

Following a review of the recent additional details and revised plans, together with the recent Old Bedhampton Conservation Area review, I wish to register my updated objections to the Bargate Homes planning application for the land south of Lower Road in Old Bedhampton (App/19/00427) due to the following reasons:

1. The land is still subject to review before acceptance within the final Local Plan 2036

The soundness of the DRAFT Local Plan 2036 for Lower Road has been challenged in many areas and is yet to be independently tested at an Examination in Public. The proposal seeks to achieve an advantage by avoiding an Examination in Public by an Independent Inspector which has been delayed for unknown reasons. It would be highly inappropriate to allow any development on such a sensitive site prior to the outcome of this process. The developer is being underhand in the early submission of this application in order to avoid the Independent Inspector's decision.

2. Plans for just 15 houses were previously refused and nothing has changed

The Current Local Plan 2026 recently rejected the development of 15 houses in Lower Road and the Inspector's Report on the current statutory Local Plan 2026 (paragraph 72) states, **"...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 justifies the non allocation of this site."**

The current planning application proposes 50 dwellings but the Government Inspector has previously rejected the site due to the adverse effect on the Conservation Area, which has recently been extended. What has actually changed since planning permission for just 15 dwellings was rejected?

3. Heritage assets still remain degraded and unprotected

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Section 66(1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 obliges Havant Borough Council to protect and enhance heritage assets. This will still be neglected if planning permission is approved.

The effect of the proposed 50 dwellings will degrade heritage assets and the setting of the conservation area. There will be further urbanisation which can't be reversed, doubling the number of dwellings on Lower Road. The full potential of heritage and conservation will be lost to future generations and will also result in degraded ambiance, soul, peacefulness, sense of well-being and safety in Old Bedhampton.

A quote from the Landscape assessment in Bargate's own application, referring to Old Bedhampton, states **"this is almost unique to the borough, a rural village conserved with heritage assets in a rural setting"**. This only goes to prove the inconsistency shown within the submission.

4. Old Bedhampton Conservation Review has highlighted the harm this would create

The recent Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Review has now provided the evidence needed to allow the Council to take the positive action needed to safeguard these individual and collective heritage assets. The review has justifiably extended the footprint of the conservation area and highlighted the importance of the protection needed to avoid the harm this development would create. The sites proposed integration in relation to the adjacent conservation area relies too heavily on the flawed proposals of boundary planting and existing screening to detach the site from impacting the landscape character of old Bedhampton.

5. Petition with 1785 signatures opposed to development in Lower Road remains open

A petition signed by 1785 people was presented in 2018 with the text shown below:

We, the undersigned, petition Havant Borough Council to remove site UE30 (Land south of Lower Road) from any future consideration as a housing site in their Local Plan for one, some or all of the following overriding reasons:- The damage it will cause to the historic and landscape setting of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area • The irreparable harm it will cause to the ancient heritage of this part of the Borough • The detrimental change that development will bring to the amenity and character of the area • The added dangers that will arise on the blind corners and shared roadway of Lower Road and at the mini roundabout junction on Bedhampton Road as a result of significant additional traffic using the bends and making right turns into Brookside Road • The failure to comply with government guidance and the core principle of protecting heritage assets contained in Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 • The ability to provide 50 houses on other less sensitive sites • The precedent that would be set for future further development in this area • Any public good that might be generated would not outweigh the harm and danger that would arise from the development

The Council has never debated this petition and is unlikely to ever consider the amount of opposition this represents. The petition was 'lost' within the early consultation responses to the Local Plan. The arguments have not changed, only the reference of the land to H20. You will see the petition is not anti-housing, nor about the status quo for a few properties. It is pro heritage protection. Removing the site will not set a precedent as no other proposed housing site irrevocably and detrimentally affects the Borough's heritage assets like this one. Supporters of this petition included all generations. Many are drawn from the wider Havant area and some from further afield with knowledge of and connections with Bedhampton, all of whom cherish its environment and want to protect it for the benefit of future generations.

