

Rebuttal of representations sent to HBC in relation to APP/17/00223 and APP/17/00224

Friends of Bidbury Mead

The house does not occupy the entire depth of its intended plot: the severance of the relationship between the Manor House and Bidbury Mead has been over-played. There will still be views over the back garden of the new house towards Bidbury Mead and Kingscroft Lane beyond from the Manor House. Indeed, it is the plain, but bulky 'Tall Trees' which is more readily seen in the context of the Manor House, having a greater impact on its setting.

The pavilion block of Bidbury Mead itself already blocks some of this setting and the new dwelling is broadly aligned in that plane of view. The positioning of the new dwelling thus has a neutral effect on the setting of the Listed Building in longer views from the east looking west towards the Manor House.

When viewed from the eastern end of Edward Gardens, the Yew tree will add to the separation and visual discontinuity between the new house and Manor House. In this view frame the setting of the Listed Building will not be impacted (as seen below).



A generous garden will still be retained to the Manor House to enable community garden parties to continue.

Whereas houses in Elizabeth Gardens may pre-date the Conservation Area's designation, if they were considered so harmful to the setting of the Manor House, why were they included within the Conservation Area boundary? The proposed house reflects the 'winged' form of the Manor House and will ensure the character and appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved.

Edward Garden Owners' Association

1. Criticisms of John's Heritage Statement. John best placed to respond, but I do not see any well argued reasoning to refute the statements John has made, which EGOA list as points 1-6.

Some confuse general planning considerations with what is supposed to be a body of evidence to refute John's position. E.g. access will mean cars cannot park in that part of the street: this has nothing to do with heritage matters and in fact would unclutter views of the Manor House.

The use of Conservation style rooflights could perhaps be stressed/clarified and use of blackened timber boarding, whilst not prevalent of adjoining built form is considered an appropriate material to clad what is intended to be a rural feel outbuilding. The new house will have a superior appearance to "Tall Trees" and mirror the Manor House 'winged' appearance, with a main roof eaves and roof ridge level demonstrably sub-servient to those of the Manor House, which will remain the dominant feature in this Edward Gardens enclave of the Conservation Area.

EGOA seem to overlook that other houses in Edward Gardens were developed from the original grounds of the Manor House, acknowledged in council publications.

With regards to the Listed wall, it would be possible to specify a protective line of fencing during construction and a method statement for foundation construction to ensure the wall is not disturbed or damaged.

Figure 9 actually demonstrates views of the east elevation will still be available and any circular walk across the Bidbury Mead will still reveal views of the Manor House and its relationship with ST. Thomas' Church. The Tudor Boundary wall itself masks the lower part of the Manor House's east elevation.

2. Public impact statement. This acknowledges the ongoing viability of the Manor House is a material planning consideration, but ignores the fact that one way to deliver that continued investment in its preservation could be delivered from the sale of the application site.

To refer to the four houses on the north side of Edward Gardens and "Tall Trees" as "limited" housing infill is clearly false, as it developed most of the original grounds and setting of the Manor House. There is no reason that the proposed development could not be equally successfully assimilated to meet the spacious and attractive character described.

PPG15, PPS3 and PPS5 have of course been superseded by the NPPF (Section 12 in particular) and NPPG ID 18a. As have the Hampshire Structure Plan and former Local Plan. An outdated Policy framework has therefore been referenced and EGOA assessment is thus flawed.

Development of garden land is not precluded under the NPPF, rather it is for the local planning authority to apply the planning balance of material considerations including the benefits of new family housing, setting of heritage assets and the character of an area. Indeed, if the council consider the last lawful use to be as a commercially run centre for supported living, there may still be an argument that the site is still within the definition of previously developed land.

References to permitted development are an irrelevance and are not being relied upon as a fall-back position by the applicant; rather, applications for planning and listed building consent have been sought and should be assessed against the adopted development plan and all other material planning considerations.

The applicant asserts the planning balance weighs in favour of the development, for the reasoning set out in the submitted design and heritage statements. The applicant has not asserted that the development would be “*hidden*” and photographic evidence submitted – including that by EGOA itself – show that the setting of the Manor House would not be “*totally blocked*”.

Adequate separation would exist between the new house and nearby housing. It would not significantly impact the natural light, privacy or outlook of any neighbour.

Turley consultant’s letter on behalf of Manor Trust (previous owners of Manor House)

It was of course open to the Trust to have placed a covenant preventing any further sub-division of the Manor House plot when selling to Mr L Peach. It did not. The applicant theorises this was because the Trust new that funds from such a sale could actually help to ensure the Manor House’s future preservation.

With the degree of separation from the Manor House and generous plot it would still be set within, the criticism of ‘*uncomfortable cramped relationship*’ is not accepted.

Furthermore, this is not a backland development, but rather the rear part of a corner site with an existing frontage to a highway.

With regards to the Yew tree, a timber fence is proposed to form the new common boundary with the Manor House, not a wall. A full arboricultural report/impact statement has been prepared. The Yew tree would continue to exist and thrive next to the new dwelling.

HBC Conservation Officer

No criticism is made of John’s Heritage statement. Indeed, no reference has been made to it, nor the public benefit that delivering a family house which might fund the preservation of the Manor House itself been carefully weighed into the Officer’s considerations.

HBC Landscape Officer

The built form strategy to avoid plot sub-division is not adopted Policy forming part of the Development Plan and the application falls to be considered on its merits.

County Archaeologist – has not objected.

Historic England – has not objected.