

Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 11 Jun 2019

I am writing in attempt to persuade you to reject the planning application APP/19/00427. I want to tell u about the many dangers, affects and inconvenience the potential houses that are to be built in old Bedhampton will have on the people that live in this area or use it regularly. I am (REDACTED) and live opposite bidbury park. Every morning I walk up brook side road to catch the bus (REDACTED) and also walk down again in the afternoon (REDACTED). There is no pavement on my side of the road which isn't a problem so much now but with the potential of more traffic coming back and fourth from brook side road, both during the building work, and after, the roads will get significantly more dangerous. Not only is there no pavement, there is also a blind spot at the end of the road where people turn to the left. Think of how dangerous that will be with double the amount of cars and more children walking down brook side. Me and my friends like to meet at bidbury park and in the quiet of the area, as it is a nice place, surrounded by wildlife and no noise or air pollution. With 50 houses being built it will be noisy and polluted, not to mention the effect this will have on the wildlife. I hope you will take my views into consideration when contemplating agreeing to the planning permission.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

PLANNING APPLICATION APP/19/00427 (Bargate Homes application to build 50 Houses south of Lower Road, Old Bedhampton, Hants PO

I wish to register my objections to the above Planning Application which has been submitted to the Council, as I feel that this proposed development, if approved, would be completely detrimental to the Conservation Area of Old Bedhampton, its surrounding area and the people of Bedhampton in general.

My Reasons are:-

50 houses in the proposed space, would mean considerable increase in the traffic, private and commercial, using Lower Road, which is a twisting 'village road' without safe sidewalks, and nowhere to put them, used by many people. Parents walking with children and prams, teenagers for recreational walking, Elderly and not so active people, some from Care Homes in the area who walk in a quiet safe and tranquil place for their general health and wellbeing, as well as by families for pleasure in good clean air, away from traffic fumes. It is also used by many cyclists, taking them safely away from the busy roads.

These houses would mean encroachment of 'Suburbia' on the Conservation Area, that so many people come to visit and enjoy in its natural state, where learning and enjoying our area's history can be safe and enjoyable, and of which Bedhampton can be proud.

Access for this Development would have to be via Brookside Road, therefore directly, though on the roundabout, opposite Maylands Road which is already carrying very much more traffic than it was designed to do, due to the Scratchface Lane Development. As a bus user and driver I have seen several 'problems' here even without the heavier traffic which would be inevitable should this Project be given planning permission.

With the Protection of Green Spaces, which we are all being urged to consider to Help Our Planet, please do not take away this small precious area away from our present generation of children and those generations still to come, who will grow up Proud of Their Heritage and History and the Legacy we have left them. Once urbanised this

tranquil and historical area can NEVER be reclaimed. It is our duty to preserve it ALL costs.

I therefore strongly urge The Council to look very deeply at this application and totally reject it, allowing us to pass on at least some of the treasure we Inherited.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

See Representation in Documents: Object - Dated 8 June 2019

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

See Representation in Documents: Object - recd 10/06/19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

Proposed development in Lower Road, Bedhampton

The following submission relates to my personal observations about the proposed development of 50 dwellings in Lower Road, Bedhampton. It is sectioned into topics on: roads, impact, infrastructure, policy and other factors with sub topics, where needed.

Topic: Roads and associated structures in Bedhampton

Because of over-development, in the immediate area of Bedhampton, and further afield, the local roads cannot adequately cope with the demands being placed upon them. The surfaces, road markings, kerbs, pavements, signs and structures are all showing signs of disintegration. Maintenance is at an almost non-existent level.

Traffic in Bedhampton

On week days, for two hours in the morning and three hours in the afternoon, Bedhampton's roads are full of traffic. It moves at a very slow pace and queues are a frequent occurrence. Mornings see youngsters being walked, or waking themselves, to school, people waiting for buses, runners out for a jog and walkers out for a stroll. The afternoons are the same story.

The air is thick with traffic fumes from this slow moving slug of vehicles. You can feel the burning sensation in your lungs and taste the toxins, bringing phlegm to your mouth, causing your nose to run and eyes to water. Crossing the road, even with a central reservoir, is a nightmare ? sometimes, it can take up to a minute to cross ? waiting for a motorist to wave you across or a gap in the traffic.

Because of the volume of traffic, the timing of the traffic lights at Hulbert Road are no longer fit for purpose, no gaps develop for pedestrians to cross or motorists to join from side roads. Similarly, the traffic build-up, in to and out from, the Bedhampton Road roundabout, prohibits crossing or joining.

Causes of the increase in traffic in Bedhampton

Several things account for the increase in traffic through Bedhampton. The natural coming of age of new drivers, development in Bedhampton ? bringing people into the area, development in adjacent areas ? bringing people into those areas and development of the Solent Road shopping centre in Havant, without consideration of the impacts on the existing infrastructure.

Topic: Impact of proposed development in Lower Road, Bedhampton

The building of 50 dwellings in Lower Road will bring at least 100 additional vehicles to this area. The only route to and from Bedhampton Road is via the first section of Lower Road, where the bends and twists terminate in the junction with Brookside Road; and, Brookside Road itself. There may also be additional traffic along Bidbury Lane and Kingscroft Lane. Unless there is a major upgrade to Lower Road and Brookside Road, which seems highly improbable for practical reasons (lack of available land to widen and straighten the road; and, the provision of proper pavements) and a lack of will by the authorities.

We are given to believe that a proposed change to traffic control at the current roundabout, serving Bedhampton Road, Bedhampton Hill, Maylands Road and Portsdown Hill Road, i.e. the imposition of traffic lights, is to cope with the increase in traffic into and out from Brookside Road, as a result of this development. The people of Bedhampton are quite happy with the roundabout ? it is a cleverly engineered solution which has served us well for years. Admittedly, emerging from Maylands Road can be difficult, but it seems an unnecessary expense for a road situation which works as well as can be expected given the overloading. The flow through this roundabout works well during off peak times. Traffic lights, it is felt, will worsen an already bad situation during peak times.

The use of Lower Road, by pedestrians, is going to change from a pleasant backwater with a reasonable amount of housing to a perilous thoroughfare where pedestrians will not be safe. During the development, large lorries, carrying materials and roof frames will cause chaos.

