

Supplementary Planning Information

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
5 March 2020

I am now able to enclose, for consideration by the Development Management Committee on 5 March 2020, the following supplementary planning information that was unavailable when the agenda was printed.

Agenda No	Item	
3	Site Viewing Working Party Minutes	1 - 4
	To receive the minutes of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 27 February 2020.	
8	APP/19/00427 - Land at Lower Road, Havant	5 - 8
	Proposal: Development of 50 new dwellings together with access, landscaping and open space.	

[Additional Information](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 27 February 2020

Present

Councillor: Mrs Shimbart (Chairman)

Councillors: Crellin, Keast, Lowe, Lloyd, Patel (Standing Deputy) and Patrick
(Standing Deputy)

Other Councillor(s): Robinson
Councillors

Officers: Mark Gregory, Democratic Services Officer
Daphney Haywood, Principal Planner
Steve Weaver, Development Manager

(In Councillor Satchwell's absence, Councillor Mrs Shimbart acted as Chairman
of the Working Party)

18 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Howard and Satchwell.

19 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 16
January 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

20 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interests.

21 APP/19/00427 - Land at Lower Road, Bedhampton

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

The site was viewed at the request of the Chairman of the Development
Management Committee.

The Working Party received a written report and update paper by the Head of
Planning, which identified the following key considerations:

- (i) principle of development;
- (ii) the nature of development;
- (iii) impact on heritage asset;
- (iv) impact on the character and appearance of the area;

- (v) residential and neighbouring amenity;
- (vi) access and highway implications;
- (vii) Flooding and drainage;
- (viii) The effect of development on ecology;
- (ix) Impact on trees;
- (x) Impact on archaeology; and
- (xi) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), contribution requirements and legal agreement.

Prior to visiting the site, the members received a briefing from the officers outlining the report and update paper and identified the following issues for consideration by the Working Party when it visited the site:

- (a) the relationship between the historic route of Narrow Marsh Lane and the development;
- (b) the progress of the archaeological excavations that had commenced on site
- (c) the relationship between adjoining properties and the proposed development
- (d) the impact of the proposal on the highway network; and
- (e) the impact on the landscape.

In response to factual questions raised by members of the Working Party, the officers advised that:

- the application site matched the parameters of the site submitted for inclusion in the Local Plan as a development site.
- the conifers in the tree screen on the eastern boundary of the site would not be removed until the new planting on this boundary had matured.
- the County Archaeologist had confirmed that provided any findings were properly recorded he had no objections to the site being built on.
- the Community orchard and open spaces on the development would be managed by a Management Company.

(the meeting adjourned at 1.07 pm and reconvened at the application site at

The Working Party viewed the site, the subject of the application, to assess whether there were any additional matters that should be considered by the Development Management Committee. On the site, the members' attention was drawn to:

- the route of Narrow Marsh Lane as identified by the archaeological dig and the historic plans and its relationship with the proposed development
- the layout of the proposed development
- the relationship between the proposed development and adjoining properties
- the existing tree screen on the eastern boundary of the site
- the relationship of the proposed footpath and the development with the adjoining railway footbridge

The Working Party also viewed:

- the proposed access and its relationship with adjoining properties and Lower Road
- the industrial unit in Lower Road and its relationship with adjoining properties and the proposed development
- the conservation area
- the site of the proposed highway improvements
- the access points to the footpath linking Lodge Road with Bedhampton Hill Road
- the Bedhampton Hill roundabout

RESOLVED that, based on the site inspection and information available at the time, the following additional information be provided to the Development Management Committee:

- a clarification on whether the roads to be constructed within the development would be adopted as highways maintainable at the public expense; and
- b details of any reasons given (if available) for the parameters of the application site when it was submitted for inclusion as a development site within the Local Plan

The meeting commenced at 12.30 pm and concluded at 2.30 pm

.....
Chairman

Item 8 APP/19/00427 – Lower Road, Bedhampton

Statement submitted by Councillor Kenneth Smith

“Dear Members and Bedhampton residents I sincerely regret that, for health reasons, I am unable to be present this evening. However, I would like to emphasise that I fully support my fellow Ward members and Bedhampton residents in their efforts regarding this planning application. Thank you”

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Submitted by Mr Tate

Good evening members.

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. iTransport 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.