6. The detrimental effect on Old Bedhampton remains significant

This development will have a detrimental effect on Old Bedhampton and totally change its character and charm forever. The proposed development will completely ruin the tranquil hamlet of Old Bedhampton with its rural sunken lanes and beautiful, listed buildings. The quality of this proposal is poor and does not enhance the area. It will forever alter the character and historic significance of the area. It is unsympathetic to the overall aesthetic and attractiveness of the area. How can Havant Borough Council allow this to happen?

7. The development would destroy the Conservation Area setting forever

The damage caused to the Conservation Area setting would be irreversible and unforgivable. The views from many positions surrounding this proposed development would harm the conservation area setting. The developer has acknowledged this by proposing screening of the site but this is flawed and will not be maintained going forward therefore exposing the site to the surrounding views.

8. The Proposal still goes against the primary principles of planning

This proposal goes against the primary principles of planning which should only develop in keeping with character of the surrounding area and should conserve or enhance the setting of the adjacent conservation area. The proposal certainly does not fit this description.

9. Very Poor Archaeology Report

The submitted Archaeology Report is a very poor standard and no proper evaluation has been conducted. Why would Havant Borough Council allow this inadequate report to be overlooked?

10. Increased Traffic would still present Increased Danger – Nothing has changed

The only access to this proposed new development is through the conservation area via Lower Road which is narrow with two very sharp bends and **no pavement**. The 50 new houses will create a significant increase in traffic on the narrow, shared spaces with treacherous blind bends and will cause a very real increased risk to everyone who uses the road.



Walker's, cyclists, school children, parents with prams, horse riders along with the disabled and elderly will all be put in greater danger. The road simply could not support the increase in traffic that development on this site would bring. It would just be a case of an accident waiting to happen.

11. The Blind bend Near Misses are still not taken into account within the proposal

As a resident, I can assure you that I have had many near misses on the Lower Road blind bends both day and night, and have taken evasive action on many occasions to avoid Cyclists and Vehicles over the last 14 years, even at only 15 miles an hour. The absurd statement made in the proposal of 'impeccable safety record' is entirely misleading and anyone with an objective view would agree that more traffic is going to be more dangerous. Why would Havant Borough Council consider this to be acceptable? The local residents Near Miss statements have already been sent to HBC and a recent accident on this section has also been reported to HBC.

12. No visibility calculations for Lower Road blind bends

The developer has not provided any visibility calculations for the Lower Road blind bends which would highlight the problem encountered for all users of this road.

13. The limited Road accident data provided is still out of date

The limited amount of road accident data provided within the planning proposal is from May 2011 to April 2016, which is now well over three years out of date. What other evidence within the proposal is also out of date?

14. Incorrect calculations still provided on Shared Road collisions

The quoted figure of 0.056% (Para 6.8.8) is nonsense. The chances of a pedestrian/cyclist meeting a car at 04:00 is very low but what is the probability half an hour either side of 08:30 or 16:30? The maths is incorrect (0.056% is 56 in 100,000) and should be corrected prior to granting any planning permission. What else is incorrect within the planning submission?

15. The Dangerous increase in the Traffic on the Shared Space for streets remains

Any additional traffic (pedestrians, vehicles, cyclists, mobility scooters etc.) will obviously increase the danger presented to all users in the shared space. The safety of the additional children predicted within the proposed site has not been accounted for when using the shared space for school or recreation. The report from i-Transport has stated that Lower Road has high levels of pedestrians and cyclists already so why would HBC even consider making this a more dangerous situation?

16. Safety issue created by increased traffic along Kingscroft Lane

The increased traffic will add to the flow of traffic through the narrow Kingscroft Lane as driver behaviour will look for alternative routes to avoid queuing at the top of Brookside and create additional safety problems adjacent to the Bidbury Mead recreational area which is now within the Conservation Area.

17. The detrimental effect on already congested nearby Roads has worsened

The adjoining road of Bedhampton Hill is very well-used as it provides access to the A3 and A27, and beyond to Portsdown Hill, Farlington, Leigh Park etc. Traffic often queues in all directions from the mini roundabout, and also back to the 'Rusty Cutter' roundabout. The approved plans for Forty Acres will make this situation even worse and this development would make the situation intolerable and has clearly not been addressed.