The use of Brookside Road, by pedestrians, is even more serious. It is one of the main routes to Bidbury Mead for pedestrians: abled, disabled, runners, with children and pushchairs and with dogs. It currently has little in the way of pavements or grass verges, particularly at the southern end. Although there are signs which indicate pedestrians in the road, these, fitted only a few weeks ago, have already become obscured by tree growth ? due to poor positioning. The erstwhile SLOW road markings at the junction with Lower Road and other white paint markings have been allowed to deteriorate by the County Council. Additionally, many cars park on the stream side. The whole picture is one of an already unsatisfactory route to Bedhampton's favourite recreation ground. The additional traffic for this proposed development will greatly increase the risk to users of this facility.

Topic: Infrastructure in Bedhampton

For the 8,835 (2011 census ? now surely much larger) people living in Bedhampton, there are very few local shops. The consequences are that everyone has to shop or obtain other services by car or alternatively, delivery vehicles. There are busses and trains, these are a very long way from the outskirts of the village. Cycling is highly inadvisable, unless you use the pavements, as there is virtually no provision for this mode of transport. No mass-transit type of transport has ever been put into the Solent area, due to short sightedness and now, any potential link between major population or shopping centres is going to be impossible, once again, thanks to over-development and our obsession with the car.

Topic: Government housing policy

The number of houses to be built per annum was increased to an unrealistic and unachievable 300,000 by Sajid Javid, the current Home Secretary when he was Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government of the United Kingdom (2016?2018). This was a rash move, designed to meet the so-called housing shortage for the predicted population growth. I do not believe it is based on any real, factual, evidence ? certainly, this evidence, if it exists, has not been presented to the British people.

I firmly believe that the house building target was a purely political move. It was introduced to promote the Conservatives as the party who provided homes, where no other government has done so before. This is absolute fantasy. Many good quality homes have been built in the past, together with a sustainable infrastructure. The modern equivalent does not provide this infrastructure, it purely compounds the demands on what used to be a sustainable relationship.

With regard to the predicted population growth, this is purely theoretical. One thing that will happen is that older people, who have heeded the warnings on life choices about smoking, drinking, eating the right food and exercise, will have their lives shortened by

pollution. Their homes will then become available to house younger families. Another factor is immigration. If the government can ever get this under control, the population will decrease. Also, because the quality of life is falling, due to the mechanisation of modern life, people may well decide to have less children.

The impact has been to overdevelop areas, such as the Solent Area, to such an extent that the quality of life has taken a nose dive. Developers love the planning system because it is biased towards them and away from what existing settlement populations find acceptable and the infrastructure can support. They also love arable land, rather than brownfield because it is easier to clear.

The disapproval of this particular development is nothing to do with NIMBYism. Bedhampton, for example, has already been overwhelmed with development in recent years ? new estates, always on arable land and in-fill development. The government policy takes no account of the impact upon existing settlements and is therefore dishonourable.

Developers always seem to fail to put in infrastructure improvements because they waltz on the agreement using clever non-viability clauses worked by their lawyers. The whole system is a total mess. It provides low quality, low equity, high-priced and relationship destroying housing which does not give families the secure and habitable futures they deserve. It destroys the very character of existing settlements by changing their architectural essence to a bland modernistic, brutal and featureless mish-mash with too many social problems.

Topic: Other factors envisaged from this Lower Road development

The proposed plot, for the Lower Road development, used to be a strawberry farm, providing locally grown fruits to hundreds of customers. It is a very fertile, prime, piece of agricultural/horticultural land. Its destruction and removal from Bedhampton's stock of arable land is an absolute travesty.

The view from Lower Road, across the proposed plot, towards Broadmarsh and beyond to the sea is breath-taking. To replace it with rows of boring modern housing, a mixture of plastic cladding and differently coloured bricks, the modern architectural style, with no distinctive features, minimal parking, tiny gardens, no play areas, tiny rooms and minimal storage is absolute modern folly. Furthermore, these houses will clash with the existing stock of housing to the north of Lower Road. A dismal mix of styles will destroy the character of this lovely area of Old Bedhampton. This too is an absolute travesty. My final argument is, that as far as I am aware, this proposed development is inside a designated conservation area, designed to maintain the unique character of Old Bedhampton. What on earth are our council thinking of, putting it into the Local Plan 2036? This is arable land ? there is still much brownfield land available ? surely they are supposed to use this first! This proposal is a betrayal of what we, the residents of Bedhampton, thought was the preservation of our past and future culture.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

See representation under documents tab 10.06.19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

See comments in documents - received 10/6/19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

As a resident of Brookside Road I wish to register my objection to the major development proposed at Lower Road in Bedhampton. In my opinion this is an ill-considered major development on a peaceful greenfield site that shows no regard for the issues of setting, neighbours or access.

The irreparable damage caused to a unique area in the borough, which forms the backdrop of the Old Bedhampton conservation area should be enough reason to reject this development.

But if this is not sufficient, then the access issues should kill the plan. The traffic surveys taken over a few days may show low levels of traffic, with no recorded accidents. However, these numbers do nothing to capture the number of times I've been walking around the blind bends on the pathless Lower Road when cars speed at you from both directions, swerving cars narrowly missing each other, you and your family. Quoting 85th percentile speeds is all well and good (MOST people sensibly understand the risks here), but I can tell you from personal experience that the real top speeds are significantly greater. And speeds on Brookside Road are higher than Lower Road, despite its narrow, non-straight and pathless nature, with children playing and dogs walking on the road at times. Any increase in traffic on these roads causes a disproportionate increase in the degree of conflict. And no previous recorded accidents does not somehow insure against the increased risk of future accidents.

No alternative access has been proposed for the significant increase in traffic flow, and no mitigation has been proposed. The developer clearly has no desire to ensure this development is delivered safely.

This is not the right location for any significant development, and permission should be refused.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

I am writing my objection to oppose the above planning.

I have lived in Old Bedhampton for four years and I love living here.

There is such a fantastic feel to the area - steeped in history and we need to protect it from being destroyed.

1. I walk my children to school most days - I can tell you first hand that the three-blind bends in Lower Road are already treacherous. Adding the work vehicles/machinery needed to build these new homes and I can foresee a terrible accident occurring - its just not safe. There is no footpath at one point so if two cars are approaching in opposite directions it's very dangerous.

2. When we take the car we face the same problem - cars come around the bend too fast/straddling both lanes and this will only exacerbate the problem.

