets need to be 'designated'.

The Plan process has been driven, at haste, to deliver a 5-year housing supply. The officers' report tells us that target has been reached. We have seen missing 'catch up' surveys within the last few weeks and very late 'error-strewn' amendments by Bargate *"to hopefully make the approval of the application easier"*. Yet a number of issues remain.

Transport forecast the mini roundabout will have 15 extra vehicles at pm peak adding to right turns into Brookside Road. Their suggested '1 every 4 minutes' is absurd. They will add to the daily bunching and queuing times, backing onto the roundabout.

Looking ahead, analysis shows the junction exceeding capacity in 4 years. No scheme for the suggested possible traffic lights is yet available. To make right turns out, of both Brookside Road and Nursery Gardens, alternative rat runs are likely using the narrow Bidbury and Kingscroft Lanes through the Conservation Area disrupting amenity and adding to safety concerns. The development will add even more traffic to this harm.

We have shown safety hazards for all shared users of the bends occur on a daily basis: 2 personal injury accidents in recent months.

The traffic analysis examines 'capacity'. Residents are more concerned about increased 'safety' issues.

Inconsistencies have arisen in the treatment of this application compared to the recent refusal at the barn. In assessing the impact of harm at the barn, because the land *"only forms part"* of the area, it was judged to be *"less than substantial"*. This comparison between area and surroundings should be used in the assessment of this application.

This is a much larger intrusive source of harm to the coastal rural setting of the conservation area as a whole and one that segregates the former farm buildings from their rural connection. To be consistent, based upon size and significance, this application cannot be regarded as "less than substantial". It proposes a substantial blot on the landscape.

The uninspiring layout takes little account of the Old Manor Farm buildings. Despite their recent addition to the Conservation Area, no change has resulted. Spaces between them and the proposed basic suburban character dwellings are little different to elsewhere within the proposed layout.

Using quality materials should be a given. It does not ensure quality design. This is poor place making.

I have often driven two-way on the ancient Narrow Marsh Lane. I know where it is and its width. It runs directly from the gate to the railway bridge. At a minimum, it is the full width of the bridge (3.6m) and the gate. It is a lane. It has never been just a footpath. The latest layout revision shows a 2m wide footpath on a different alignment. This does not correspond with the wide route under consideration for recognition by the Rights of Way Team. Only the Civil Engineers have, honestly, identified its correct position and width.

If approved, the layout puts part of the gardens of 5 dwellings on top of it. Needlessly, the visibility, appreciation and use of this significant historic route to the harbour will be lost.

Nowhere does the application set out the balance between harm and public (not private) benefit.

I remind you of the cumulative irreparable substantial harm to...

the amenity of the whole of the Conservation Area and
harm to its open rural setting,
harm to Grade II* listed "The Elms" and adjacent care home,
harm to the hedgerow and 'sunken lane' character of Lower Road,
harm to Narrow Marsh Lane,
harm to the setting of Old Manor Farm buildings,
harm to potential wildlife habitats and
harm through several increased highway safety concerns.

Old Bedhampton is unique. Why make it like anywhere else?

Refuse permission.

17 Matters to be Considered for Site Viewing and Deferment

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

18 APP/19/00427 - Land at Lower Road, Havant

(The site was viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party on 5 December 2019 and 27 February 2020)

Proposal: Development of 50 new dwellings together with access, landscaping and open space.

Further to Minute 5/1/2020, the Committee considered the revised written report, an update report and recommendation from the Head of Planning to grant permission.

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

- (1) the minutes of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 27 February 2020;
- (2) a copy of a statement submitted by Councillor Smith, a ward councillor;
- (3) a copy of a deputation submitted by Mr Tate relating to the meeting held on 23 January 2020;
- (4) additional information requested by the Site Viewing Working Party held on 27 February 2020;
- (5) an amendment to the officer's recommendation and condition 2; and
- (6) additional conditions relating to the tree belt and the permission path.