18. The neglect of exit traffic effects on the mini roundabout remains

There is no assessment for the mini roundabout / Brookside Road entrance in the light of possible changes to the mini roundabout. The mini roundabout prior to turning right into Brookside Road from the West approach can become grid locked when too many cars are waiting to enter Brookside Road due to the extremely short distance allocated for cars to wait as seen in the photograph below:



The proposal is missing how the additional "right turn" traffic from Brookside Road will affect the mini roundabout. What else within the proposal is also missing?

19. The mini roundabout traffic incidents are still not referred to in the proposal

The traffic incidents on the mini roundabout on the exit to Brookside Road are not referred to in the proposal. There have been a number of incidents on the mini roundabout which have been conveniently omitted from the development proposal. Why would Havant Borough Council want to allow this omission to go unquestioned?

20. The development will cause a greater danger on the mini roundabout

The increase in traffic levels due to the proposed development will make the mini roundabout become even more dangerous. Why would Havant Borough Council allow this to happen?

21. Alternative Lodge Road footpath is still not a viable option

Using the Lodge Road footpath as an alternative to using the Lower Road bends is not a viable alternative. It is too narrow for Motability scooters and prams to pass. You can't see the far end of the footpath from either end and it is very intimidating during the long dark winter evenings. Some pictures are provided below to highlight the limited light at the bends of this footpath. Would you allow your daughter to use this route?



Natural human behaviour would be to take the shortest route, via the Lower Road shared space, which means this inconvenient and intimidating footpath would not be used and to suggest it within the mitigation to avoid the dangerous section of Lower Road is irresponsible.

22. Opportunities for sustainable transport modes have still not been taken up

Sustainable transport modes have still not been taken up within the proposal and the developer has failed to demonstrate this within the submitted reports.

23. There are still concerns over the Bus Stop distances provided

There are some serious concerns about getting to and from the eastbound bus stop as getting to a "safe" crossing place could extend the walking distance. How safe would the route shown in figure 3.1 top right at night be in the winter?

24. The timetable for Bedhampton Rail Services is still inaccurately reported

The service from Bedhampton railway station is not regular, does not have good work commute links and is inaccurately reported and misleading within the i-Transport Technical Note.

25. The land to the East and West will become more attractive for further development

The land remaining to the East and West of the proposed site will become more attractive to development once completed and the layout is designed to provide easy access for this purpose.

26. Walking Distance Errors from the Development Proposal remain

The walking distance to local facilities has been re-assessed and many have now been removed as too far away but the method used to measure the distances is inaccurate and practical scientific methods should be used to provide the required information before planning approval is granted.

27. The partial Destruction of Narrow Marsh Lane

The historic Narrow Marsh Lane, a public footpath used for at least 300 years, would no longer be totally destroyed as the developers have now finally recognised its historic status but unfortunately have not preserved the original course of the track within the revised plans. The plan now is to push Narrow Marsh Lane to the East and reduce the width, but this is not acceptable as it would remove the historical interest and heritage of the lane, again proving that Bargate do not respect the heritage of this site. Please see a recent photograph of Narrow Marsh Lane below.



The re-location of this historic lane leading to the railway bridge should not be allowed and the site plan needs to be adjusted again to maintain the current position of Narrow Marsh Lane. This lane has remained in public use for over 300 years but was recently blocked by the land owner and is currently under investigation regarding public access rights.

28. The Destruction of the Hedgerow remains

The removal of the hedgerows surrounding this land is only permissible in exceptional circumstances and no clear or robust reasoning has been provided within the proposal setting out why the loss is unavoidable and justified. This defies the NPPF section 15 requirement to conserve and enhance the natural environment by proposing to destroy the valued landscape which this development would occupy. The developers plan does not conserve or enhance the existing landscape and certainly does not protect the hedgerow. Please see the current hedgerow viewed from the corner of the conservation area in the picture below:



The development plans to remove part of this hedgerow and significantly change the setting along Lower Road. Also, whatever is left of the hedgerow may not be maintained by the proposed management company leading to future removal.