3. There are many cyclists that use this route as well as horses - again adding to the risk
4. The only access to this proposed new development is through the conservation area via Brookside Road or the single track Bidbury Lane. The 50 houses will create a massive increase in traffic which will shatter the peace and tranquillity of the area
5. Residential Home with lots of elderly residents who walk this route is situated right on one of these blind bends

We really need to protect these areas of natural beauty and help conserve for our generations that follow.

Please, I beg, take a walk around the area, see for yourself what a disastrous impact this will have.

I really hope that this planning is rejected.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

Old Bedhampton has a unique character with its Conservation Area, sunken lanes and listed buildings. This is currently available for all to enjoy. The new development will increase traffic which will be a danger to pedestrians and cyclists and also destroy the peace and tranquillity of the area.

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory obligation to safeguard heritage. Old Bedhampton is of historic and cultural significance and should be preserved as a unique asset for the borough.

This is a greenfield site, development will degrade the value of the area for our wildlife which is already under pressure. There are sufficient brownfield sites in Havant which could be developed to meet our housing requirements without destroying this beautiful area

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

I object to the application to build 50 dwellings on land south of Lower Road, Bedhampton:

As a regular walker, cyclist and runner along the narrow blind bends on Lower Road I have already had several near-miss incidents with traffic in both directions. The road at one point is contained by a high hedge on one side and a wall on the other. There are no pavements for a long section. It is extremely difficult to move out of the way of badly positioned cars as they travel through the bends. If two cars should meet in this section of road there is insufficient room to pass and avoid pedestrians or cyclists. The

increased level of traffic with cars and large delivery and service lorries will exacerbate the situation and convert what is already a dangerous situation into a lethal one. I believe that the road accessing this site is insufficient to sustain the increased traffic safely.

Parking is already a regular occurrence on the grass verge in front of the Elms and it is being damaged. This verge will be used by traffic as cars pass each other on the narrow road, which is likely to completely destroy it.

This is a quiet area that is full of character. The addition of 50 dwellings will adversely affect its character with increased traffic noise and pollution and turn it into a busy area, destroying the peace and tranquillity of charming area.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

We frequently visit our children and grandchildren in Lower Road, Old Bedhampton and consider the road and lack of pavements in that area to be inadequate and very dangerous, even for the existing properties. Should this development go ahead it would cause much more traffic, increasing the danger to pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. We have encountered a few near misses ourselves on the blind bend, eg. oncoming traffic over the wrong side of the road or going too fast. We fear for our grandchildren's safety when either walking or going to school by car. Apart from the inconvenience while building work is taking place, eg lorries, dust, noise etc., what about afterwards - the added amount of cars per household, delivery vans and lorries etc.

We strongly object to this application.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

To: Havant Council

Re: Planning Application APP/19/00427 (Bargate Homes application to build 50 houses south of Lower Road in Old Bedhampton)

I wish to object to the above planning application which should be refused planning permission.

My reasons for saying this planning application should be completely rejected are as follows:

- The only access to this proposed development is through the conservation area via Brookside Road or the single track Bidbury Lane. The huge increase in traffic will change the nature of the tranquil area forever.

- The increased traffic on these often narrow, pavementless roads with their already treacherous blind bends will cause a very real danger to us all. Walkers cyclists, school children, parents with prams, along with the disabled and elderly- all will be put at danger

- The number of wildlife/animals living in the planned development site that will be

killed/homes destroyed will be a huge loss

- In the application by Bargate it is suggested that the Footpath in Lodge Road is used to avoid using the pavement less roads. Have you ever used this footpath? Its only wide enough to walk one person abreast in a single file - so when I take my children to school I am not able to hold their hand - they must walk in front or behind. It's often very overgrown. I am unable to go down this footpath with my double buggy (which is the same width as a wheelchair). If you meet another person with a pushchair/bike coming the opposite way, then one of you has to "back-up" and go back to the beginning in order to let them pass. Completely inappropriate to compound this situation further by relying on this footpath as a pedestrian thoroughfare for the proposed development. The lighting is also very poor - and when the lights go off at (by HBC in the early morning it is in complete darkness).

I strongly urge the council to reject this plan and let us preserve the unique beauty of Old Bedhampton.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

I wish to object to the above planning application. My reasons for saying this planning application should be completely rejected are as follows:

- It will completely ruin the quiet, tranquil recreational area that is Old Bedhampton with its Conservation Area and Listed Buildings and which is accessed via Brookside Road, Lower Road and Bidbury Lane

- Because the only way to reach Lower Road (a cul-de-sac) is via Brookside Road or the single track Bidbury Lane, there will be a massive increase in road traffic due to 50 more houses. This will be a great danger to the hundreds of families around Bedhampton and Havant who come to Old Bedhampton to walk, play and cycle with their children as well as dog walkers and elderly people.

- There will be extreme danger to school children and others both on bikes and on foot as well as elderly and disabled people, families and dog walkers who have to walk on the road around the blind triple bends along Lower Road. This road is very narrow, has no pavements or room for any and is barely wide enough for 2 cars or Home Delivery vans to pass each other, let alone for children and families to be squeezed past by these vehicles.

- Lower Road with its 3 blind bends is used heavily by schoolchildren going to and from school and by cycling commuters, as well as by leisure cyclists as a safe alternative to the busy main road. Massively increasing the car traffic from the 50 houses will put them at serious and unacceptable risk.

- Unbelievably, there is an Old Peoples Residential Home right in the middle of the blind bends with no pavement. It is simply not right that a planning application should be made which will double the cars and delivery vans squeezing past these elderly and often infirm old people, some in wheelchairs as they try to take some daily exercise. This planning application must be refused.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

I do not live in Old Bedhampton but visit occasionally and would like to object to the proposed development of 50 homes on the land south of Lower Road. It is a beautiful area and should be protected from further development and the conservation area should be expanded to include the land in this application. I understand that this was recommended but the council decided to ignore that and only select extensions to the East and on the other side of the main road to the North. Surely the land adjacent to the current conservation area should be considered as the setting is part of the village and should not be spoilt by any housing estate which is not in keeping with Lower Road.

The traffic situation around the triple bends in Lower Road is already intimidating and I do not feel safe on the sections with no pavement. I use a walker to assist with walking and feel that any additional traffic would cause a danger to me. The Lodge Road footpath is too far for me to walk when going to the park and I would be reluctant to use the unpaved roadway if any more traffic was present.