The Committee was addressed by the following deputies:

- (a) Mr Tate, on behalf of the Bedhampton Heritage Alliance and local residents, who with reference to his previous deputation, made the following additional comments to support his objections to the proposal:

1. the application was an attempt to gain permission before the inclusion of the site within the emerging Local Plan (including its impact on heritage assets) could be tested at the forthcoming Inquiry and as a result the application process had been rushed through without sufficient evidence or documentation to show that the development was sustainable which was contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the policies of the draft Local Plan;

2. the report indicated that the Council had met its housing supply. Therefore, the reason for hastening this application on grounds of housing supply did not apply in this case;
4. The ITransport traffic forecasts underestimated the impact the traffic likely to be generated by the proposal would have on the mini roundabout at Bedhampton Hill and its junction with Brookside Road. The mini roundabout was, at the time of the meeting, at full capacity and the junction forecasted to be at full capacity within four years. The roundabout and junction would not be able to cope with the additional traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development and as result his proposal would:
 - (i) add to the existing traffic queues associated with Bedhampton Hill min- roundabout and
 - (ii) encourage vehicles to use alternative roads in the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area as "rat runs" to the detriment of the amenities of the area and adding to safety concerns.
5. the analysis concentrated on "capacity" and did not adequately address the existing or potential hazards of using Lower Road, Bedhampton and adjoining highways;
6. The treatment of this application compared to application APP/19/01083 was inconsistent. To be consistent, based on size and significance, this proposal could not be regarded as less than substantial;
7. the proposed development adopted a similar uninspiring layout across the entire site. There should be a noticeable change in layout (spacing and character) in that part of the development fronting the Old Manor Farm buildings to respect the fact that these buildings formed part of the Conservation Area;
8. the development did not propose to use high-quality materials, which would be expected for a development situated close to a Conservation Area;
9. the true width of Narrow Marsh Lane (3.6m at full width) had not been take into account by the applicants or correspond with route to be considered by the Hampshire County Rights of Way Team. As a result, the development would be built over part of this historic route to the harbour;
10. the proposal does not set out the balance between harm and public benefit; and

12. the development would have a cumulative substantial harm: to the nearby heritage assets; the open rural setting and amenities of the Conservation Area; the ecology of the area and existing wildlife habitats; Narrow Marsh Lane; the Old Manor Farm buildings and through highways safety concerns.

In response to questions raised by Members of the Committee, Mr Tate advised that:

- The route of Narrow Marsh Lane to Langstone harbour was currently blocked by the A27. However, this route could be reconnected.
- Members of the public could not currently use Narrow Marsh Lane as the landowner had prevented access to this route. A claim for a right of way across this lane had been made to Hampshire County Council's Rights of Way Section.
- A number of documents had not been submitted to support the proposal such as an archaeological report

(b) Mr Johnson who, on behalf of the applicant, advised that the applicant had recently been acquired by Vivid Housing Association. Mr Johnson supported the officer's report and made the following additional comments:

1. the proposal had been submitted after extensive public consultation and amended to address concerns raised during this consultation period and at the pre-application stage;
2. 30 representations supported the application;
3. the statutory consultees had not objected to the proposal;
4. the emerging Local Plan had identified the application site as suitable for development of 50 houses;
5. the proposal was in accordance with the Council's policies;
6. the proposal sought, where possible, to retain the existing hedgerows;
7. the proposal would provide open spaces and a community orchard;
8. the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area had been respected;
9. there was no definitive right of way across the application site. Should Narrow Marsh Lane be registered as public right of



Extracts

SUMMARY

Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology (LLD) has been commissioned by 'Save Old Bedhampton' to provide a statement of professional opinion further to a proportionate appraisal of Landscape Character and Visual Amenity on the landscape capacity of the Site (*Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site UE30*) for residential development. The Site comprises an area of open fields of some 3.71 hectares, which is both accessed through and borders the south western edge of Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and is blanketed with an Area Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Grade II Listed 'The Old Mill House' is located to the south east of the Site.

LAND SOUTH OF LOWER ROAD, BEDHAMPTON

Landscape and Visual Appraisal - Statement of Professional Opinion

Josh Peacock CMLI for Save Old Bedhampton regarding Site Landscape Capacity

The Kirkham Landscape Planning Ltd Capacity Study (May 2015) looked at 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity and The Value of Undeveloped Open Land in Havant'. This included consideration of the Site as a part of a larger area (Area 13.1), which extends to the A3 and A27 road corridors to west and south respectively and to a small water course, which drains to the lower reaches of the Hermitage Stream to the east, (*Relevant Extract provided in Appendix A*). Area 13.1 was allocated with a Medium Capacity to accept change. This allocation contrasts with that provided to the east, outside of the Conservation Area (Area 13.2), which was allocated with a Medium / Low Capacity to accept change.

In summary it is the professional opinion of LLD, having carried out a review and preliminary appraisal of baseline landscape and visual information that the landscape capacity of *Medium / Low* should extend across Area 13.1. Through reference to the Kirkham (May 2015) methodology LLD consider that the visual sensitivity should be identified as *Medium* with a resulting overall Landscape Character Sensitivity of *Medium*, rather than *Medium / Low*.

