

Miscellaneous Documents:

- (i) Extract from the Inspector's Report 7th July 2014.**
- (ii) Extract from Decision Notice (APP/19/01083)
13.2.2020 Land adjacent to Old Manor Farm.**
- (iii) Listing Text for "The Elms" Lower Road taken from
British Listed Buildings.**
- (iv) Notes of a meeting Havant Borough Council held on
13th August 2018 concerning the Conservation Area
Review.**
- (v) Email dated 28 Oct 2020 from Dr Dominic Fontana, an
acknowledged expert on the archaeology of
Langstone Harbour, regarding the ancient origin of
Narrow Marsh Lane.**

Extract

(i)

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 site's 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,

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.

13. 2. 2020 .

Taken from British Listed Buildings.

Listing Text

SU 70 NW

4/23

HAVANT

Bedhampton

LOWER ROAD

No 2 (The Elms), including front garden wall, gate piers, and gates.

(Formerly listed as The Elms under Manor Road)

16.5.52

II*

House. C18 Gothick with an early C19 extension built to accommodate a visit by the Duke of Wellington. Late C18, early C19. Stucco, with a slate roof. The tall centre part has a symmetrical front (east) of three storeys, three windows, and set back at each end are lower wings, of two storeys and attic, one window to the gabled front, the north side being now masked by the later forward extension, which comprises a tower and a windowless rectangular block (of about one and a half storeys) with top-lighting. The centre has a crenellated parapet and the openings have ogee heads (capped by decorative roundels) above the windows, which on the second floor have cills at the foot of the curves, and on the 1st and ground floor include Venetian lights on each side, also repeated on the south wing (with blank side panels); the walls are grooved with a rustication pattern. Sashes. The central doorway is of classical form, with a Tuscan entablature and Gothic triple attached columns; this is enclosed in a later simple classical porch with square columns, now walled-in with side windows and a plain doorway.

The tower has Gothick niches, and narrow corner pilasters, each with three shallow panels marked by circular designs and cusping. The front wall continues from the tower northwards, with a four oval-arched blind arcade and rustication bands. This block encloses the chief feature of the house, the Wellington Room. This is a rectangular apartment, with four Ionic columns at the north (short) side, supporting an entablature which continues round the room as a decorative frieze, with Greek ornament. Above this frieze there is coving up to a flat ceiling, which has in the centre an octagonal opening, again with coving to the base of the top light. The lower walls have a dentilled band above three tiers of panelling, and a skirting; there are niches and floral decorations to enrich the interior (recently renovated). Front gate piers with pineapples, and a 'Tudor' side gate within a vail, also capped with pineapples.

Listing NGR: SU7013706384

This text is from the original listing, and may not necessarily reflect the current setting of the building.

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.

ACTION: Jessica Hill to send PDF of minor amendments to FBM and Ms Murphy.

Mr Hayward commented that the Draft Appraisal referred heavily to the Local Plan (Core Strategy) and Local Plan (Allocations Plan). It was highlighted that the emerging Local Plan 2036 would be gaining weight by the time the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Character Appraisal would be adopted. The appraisal should look to the future otherwise it would be out of date relatively quickly.

Traffic/Pedestrian Management (Page 58) – All agreed, however, in absence of any data, it was recommended that the text be altered to state how the highway layout presents an opportunity to explore traffic speed reduction. The opportunity for gateway entrance signs to the conservation area was also discussed.

3. Proposed eastern extension (Bidbury Mead)

Unanimous agreement that Bidbury Mead should be proposed to be included as part of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area subject to boundary amendments. It was recommended:

- a) The extension stops where Kings Croft Lane meets Bedhampton Road;
- b) Those buildings highlighted along Bedhampton Road are considered for inclusion on the list of Local Interest Buildings; and
- c) The boundary is extended to include the feature walls along the eastern and southern sides of Kings Croft Lane and Bidbury Lane respectively.

SUMMARY: Include as extension to the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area subject to above amendments.

4. Proposed south-eastern extension (Portsmouth Water)

a) Triangle with allotments:

Ms Murphy highlighted that this was the original site of the Old Manor before it became the Poor House and then Biscuit Factory. Ms Hill said that there was no longer anything of architectural or historical interest within this parcel of land, other than the wall on the south side of Bidbury Lane (to be included in the Bidbury Mead extension – please see above). It was agreed that under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the land parcel was part of the setting of the conservation area and, therefore, had a degree of protection.

SUMMARY: Do not include as extension to the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area¹.

b) Portsmouth Water land to the south of the railway line:

Ms Murphy highlighted how the supply of fresh water from the mills and waterways had contributed to the social, economic and landscape evolution of Bedhampton. The former Bedhampton Villa had once stood in this area and Cllr Fairhurst confirmed that you could view the area from Jubilee Walk. However, Ms Hill stated that although she saw the historical interest and potential for the area to be designated, the land parcel and the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area were distinctively different in terms of history and

¹ The northern feature wall will be included as part of the Bidbury Mead extension.

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

released, a Public Interest Test was undertaken. As part of this test, the organisations preparing the report (FBM and Ms Murphy) had been consulted as to whether, under the regulations, the drafts should be released. It was confirmed that the Public Interest Test had concluded that the draft report should not be released. A letter would be provided to the requestor setting out why this is the case. However, the final report will be published on the Council's website as part of the upcoming conservation area consultation.

MD (v)

Ron Tate <rontatepdr@gmail.com>

Narrow Marsh Lane at Bedhampton

Dominic Fontana [REDACTED]

Wed, Oct 28, 2020 at 8:15 PM

To: Ron Tate [REDACTED]

Dear Ron,

Thank you for your email message about Narrow Marsh Lane at Broadmarsh, Bedhampton.

I don't know very much about the immediate vicinity of Broad Marsh, but it's not far from there into the mudflats of Langstone Harbour where rich deposits of archaeological material have been found, including finds from the Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age, as well, as quite a bit of Roman material and a Saxon log boat. Further to the west nearer Farlington Marsh, there is a fairly extensive Bronze Age site with ditches, a Henge circle, cremation burial urns and a Bronze Age human burial. So, it is a landscape which was once dry, but now covered by the tide and was extensively settled and used in prehistory. It is possible that the hard path leading out from the shoreline into the harbour at Broad Marsh continued further south in earlier millennia, but I don't know. Equally, the path could have continued further north, but I couldn't find a great deal of map evidence for this, although this doesn't preclude the path's existence in prehistory. Early maps generally don't record small paths at a high resolution as the maps were mostly at the county scale and only recorded major route ways. Again, paths and routes through the landscape were generally long established and apart from during the Roman period, it wasn't really until the 19th century that new routes started to become developed and mostly people stuck to using already existing paths.

There are a number of similar "hards" in other locations around the harbours. In particular, there is a large one in Portsmouth Harbour to the west of Portchester Castle, which goes out to an island called Pewitt Island. Surrounding Pewitt Island, there are a number of timber structures, which are probably the remains of fish traps. I don't know the age of these but fish traps were used from prehistory until the 18th century to catch fish using the action of the tide. The path would make an excellent route for people to go out and collect the fish from the traps every 12 hours on low tide. There are also a number of remains of fish traps in Langstone Harbour, particularly on the West Coast of Hayling Island.

You might find this website helpful as it contains quite a few historical maps of Hampshire, which can be downloaded at a good resolution.

<http://www.oldhampshiremapped.org.uk/index.html>

Best wishes

Dominic

Dr Dominic Fontana FRGS FSA

[REDACTED]

[Quoted text hidden]