The development will spoil the tranquillity of the area and effect the wildlife that uses the land. The development application should be rejected as the harm caused will be much greater than any benefit provided.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 14 May 2019

Who validated this application and what are their qualifications?

Comment submitted date: Wed 29 May 2019

Is there a new planning development at the end of Lower Road, Bedhampton.? I see that the owner of the Metal warehouse is clearing the land and laying a hardcore area next to it. As a regular cyclist in and around Bedhampton, Lower Road is busy enough with all of the white vans that come out of that warehouse. I don't think Bedhampton needs a lorry park at the end of it as well. Sad to see the character of this old village change so much in a few years.

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT & DEVELOPMENT DRAINAGE STRATEGY.

Para 4.17 Artificial Sources. "no recorded incidents".

The "18 inch" water main serving Hayling Island from the Portsdown Hill Reservoir along with the sewer under Lower Road ruptured flooding Old Manor farm properties and the north side of the H2O development site with contaminated water. There was months of disruption. This disingenuous omission questions the reports accuracy.

4.25 "no flooding from sewers in the last 10 years". There is a section of Lower Road outside of "Long On", that floods after every significant rainfall several times a year. Occasionally filling the whole carriageway. The developers, Bargate Homes are well aware of this problem having had it brought to their attention at DCF44

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

4. This application (APP/19/00427) is premature as it posted just before the Sec. of State forwards The Local Plan 2036 to an Independent Inspector for Examination in Public in the third quarter of 2019. Residents and consultees submissions have already identified numerous areas where additional information is required (HCC Flood and Highways, Environment, Archeology, Ecology, Langstone Harbour Board, Arborocultural). There are also 2 large topics yet to report conclusively. The first is the Borough wide Traffic assessment which is proposing significant changes to the Rusty Cutter roundabout and the mini roundabout at the north end of Bedhampton Hill with Portsdown Hill Rd, Maylands Rd, Bedhampton Rd and Brookside Rd. These proposed changes will have a significant knock on effect on the flow of traffic in and out of Old Bedhampton and also through the Conservation Area, including Kingscroft Lane. The second is the Conservation Review of Old Bedhampton which is not due to make recommendations to the Full Council meeting until 10th July 2019.

The application may also be considered opportunistic and speculative as it seeks a determination in isolation and avoid the more intense scrutiny of the whole LP at EiP.

The application should be rejected on the grounds that only an informed determination can be made with all the evidence available and in the context of the whole plan. The latter will more clearly demonstrate the accumulative effects of incremental planning decisions on Bedhampton (The proposed H20, H40, H22, H14, C10 and the already recently completed developments at Site 180, The Chalk Pit, Scatchface Lane and multiple windfall sites, some 1,400 dwellings.). The development of H20 (50 homes) does not meet the test of does it deliver more good for the community as compared to the harm to the heritage, ambiance, amenity and well being that will result if progressed. This was clearly expressed to the same developer by an Independent Inspector in 2014 who determined at appeal against an application and upheld the objections by HBC and local residents. Nothing has changed since 2014 and thus the residents consider this application in the context of the history of this site and the timing of this more recent application in relation to the progress of HBC LP 2036 to EiP, as vexatious no matter what spin the developers have put in their application documents which contain multiple errors of fact, bizarre conclusions and disingenuous misuse of statistics. The space for this submission does not allow for a detailed listing but these will all be addressed in separate submissions by other residents.

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

APP/19/00427 should be rejected on the grounds that:-

Traffic flow statistics used to make conclusions are from 2016 (out of date) and in part at times of the year (weather?) when movements are likely to be reduced. Anecdotally residents are confident that there has been a significant increase in vehicular movement since 2016 as "The Barn" at the western end of Lower Road has developed its light industrial activities.

The application puts great weight on the "exemplary" safety record of Lower Road, which is based on records showing no serious injuries recorded. This ignores the anecdotal evidence of near misses and minor injuries/damage recorded by residents over the years. Only when these events are recorded scientifically can anyone be confident that when "Heinrich's safety pyramid" is applied it will confirm or deny the conclusions drawn in the application.

This application references "Manual for Streets" to confirm that with increased traffic movements resulting from H20, there will be no effect on safety in the shared spaces which are more extensive than the application indicates. Manual for Streets is designed to be a guide for urban straight streets and is not designed to be applied to semi rural bendy Lanes as exist in Brookside Road and Lower Road.

No comment has been made on the imminent increase in 'silent' electric vehicles and their impact on safety. There is already a problem with cyclists who do not have bells and a widespread lack of understanding that pedestrians have priority in shared spaces. If there is truly no safety concern, why have new traffic calming white lines been introduced on Lower Road recently. The Lodge Road cut to Bedhampton Hill is not a viable alternative route for anyone other than a fit pedestrian, and even then the cut is an intimidating place for ladies at night. Anyone approaching the cut can not see the opposite entry point. Therefore anyone entering the cut on any mobility aid or with a pram meeting a similar set up coming in the opposite direction will end up with one party having to reverse to their entry point to allow the other party to pass.

The safety aspects are one of the greatest concerns of residents and users of Old Bedhampton arising from this application. There is an impression that legitimate concerns are not being taken seriously and that the whole subject has been addressed glibly and in a patronising manner. The experts know best and the local knowledge is worthless. Acknowledging an arrogant bad decision will be of little comfort after one death or serious injury. The parties involved in this planning decision should be cognisant of the seriousness of the facts and the unfounded conclusions.

Reject this application on the grounds that currently the evidence and conclusions are unsound and that it is not yet proven that safety will not be diminished and that any good arising from this development does not outweigh the potential harm.

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

There has been little reference to future environment and ecology. Some examples:-

Any tree planting should consider species that will thrive in an environment that is likely to warm over the next 50 years.

In housing design there is no mention of the use of photo voltaic roof tiles in appropriate

positions.

Waste water collection in "ponds" should be assessed as there is a theoretical risk of foreign disease carrying insects being attracted to and inhabiting the ponds with global warming.

Electrical infrastructure should be of a specification to support fast recharging of batteries.

This application to develop H20 should be rejected because it lacks imagination to plan and use technology for the next 50 years at least.