29. The Proposed Road Junction still Encroaches into Lower Road

The Proposed Road Junction encroaches deep into Lower Road which is already narrow and barely wide enough for two cars to pass. This will increase the possibility for accidents at the junction, especially with the high number of cyclists and pedestrians and no footpath. There is no mention of parked vehicles in Lower Road causing problems for large vehicles. Bin collections have sometimes been abandoned due to parked vehicles blocking access.

30. The Harm to the historic rural character of Lower Road

The development will cause harm to the historic rural character of Lower Road. The proposed plans still negatively affect the appearance of the lane and access points that destroy the hedge and degrade the historic sunken lane appearance and should not be permitted.

31. The proposed new junction still needs the visibility splays to be kept clear

The proposed new junction to enter the development on Lower Road needs the visibility splays to be kept clear. How will this be ensured once the development is handed over to some management company?

32. The increased levels of vehicle noise remains

This development would present increased levels of vehicle noise to pedestrians and cyclists which share the road leading to the site and the elderly occupants of the retirement home situated between two of the blind bends and also the properties adjacent would also be adversely affected as a result of any new development due to the increased traffic noise that would result.

33. The increased levels of air pollution remains

Pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulates (NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) are generally associated with traffic generated by any new development. The increased levels of vehicle air pollution will negatively affect the Grade II listed buildings situated within the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. The pollution will almost double within the residential cul de sac which currently has 80 houses as the proposed development is for an additional 50 houses. The air quality imposed on pedestrians and cyclists which share the road and also the elderly occupants of the retirement home situated between two of the blind bends would be adversely affected as a result of any new development due to the increased traffic air pollution.

34. The Proposed Tree Screening to the East to the Development is still Inadequate

The sites successful integration in relation to the conservation area relies heavily on proposed boundary planting and existing screening to detach the site from impacting on the landscape character of Old Bedhampton. The proposals for the tree screen is totally inadequate and would require ongoing maintenance and finance. The proposal recognises the need to screen the development but does not meet the required standard to achieve this. Replacement planting of more appropriate species is proposed along the east side of the coniferous shelter belt as the conifers are at the end of their natural life and will therefore degrade the conservation area, by allowing visualisation of the development.

35. The Proposed development House type still remains Wrong

This proposal goes against the primary principles of planning which states that any development should be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and should conserve or enhance the setting of the adjacent conservation area. This proposal certainly does not fit this description.

36. The Proposed development footpath still utilises private drives

There is a distinct lack of any realistic footway provision to safely navigate around the proposed site. The footpath shown on the proposed plans looping through an area of Communal Open Space, the western link of which utilises a private drive. It is not recommended to have public rights over a shared private drive.

37. The Development will still lead to the Destruction of a vibrant wildlife habitat

The proposed land is a haven for wildlife whose very existence is under increasing threat i.e. hedgehogs. It is home to Brent geese, hedgehogs, foxes, bats and many species of birds. Many people who visit the area comment on its uniqueness and appreciate the wildlife it attracts.

38. Lack of consideration for protected Bats remains outstanding

The proposed development is in the middle of a recognised bat area and some of the bat species are protected (Bechstein's bats) and I have seen bats on many occasions around this area. The mitigation proposed within the application is inadequate for the protection of these bats.

39. The Development will still cause disturbance to birds that use the land

The land is currently categorised in the Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy as a Secondary Support Area for SPA bird species. The site falls within 5.6km of the Solent SPAs and will therefore contribute towards a cumulative impact from recreational disturbance. In line with the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy, financial contributions will be required on a per-dwelling basis. Evidence of previous use of this land is shown in the photograph below:



40. No realistic site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan

Inadequate information is provided for a realistic site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan. A robust plan needs to be submitted before any decision can be made, that demonstrates the adoption and use of the best practicable means to reduce the effects of noise, vibration, dust and site lighting.