It is considered that extension of built development into the agricultural land would be out of keeping with the existing settlement pattern and result in an adverse effect on the setting of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area with the loss of rural qualities of agricultural fields and hedgerows and views of rural character from Public Rights of Way, including key views about a historic bridge associated with the Grade II 'The Old Mill House' from the Wayfarers Walk (*Long Distance Path*) and Public Footpath no. 30.

Final Issue

Prepared by	JP
Checked by	JJ
Date	09 th July 2018
Document Reference	LLD1453-LPL-REP-001
Revision	01

2.0 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL APPRAISAL

- 2.1 Within this section a review of the Kirkham Landscape Planning Ltd Capacity Study (May 2015) is undertaken, followed by some recommendations for consideration in any ongoing review of the suitability of the Site for development.
- 2.2 A summary of the landscape components of value identified across the Site are identified within Appendix A. These components are taken into account within the review of the Kirkham (May 2015) Study.
- Review - Kirkham Landscape Planning Ltd Capacity Study (May 2015)*
- 2.3 The Kirkham Landscape Planning Ltd Capacity Study (May 2015) looked at 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity and The Value of Undeveloped Open Land in Havant'. This included consideration of the Site as a part of a larger area (Area 13.1), which extends to the A3 and A27 road corridors to west and south respectively and to a small water course, which drains to the lower reaches of the Hermitage Stream to the east, (Relevant Extract provided in Appendix A).
- 2.4 Area 13.1 was allocated with a Medium Capacity to accept change. This allocation contrasts with that provided to the east, outside of the Conservation Area (Area 13.2), which was allocated with a Medium / Low Capacity to accept change.
- 2.5 It is the professional opinion of LLD, having carried out a review and preliminary appraisal of baseline landscape and visual information (See Appendices), further to a site visit undertaken on the 5 June 2018, that the Landscape Capacity of Medium / Low should extend across Area 13.1. The reasoning for this is provided below.
- 2.6 Through reference to the Kirkham (May 2015) methodology LLD consider that the visual sensitivity should be identified as Medium with a resulting overall Landscape Character Sensitivity of Medium, rather than Medium / Low.

2.7

It is considered that extension of built development into the agricultural land would be largely out of keeping with the existing settlement pattern and result in an adverse effect on the setting of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area with the loss of rural qualities of agricultural fields and hedgerows and views of rural character from Public Rights of Way, including key views about a historic bridge associated with the Grade II 'The Old Mill House' from the Wayfarers Walk (Long Distance Path) and Public Footpath no. 30.

2.8

With regards to settlement pattern, the only area which might recommend itself for development would be a linear strip along the northern field boundary offset from Lower Road. (See Figure 2). This area would however have to be carefully considered so as not to impact on the influence of the hedgerow along the roadside on the setting and wider setting of the Bedhampton Conservation Area.

2.9

Should development be considered appropriate within this area LLD would recommend that the roadside hedgerow should be retained in situ, with vehicular access introduced through the existing (overgrown) field gate access to the east. This may also enable the historic pedestrian access across the field to be reinstated, with an avenue of trees planted to reinforce this within the landscape and an access link provided to the Wayfarers Walk (Long Distance Path) and Public Footpath no. 30. This would also enable the incongruous feature of the Leyland cypress tree line across the eastern boundary of the Site to be removed, with a resulting benefit on the setting of the Bedhampton Conservation Area.

2.10

LLD consider that this area could be sensitively developed, further to a more detailed landscape and visual appraisal to enable the identified components of value to be incorporated and reinforced, whilst maintaining settlement pattern and overall setting to the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. LLD do not agree that the larger part of the parcel promoted under SHLAA Site UJE30 should be considered further as a potential growth area.

2.11

There would however be likely adverse impacts on visual amenity for local residents using Lower Road and Lodge Road, through reference to Viewpoints No. 04-06, which would require some consideration regarding roof height and alignment and reinforcing the hedgerow with a more diverse species mix and incorporation of standard trees.