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

Traffic volume assessments are notoriously poor at forecasting. Almost always underestimating numbers to a significant extent. Data collected in 2016 is out of date and already underestimates volumes. Statistical conclusions drawn to support the conclusions drawn in the application are at best misleading. For instance for 2 cars passing in the opposite direction at the same time as a pedestrian also occupies the carriageway outside The Lodge is once every 56,000 times a user passes through the bends. This is designed to re-assure but is seen as being so far from reality to be laughable if the subject of safety were not so important.

The threat to safety by increased traffic is real. On this basis along with numerous other reasons this application to develop H20 should be rejected.

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

The Landscape assessment used to vindicate the planning applications conclusions is flawed. The survey was carried out in the summer when leaf cover is maximum. For nearly 6 months of the year there are no leaves which fundamentally alters the views to and from the conservation area and thus its setting. Supportive comments were taken from the 1994 Conservation Area review which is patently 25 years out of date and is now being updated by the 2019 review which has yet to make recommendations. The shelter belt of non native leylandii type trees is reaching its end of life and serves no functional purpose. It should be removed.

The developers report comments:

"This is one of the few landscape types in the Borough where a rural village survives with its semi rural setting intact."

Any development in a rural settlement should be resisted as this will alter the irregularity and density of the settlement morphology. H20 and its access will urbanise Lower Road with increased traffic, destruction of an ancient hedge and its sunken lane and increased artificial lighting.

These are further reasons to reject APP/19/00427.

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

APP/19/00427 should be rejected on the grounds that:-

Traffic flow statistics used to make conclusions are from 2016 (out of date) and in part at times of the year (weather?) when movements are likely to be reduced. Anecdotally residents are confident that there has been a significant increase in vehicular movement

since 2016 as "The Barn" at the western end of Lower Road has developed its light industrial activities.

The application puts great weight on the "exemplary" safety record of Lower Road, which is based on records showing no serious injuries recorded. This ignores the anecdotal evidence of near misses and minor injuries/damage recorded by residents over the years. Only when these events are recorded scientifically can anyone be confident that when "Heinrich's safety pyramid" is applied it will confirm or deny the conclusions drawn in the application.

This application references "Manual for Streets" to confirm that with increased traffic movements resulting from H20, there will be no effect on safety in the shared spaces which are more extensive than the application indicates. Manual for Streets is designed to be a guide for urban straight streets and is not designed to be applied to semi rural bendy Lanes as exist in Brookside Road and Lower Road.

No comment has been made on the imminent increase in 'silent" electric vehicles and their impact on safety. There is already a problem with cyclists who do not have bells and a widespread lack of understanding that pedestrians have priority in shared spaces. If there is truly no safety concern why have new traffic calming white lines been introduced on Lower Road recently. The Lodge Road cut to Bedhampton Hill is not a viable alternative route for anyone other than a fit pedestrian, and even then the cut is an intimidating place for ladies at night. Anyone approaching the cut can not see the opposite entry point. Therefore anyone entering the cut on any mobility aid or with a pram meeting a similar set up coming in the opposite direction will end up with one party having to reverse to their entry point to allow the other party to pass.

The safety aspects are one of the greatest concerns of residents and users of Old Bedhampton arising from this application. There is an impression that legitimate concerns are not being taken seriously and that the whole subject has been addressed glibly and in a patronising manner. The experts know best and the local knowledge is worthless. Acknowledging an arrogant bad decision will be of little comfort after one death or serious injury to any of the parties involved in this planning decision.

Reject this application on the grounds that currently, the evidence and conclusions are unsound and that it is not yet proven that safety will not be diminished and that any good arising from this development does not outweigh the potential harm.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jun 2019

We are writing to you reference APP/19/00427 to develop H20, Land south of Lower Road, Bedhampton. We object to the proposed development. Our concern is primarily focused on safety. As you

are probably aware,
Lower Road has 3 blind bends in succession, passing a building of historical significance
- The Elms. In addition
to this the north/south section of Lower Road (south of The Elms) has no pedestrian
footpath.

We have three children who attend one of the local primary schools. We often
walk/scoot via this route and
through Bidbury Park. The park is a quiet and safe alternative to walking them along the
busy Bedhampton

Road. Due to our concerns regarding safety through the 3 blind bends we typically elect
to drive to the park

and walk/scoot from there, especially if there is only 1 adult to supervise. Clearly this
situation today is not

ideal, and somewhat counter productive to the programs promoted through schools and
local council,

encouraging children to walk to school. Additional traffic through these sections would
effectively put a stop

to walking for us, when our children are keen to walk to school or the park.

We have witnessed several incidents and have lots of experience where the safety of
the section of Lower

Road containing the three blind bends is of concern:

- Residents from houses struggling to join the road, sometimes needing to reverse from
their drives.

- Cars parked on the verge outside The Elms, forcing northbound traffic into the middle
of the road and

into oncoming traffic around a blind bend.

- Delivery vans and lorries driving over the central line round a blind bend, due to their
size and the

narrowness of the road.

- A Mobility scooter on the wrong side of the road coming from the direction of Bidbury
park, unable to

join the footpath until the driveway next to The Elms ? effectively head-on as we came
Northwards

past The Elms around the middle of the three blind bends.

- A delivery driver overtaking me whilst pushing our daughter in a pram on the road (in
the section

without a footpath) ? if a vehicle had come the other way around the corner and they
had swerved to

avoid it, rather than hitting it head on, we would have been crushed against the wall.

- While cycling along Lower Road, we have experienced cars overtaking us through
section of

blind bends, again causing concern should a vehicle come around the blind bend and
result

in the overtaking vehicle to swerve.

- Cars parked all the way along the road, next to the stream, forcing southbound
vehicles to approach a

blind bend on the wrong side of the road.

- Poor drainage regularly leading to up to half the road being flooded at the south-most
bend, forcing

southbound traffic onto the wrong side of the road as they approach a blind bend

- Difficulties crossing with small children on foot at the north-most bend to access the
park. It is

difficult to see cars coming from both directions and there is the added complication of a further road joining at the bend.

Here is a summary of our main concerns that would impact pedestrian and cyclist safety:

The increase in the volume of traffic presented by 50 new homes on Lower Road:

130+ parking places have been allocated to the new estate, approximately doubling the volume of traffic

through Lower Road (and through the conservation area). Doubling the traffic (in both directions) would

quadruple the number of times vehicles cross and a serious incident occurring. It's also worth noting that it

won't just increase residential traffic. Households continue to move their shopping habits online and away

from the high street and as a result the traffic is already increasing.