41. Excessive development already completed within the local area has worsened

A huge amount of housing development has already taken place within the local area and additionally the large Forty Acre site has now been approved. Any further development on the site south of Lower Road is a development too far.

42. Increased cyclists and pedestrians from recently approved Forty Acre site

Additional pedestrians and cyclists will use Lower Road, due to the Forty Acre site being approved, which has not been considered. Human nature is to use shortest route regardless of any mitigation put in place.

43. Lower Road is liable to flooding and snow which makes it very dangerous to navigate

Lower Road is liable to flooding and often gets blocked drains due to leaves which I have cleared in the past. When snow falls the road becomes very dangerous to navigate and takes a long time to clear due to the trees shade effect.

44. The Proposed Tree Screening to the North of the Development is Inadequate

The proposed variety of tree species planted along the frontage of the site is not considered to be diverse enough and is deemed not to be in keeping with the existing landscape character of Old Bedhampton.

45. Vehicle light pollution from Headlights

Vehicle light pollution from headlights will intrude upon the residents that live opposite the exit of the development.

46. Safety of children playing on railway bridge

There is a clear danger to children that would be attracted to the railway bridge on the edge of the development, especially as a play area is planned adjacent to the railway.

47. The proposal still neglects the state of the pathways near the blind bends

The pathways leading to the blind bends are in poor condition and users find them difficult to navigate, especially the elderly and disabled. The paths are narrow and not suitable for wheelchairs, buggies or mobility scooters which are then forced to use the road. There is no provision to prevent using the road within the planning application and this will only add to the shared space dangers. The pathway leading to the corner by the Elms is shown below:



The absence of any pathways between the bends creates safety problems for pedestrians and passing vehicles which Havant Borough Council and Hampshire County Council have already acknowledged but the poor condition of what pathways seems to be neglected in the development proposal.

48. Strong opposition to housing development remains in Old Bedhampton

There is strong opposition from within the local voting population and from the many visitors to Old Bedhampton covering a large number of diverse issues. The overall consensus is how the Council could possibly let this development happen. Havant Borough Council should take full notice of their resident's concerns and objections when considering this application and fully reject any planning permission. The Local Plan Examination is not yet complete.

49. HBC have already exceeded the quota required for affordable housing development

The required affordable housing development has already exceeded the quota needed within HBC and this site no longer has the excuse of "nowhere else to build".

50. The Land is excellent quality agricultural land

The proposed land is excellent quality agricultural land and alternative areas should be sought within the borough to avoid the permanent loss of premium quality land.

51. Lack of any realistic Landscape Management Plan

There is a distinct lack of any realistic landscape management plan, required to ensure the realization of the soft landscape scheme proposed.

52. Inadequate response provided by i-Transport to road Safety Concerns

The revised traffic predictions and response to HCC questions is inadequate and condescending. Modelling is not an accurate forecast of actual future traffic and the effect of the 40-acre site has not been acknowledged or accounted for. The cavalier attitude to the serious safety concerns raised is unprofessional and their attitude to the clarification responses requested are dismissive in their reasoning.

53. Loss of the Old Manor Farm land connections

The connection to the agricultural landholding of Manor Farm is not preserved with this development. No changes have been made to the housing plan adjacent to Old Manor Farm to account for the extensions made in the recent Conservation Area review and the response provided by Bargate is inadequate.

In summary, the 53 objections detailed above does not include the many other valid points made by the high number of objectors to this development.

The objections raised above have not been adequately addressed by the recent changes to the proposed plan and it is obvious that many of the issues stated above can never be addressed e.g. heritage, access and safety concerns. The cumulative effect of these remaining objections signifies a genuine reason for Havant Borough Council to refuse planning for this major site. All the mitigation proposed is insufficient and does not completely remove the identified problem, which requires mitigation in the first instance.

I strongly object to the proposed major development and hope council planning will agree that this is a flawed and poor quality planning application. Havant Borough Council should be proud to have the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area within its borough and fight to maintain, protect and enhance it. I can only hope that common sense will prevail and this development proposal will be rejected because of the safety issues raised and the overwhelming harm to the Conservation Area being greater than any benefit provided.