Landscape Components Recommended for Further Consideration

2.12

The following landscape components are recommended for consideration in any ongoing review of the suitability of the Site for development:

- *The contribution of the hedgeline along Lower Road to relative tranquillity and setting of the Conservation Area, relative to the time depth associated with this, located atop a bank adjacent to a sunken lane;*
- *The incongruous presence of the existing Leyland cypress tree shelter belt along the eastern boundary of the Site to local landscape character and the setting of the Conservation Area; it is understood from conversation with local residents that this was planted as a shelter belt for soft fruit growing;*
- *The contribution of the medium sized regular field to the rural setting of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, viewed from the Wayfarers Way upon the historic railway bridge and from further to the south along Public Footpath No. 30 within the wider setting of the Grade II Listed 'The Old Mill House';*

- *Time depth associated with an historic trackway on a north south alignment to the west of the Leyland cypress shelter belt. It is understood through reference to the 1870 Ordnance Survey Map (See <https://maps.ols.uk/>), that the trackway provided access to the shoreline south west of the Grade II Listed 'The Old Mill House'. Through conversation with local residents it is understood that this track was actively used for recreation, returning a circular path over the pedestrian railway crossing and along the field boundary to the south of the railway line via the Public Footpath No.30 until some eight years ago, when the farm gate along Lower Road was locked by the landowner;*

- *Contribution of the medium sized regular field to the rural setting of Old Bedhampton Conservation Area when viewed from along the southern half of Lodge Road;*
- *The contribution of the narrow access lane through the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and limited use to potential for increased vehicular movements to relative tranquillity of the Conservation Area.*

3.0

CONCLUSION

3.1

In summary it is the professional opinion of LLD, having carried out a review and preliminary appraisal of baseline landscape and visual information that the landscape capacity of *Medium / Low* should extend across Area 13.1. Through reference to the Kirkham (May 2016) methodology LLD consider that the visual sensitivity should be identified as *Medium* with a resulting overall Landscape Character Sensitivity of *Medium*, rather than *Medium / Low*.

3.2

It is considered that extension of built development into the agricultural land would be out of keeping with the existing settlement pattern and result in an adverse effect on the setting of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area with the loss of rural qualities of agricultural fields and hedgerows and views of rural character from Public Rights of Way. Including key views about a historic bridge associated with the Grade II 'The Old Mill House' from the Wayfarers Walk (Long Distance Path) and Public Footpath no. 30.

3.2

A small area along the southern edge of Lower Road, in keeping with settlement to the west is considered by LLD to have some capacity for residential development. Should development be considered appropriate within this area LLD would recommend that the roadside hedgerow should be retained in situ, with vehicular access introduced through the existing (overgrown) field gate access to the east. This may also enable the historic pedestrian access across the field to be reinstated, with an avenue of trees planted to reinforce this within the landscape and an access link provided to the Wayfarers Walk (Long Distance Path) and Public Footpath no. 30. It would also enable the incongruous feature of the Leyland cypress tree line to be removed with a resulting likely benefit on the setting of the Bedhampton Conservation Area.

Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Character Appraisal

Havant Public Service Plaza, Room B025, Monday 13th August 2018, 14:00

Notes of Meetings

Present:

Simon Jenkins (Head of Planning), David Hayward (Planning Policy Manager), Lewis Ford (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Jessica Hill (Conservation Officer), Cllr Edward Rees (Bedhampton Ward), Cllr Kenneth Smith (Bedhampton Ward), Cllr Leah Turner (Cabinet Lead for Communities and Housing), Cllr Liz Fairhurst (Friends of Bidbury Mead), Eimear Murphy (Murphy Associates) and Martin Small (Historic England).

Apologies:

Cllr Michael Wilson (Leader of the Council), Cllr Gary Robinson (Bedhampton Ward) and Ron Tate (Friends of Bidbury Mead)

Please note, throughout these meeting notes the Friends of Bidbury Mead and Havant Borough Council are referred to as FBM and HBC respectively.

1. Introductions and Context

Introduction of all attendees and apologies were noted. Mr Hayward set out that FBM had commissioned Murphy Associates to undertake a review of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Character Appraisal. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss FBM's Draft Character Appraisal and provide feedback for the final report. The final report would then help inform HBC's review of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area.

It was stressed that the meeting was not to discuss the proposed development at 'Land south of Lower Road' which is a separate matter.

Mr Small outlined that it was the responsibility of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to designate conservation areas and it was not for Historic England (HE) to tell a LPA whether a conservation area should be designated or extended. However, as a representative of HE, he would be happy to comment and provide advice.

2. General comments and feedback on the Character Appraisal (CA)

Ms Hill said she was happy with the quality and detail of the Draft Appraisal and that she would provide a PDF version of minor wording amendments and general comments after the meeting.

architecture. There is not the evidence in the Character Appraisal to justify inclusion in the Conservation Area. Cllr Fairhurst confirmed that looking at significant new evidence regarding the heritage value of this area was not part of the commission.