The width of the Lower Road and its ability to sustain the increased volume of traffic:

The width of the road through the bends is very narrow. Large vehicles, for example construction traffic and

delivery vans, struggle to keep to their side of the road. To prove the point very visually, the road was recently

painted with new 'slow' signs added to the road. In order to accommodate the word 'SLOW', the line

painters had to leave gaps in the road edge lines. The central lines were not repainted for some reason ?

perhaps because this would mean larger vehicles would have no option but to drive over it making it

pointless?

The data presented by Bargate Homes traffic analysis raises questions:

We question the accuracy/interpretation of traffic data presented by Bargate Homes.

Since the application we

have been noting how often we pass at least one vehicle whilst travelling through the section of blind bends.

We typically drive in and out of Lower road 6-8 times a day and it is over 50% of the time. On one occasion we

passed 4 vehicles travelling in the opposite direction. We accept that we probably travel at peak times ? but

these are the very peak times children are walking to or from school. We note the survey times presented as

peak are from 16:00 to 19:00, which does not include returning school traffic, so perhaps despite the amount

of traffic we see, we are not even travelling at peak times?

We also note the data in the Transport Statement is poorly presented, with use of undefined acronyms, tables

split over pages, pages full of '*' (was there a problem with the data or is it just not shown?) etc, making

analysis difficult. Despite this, as an example, on Thursday 13th June 2016 the data suggests that there was just

104 car movements in 24 hours ? we very much doubt that we make 6-10% of all car journeys in a day.

Furthermore, it says that there were 164 LGV movements in the same period. This appears to be a similar

picture for most/all of the data. This seems completely ridiculous. While there are many LGVs delivering

orders etc, there are many more cars using Lower Road. If this picture were to be true it would mean the development would result in a massive increase in large vehicles that are not suited to the narrow road and blind bends?

The proposed diversion of pedestrian traffic to a pathway in Lodge Road:

The transport statement includes discussion regarding the footpath from Lodge Road as an alternative for

pedestrian traffic to avoid the dangerous section of Lower Road (Transport Statement, page 14). The proposed

pathway via Lodge Road is not a suitable alternative.

It is narrow, surrounded by high fencing, walls and hedges, and is overhung by trees, making it enclosed.

There are 2 almost right-angle bends in the path with no way to see ahead (not shown in the transport

statement, which shows only a photograph of a straight section and an incorrect straight line on image 3.2).

The width is such that two mobility scooters/wheelchairs/prams coming in opposite directions would be

unable to pass let alone navigate the bends. We note that in the planning there are some proposed homes

with disabled spaces ? how will these residents access the facilities of Bedhampton safely if they use mobility

scooters?

The proposed plans discuss upgrading the footpath from Lodge Road to support pedestrians and cycles

(SCI_Appendix_1-1, page 7 - 'this existing route should be upgraded to provide a safe route for cyclists and

pedestrian from the new development to the north.'). The recommended width for mixed pedestrian and

cycle traffic is 3 meters. We fail to see how this path can be expanded to 3 meters, given the distance

between the houses at the north end and between the garages at the south end.

Currently Cycling is

prohibited on this footpath.

The direction of pedestrian traffic and its impact on the proposed diversion:

The application documents state that the Lodge Road foot path provides a shorter distance to travel to the bus

stop (Transport Statement section 3.3.4), However, it appears that the measurement of this distance was

taken from the end of Lodge road where the new proposed footpath finishes, and not the new road

intersection with Lower Road, which is a little disingenuous, incorrectly suggesting the Lodge Road footpath is

route is shorter. It seems that this new footpath is of limited value and added to reinforce the false impression

that the Lodge Road footpath is a sensible option.

The Lodge Road footpath alternative is a longer route for most of the residents that use Lower Road. While

distance-wise, it is marginal for bus stop access, anyone wishing to walk or cycle to Bidbury Park, Bidbury & St.

Thomas More's Infant / Junior Schools, or further into Bedhampton and Havant, would

opt to use the more accessible and direct route via Bidbury Lane and Bidbury Park, which passes through the three blind bend section of Lower Road.

Other comments

We note that most of the specific objections raised relate to safety, even though many people quite rightly share concerns about the conservation area (both during construction and due to increased traffic on completion), loss of arable land, access to schools and doctors etc, damage to trees and hedges covered by preservation orders etc. Safety is a genuine concern for the local residents, familiar with this section of roadway and its inherent dangers.

Finally, if, despite all the safety concerns raised above, this proposal were to be approved, we would expect due consideration of the precedent set in items 2 & 3 of decision notice of APP/14/01040 (restricted opening and obfuscation of all north facing windows, including ground floor) to be applied equally to the proposed new development. It should also be noted that the western elevation of the same property was required to be windowless, providing privacy to the western neighbour, and again this precedent should be continued in the new development

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

The parcel of land proposed enhances the whole area of Old Bedhampton and in particular the conservation area it adjoins. It offers residents and its many visitors a clam tranquil place to enjoy. A green space in an otherwise busy town. This proposed development only plans to destroy this.

The conservation area, which this land south of lower road is adjoined too, is something HBC should be looking to protect and enhance. The Conservation area is currently under review with HBC with a report submitted by an independent heritage consultant. The review recommends the inclusion of Lower Road, and Narrow Marsh Lane which runs across the land proposed for development. The developer by submitting their planning application before the final decision has been made by the council regarding the extension of the conservation area highlights that they do not consider the conservation area of any significance. The conservation area with its historical interest brings people into the area to enjoy. The conservation area review gives the council an excellent opportunity to enhance it and preserve it for future generations to enjoy. HBC have a duty to protect heritage.

The proposed development only looks to destroy and diminish it.

Accessibility

The land can only be accessed via Lower Road which is narrow and passes through the Conservation area. It has three tight bends which in parts offer no pavements. It is

shared with walkers and cyclists. The near misses are all too frequent and with the road already getting busier with the increase in vans and cars this road is an accident waiting to happen. The road is also a national cycle route and with further developments proposed elsewhere in the borough this route will only get busier. How can HBC justify agreeing to this development where clearly it will pose an even greater risk to all who use this road way. Families walking with their children, joggers, and the elderly all have to navigate the roads carefully now, this will be impossible if further traffic is put on this road by this unreasonable development.

The Setting

The developers plan is flawed and does not in any way enhance the area or protect heritage. It is not in keeping with its surroundings. Lower Road is NOT a housing estate. It is made up of individual houses along a narrow country lane which is barely wide enough for two cars to pass. Lower Road currently has approximately 52 houses, this development will double the amount of traffic for this area and will COMPLETELY change the area for the worse, adding noise, pollution and congestion. There is NO benefit, just harm to a beautiful area.

The development relies upon screening on all sides to reduce its visual impact, which is why the developer has agreed to maintain the shelter belt of trees to the left of the site. These trees are old and will not last. Any replacement will take years to mature to the stature of the current trees and is also a clear indication that this site is not in keeping and would be an eyesore if not screened. This shelter belt will become impossible to maintain with management companies having to become involved and will then fail thus exposing the estate to all thus ruining the setting of the conservation area and its surroundings.

Wildlife

I am aware that wildlife is not considered important to developers. It is often only considered with only small concessions being made. However this site is home to many birds and mammals. This rich mixture of wildlife adds to the charm and beauty of the area which visitors and residents all enjoy. Any development will only destroy this. No matter how many bat or bird boxes are put up to help mitigate, damage will be done.

Local Plan

This development is not only opposed by the local residents but by many people who travel here to enjoy what Old Bedhampton has to offer. A signed petition with over 1700 signatures was submitted to the council opposing it being included in the local plan and the site has been rejected by the council before. WHAT HAS CHANGED?

The developer is fully aware that the local plan has yet to be finalised and therefore has

applied for planning permission hoping to get it all agreed before the government inspector can fully access the suitability of this site. Therefore please do not allow this application to 'slip through' the net.

AND Finally

Please do not destroy such a well-loved and special place that is enjoyed by so many with unnecessary development. Please allow it to be enjoyed as it is for future generations to enjoy. Please do not be the council who is remembered for its destruction.

This development offers no benefit to the area, just harm. Therefore please REJECT this application for development on land south of Lower Road.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

In the 21st century, the concept of creating dwellings immediately adjacent to two major A roads and a mainline railway raises serious concerns for the health of those living in the new development. Furthermore the irretrievable loss of an attractive rural space in the heart of a densely developed area will have a negative effect on the character of Bedhampton.

Air pollution. The proposed development is adjacent to the very busy A27 and A3M. In the last decade our understanding of the dangers to health from the inhalation of fine particulate matter have increased substantially. The risks are higher the closer to the site of emissions, local climate and prevailing wind. Exposure of PM 2.5, PM 10 and nitrous dioxide all affect human health. The proposed development lies immediately downwind of the polluting roads. No fixed monitor exists in the location and so it is not possible to comment with any confidence on the level of pollution to which the residents will be exposed over time. The effect of long-term exposure to such particulate emissions especially on the health of children should be considered.

PM10 and PM2.5 include inhalable particles that are small enough to penetrate the thoracic region of the respiratory system. The health effects of inhalable PM are well documented. They are due to exposure over both the short term (hours, days) and long term (months, years) and include:

- respiratory and cardiovascular morbidity, such as aggravation of asthma, respiratory symptoms and an increase in hospital admissions
- mortality from cardiovascular and respiratory diseases and from lung cancer
- reduced lung growth in children which persists into adulthood

There is no evidence of a safe level of exposure or a threshold below which no adverse health effects occur (WHO 2013).

Noise. The area is bordered immediately to the west by the A3M and to the South by the railway line and A27. The immediate proximity to these busy routes will expose residents to high levels of noise and air pollution. I recognise that noise levels are measured inside a building but a healthy environment encourages people and especially children to be outside being active. The constant and intrusive noise from the busy roads is not consistent with designing for a healthy environment. The area is adjacent to flood plain and flooding has a major negative impact on mental and physical health that can be long-lasting.

Access to the area is limited to a single road that passes through a conservation area and contains three blind corners. On two such corners (beyond 'The Elms') there is no pavement. A healthy environment would encourage residents to walk or cycle but the constraints mentioned discourage this and would inevitably increase the amount of traffic on this single road.

Regular physical exercise reduces the risk of heart disease/obesity/hypertension and diabetes and promotes general well-being and mental health. Promotion of physical exercise is encouraged when planning new housing. The relative isolation of the site with regard to shops and employment will necessitate car journeys. In addition the busy A roads make cycling unattractive/dangerous; the area is cut off from the national cycle network way by the A27. Any proposal to increase cycling as a means of regular transport needs to acknowledge the particular dangers posed by crossing these busy roads. None of the access roads have provision for cyclists.

Increase in car journeys. The nearest doctor's surgery is either Drayton Surgery (catchment stops at the A3M) or The Bosmere Practice in Solent Road. Both are over 2km distant which will usually preclude walking. There is a bus route to the Drayton surgery but the stop requires a walk of 800 metres. There is no public transport to the Bosmere surgery which for practical purposes can only be reached by car.

Conservation Area. The development will have a negative visual and physical impact on an attractive open landscape in an otherwise densely developed area. The highly prized conservation area and adjacent Bidbury Mead encourage outdoor activity and exercise. The development further encases this 'open lung' in the middle of Bedhampton. Bidbury Lane passes through the quietest part of the conservation area. The development will inevitably lead to an increase in traffic here as motorists seek a 'rat-run' to bypass the

traffic lights on Bedhampton Road.

Reducing the options for local walks. The previously rural community of Old Bedhampton has been effectively blockaded in most directions. Despite these barriers there exist several attractive local circular walks. One of Bedhamptons' circular walks runs across the field to the south of Lower Road along an old path which allowed locals direct access the foreshore at the northern extent of Langstone Harbour. The proposed development would remove the rural aspect of this walk.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

I object to the proposed development on the following grounds.

We have a duty to protect and enhance this tranquil area for future generations. Once the rural character has been lost, it is gone forever. I have lived in Bedhampton for 20 years and know how much people welcome the oasis provided in the midst of an otherwise very built up area. Importantly one can walk with children and dogs to enjoy this area. In other words a car journey is not required. The development not only degrades the rural setting of Lower road but also encourages the use of cars through the Old Bedhampton conservation area.

Residents of West Bedhampton and beyond can access Bidbury Mead along Lower Road. A sense of calm is restored as soon as one leaves the frenetic 'Rusty Cutter round-about' and join the footpath to Lower Road. This encourages people to walk and cycle. The development would reduce rather than encourage this.