Mr Small outlined two questions to be considered:

- 1) Did the Portsmouth Water parcel have special historical and/or architectural interest worthy of designation as a conservation area?

And, if yes;

- 2) Should this area be designated a conservation area in its own right or could it be an extension of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area?

Mr Hayward recommended that the Portsmouth Water parcel could potentially be designated separately if it is found to be suitable for designation; however, Ms Murphy and Cllr Fairhurst wanted to see it included as an extension. Cllr Rees added that it would be more economical to include as an extension and consult on just one Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

Cllr Smith asked about timeframes between adopting a revised Old Bedhampton Conservation Character Appraisal and then designating this land parcel separately. Mr Jenkins confirmed that if the land parcel was to be explored for designation separately, then it would be considered a discrete project and would look to find resources to carry this work out.

Mr Hayward reminded the group that Portsmouth Water, as a statutory undertaker, have their own Permitted Development (PD) rights and the need to provide potable water is a significant material consideration when considering any planning applications. It was suggested that either FBM could extend the commission with Murphy Associates or it could be recommended that the Council consider the area in question separately.

SUMMARY: There is not the evidence to justify the area's inclusion in the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area at this time. Either there needs to be further investigation to determine if there is the evidence to justify inclusion or, alternatively, the Council can consider this area as a separate conservation area once the review of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area is complete.

ACTION: Cllr Fairhurst to discuss the above suggestion with FBM and Mr Tate.

5. Proposed south-western extension (Lower Road)

Ms Murphy stated that the end house of the proposed extension was the original Manor Farm, owned by the Mason Family, and that the proposed extension could include the whole of the field south of Lower Road. Ms Hill was not convinced that the proposed extension had special architectural or historic interest of merit and that its inclusion could devalue the existing conservation area. It was confirmed that the path crossing the field is not a designated Public Right of Way (PROW). It was then highlighted that development of any kind in this area could have a negative, positive or neutral impact and that this area could be considered as part of the setting on the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Mr Small further commented that as the Draft Appraisal had identified "neutral buildings" along Lower Road, he did not see the justification of including them within the conservation area. Ms Hill said that those buildings identified as having some interest could be assessed for inclusion on the list of Local Interest Buildings.

SUMMARY: Do not include as extension to the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area unless further evidence of its special architectural or historic interest is provided to justify its designation as a conservation area.

6. Next steps moving towards a formal review of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area

It was highlighted that both FBM and Bargate Homes have commissioned separate reports to inform HBC's review of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and that it was only fair that any stakeholder that wanted to is able to. It was outlined that HBC, as part of its statutory duties and in-being robust and fair, would take the final reports from both parties (once submitted) and use them to inform the formal review. In that sense, it would be helpful if the report is submitted in a readable format that will enable copy and paste. In the interests of openness and transparency, the notes of this meeting would be provided to Bargate Homes.

The HBC Character Appraisal would then be the subject of public consultation later this year. Cllr Turner and Mr Hayward emphasised that the consultation must not be mistaken for a referendum regarding the land south of Lower Road (H22), but that this was solely about the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. Mr Small added and explained that the Council's duty to designate a conservation area, or an extension to an existing area, is based on the consideration of an area to be of special architectural or historic interest, the character and appearance of which is desirable to preserve and enhance. As such, the purpose of any consultation, therefore, should be to elicit views on whether any additional land is of such interest, not simply whether people want it or not.

Mr Hayward stated that HBC is exploring changing its constitution so that the Head of Planning can approve planning related consultations, such as for Conservation Area Reviews. The HBC Character Appraisal would then, after public consultation and appropriate updates, go to Cabinet and Full Council for debate and consideration for adoption.

Cllr Fairhurst asked if fellow councillors and residents would see the FBM and Bargate Homes reports. It was set out that both reports will be published on the council's website as evidence-base documents to HBC's Character Appraisal during the public consultation.

ACTION: Cllr Fairhurst and Eimear Murphy to discuss with FBM about timescales towards the production of their Final Report (to include paragraph numbers) and notify HBC when the report will be submitted in readable format.

ACTION: HBC to provide notes of the meeting to Bargate Homes.

7. Any Other Business (AOB)

Mr Hayward confirmed that HBC had received an Environmental Information Regulation (EIR) request asking for all correspondence regarding the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and the drafts of the Character Appraisal. In assessing whether the drafts should be