Many generations have enjoyed walking across this field to the harbour before the A27 severed the link. Ideally that right of way should be re-instated to allow a circular walk (enjoyed in recent years before the land-owner sealed it off) linking to the bottom of Mill Lane and back to St Thomas' Church.

The prospect of more through the conservation area traffic is not welcome especially for the children who enjoy cycling and walking freely on Brookside Road and the adjacent natural stream.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

I strongly object to the proposed development of 50 new houses in Lower Road.

This development will completely ruin the the tranquil Conservation Area of Old Bedhampton for local residents and visitors.

The local roads of Lower Road, Brookside Road and Bidbury Lane are not wide enough to accommodate increased traffic, it is already hard enough to drive out of driveways on Bedhampton Road and Bedhampton Hill in rush hour traffic. Traffic queues already back up from the roundabouts and junction with traffic lights, with cars blocking the driveways.

With all the other housing developments in the pipeline, it will only exacerbate congestion, pollution, stress on schools, QA hospital and medical facilities in the area.

Please don't let this development go through, leave Old Bedhampton for future generations to enjoy as I do.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

I am writing on behalf myself and the members of The Bedhampton Historical Collection to object to planning permission being granted for the proposed housing development reference Planning Application APP/19/00427 on the land south of Lower Road in Bedhampton. From the outset, let me assure you that this letter is not nimbyism as only one of our members is a resident of Bedhampton village.

This letter is designed to question the wisdom of the proposal by Havant Borough Council to consider the building of a significant housing development (APP/19/00427) in Lower Road across Narrow Marsh Lane, the historic access route to the common land of Broadmarsh; to question the long-term damage that the development will have on The Elms, the most important Grade II* Listed building in the village (the star rating puts it into the top 8% in the country and one of only six in the Havant Borough); to support the Bedhampton Heritage Alliance with their proposals to extend the existing Conservation Area for the enjoyment and recreational use of visitors and residents.

The proposed planning application APP/19/00427, if approved will:-

Destroy the traditional character of the village that is so attractive to visitors and residents alike.

Remove the rural nature and destroy the historical landscape of Lower Road

Build across Narrow Marsh Lane; the former historic route to the harbour and the common land of Broadmarsh.

Make using the roads in the village more dangerous for walkers, cyclists, wheelchair and mobility scooter users.

Increase traffic flow to unacceptably hazardous levels through the double-bends at the eastern end of Lower Road

Increase queuing traffic at the B2177 junction waiting to turn into Brookside. The resulting queue would impact on traffic leaving the mini roundabout and encourage

motorists with local knowledge to increase use of the narrow alternative route Kings Croft Lane.

Unnecessarily destroy the heritage and tranquil nature of the area for the enjoyment of future generations.

It would appear that the initial local authority quota of new home has already been met through other developments in the scheme, so this development is unnecessary and not essential.

It is our privilege to take groups of school children, visitors and other educational groups on guided walks around the village to explain the history and development of the area. The feedback from these tours has always been positive with participants making return visits because they have learnt to appreciate the unusual, quiet calm that the area has. Risk assessment of the area with increased traffic flow would probably result in ceasing any group walks around the narrow roads of the village.

Bedhampton has, until now, been a survivor - a village that still retains its identity and landscape in a way that other areas of the borough have lost through development of the built environment. It is a shame that politics, commercial gain and greed should be the downfall of this charming backwater that until now, has been protected by the B2177, the A27 and the closure of the western end of Lower Road; taking traffic past and not through the area has, until now, been its saviour. For the last two years the Bedhampton Historical Collection have been displaying a very large 3 metre long map of Bedhampton Parish dated 1825. The 8 miles of the parish in 1825 finished at Padnell Avenue at Cowplain. What is striking is, the only built area is that grouped around Bedhampton village leaving the rest of the map as fields and forest. It clearly demonstrates how the built environment has swallowed up all of the land leaving less than 1% of the original maps landscape as it was in 1825, and it is this final, small percentage that is now being proposed for development in the name of progress... How sad that is.

Whilst we are not proposing to turn Bedhampton village into a history theme park, we do see Bedhampton as it is today, as an opportunity for tourism, recreation and education; a destination for both local people and visitors alike to enjoy. Building a significant housing development in Lower Road will lose this opportunity forever.

We are currently planning a special event for Heritage Open Day on Sunday 15 September that will exhibit a collection of paintings at The Elms in Bedhampton by some important artists who lived in the area. The paintings which span a century and a half of a landscape views that can still be recognized today have been hidden in the collection until now, because of limited funds to be able to mount and frame them for public exhibition, but they clearly illustrate why this area should be protected for future generations to enjoy.

Decision makers should ask themselves why an artist of such importance like Lionel G Fawkes (1849 - 1931), whose work is held in the National Portrait Gallery, London and The Vancouver Art Gallery and was an illustrator for Anthony Trollope and Punch Magazine should choose to live in and paint the Bedhampton landscape. The answer was then, as now, that the traditional village layout and surrounding area to the harbour is beautiful and needs to be protected. The artist Martin Snape (1852 - 1930), whose work has recently been the subject of an important exhibition by The Hampshire Cultural

Trust chose to paint an important view of Bedhampton. These artists and others loved the mix of rural, hill and sea views that were key to the importance of the village, the coastline and the connection of Portsmouth to Havant. Why did these people choose to paint views of Bedhampton and not Havant? Probably because of its sense of place and beauty; something that the sprawling metropolis of Havant has lost through over development.

Narrow Marsh Lane appears in at least three of the paintings in the collection - Why should a decision by Havant Borough Council burying it under a housing development be lost forever?

We would welcome any Havant Borough Councillors and Officers to take a walk around the village with one of us or to visit the Bedhampton Historical Collection to see why we are so concerned at the Planning Application APP/19/00427 and why we are so keen to oppose Planning Application for the development and support the extension of the existing Conservation Area.

With a little imagination and support from our local authority Old Bedhampton could become a wonderful resource for the borough, so instead of seeing it as just 'another building plot' HBC could invest in the people who care so much for the area and save it as a place full of character, history and beauty for everyone.

In early 1825 Charles Wentworth Dilke, a former resident of Bedhampton wrote in a letter to his son:

Does Bedhampton stand where it did, with its little streams running here and there and everywhere, its little picturesque Church, nestling like a bird's nest in its own little wood - and the rookery as of old - and the Mills and their ceaseless music? I rejoice to know that the same good people are there, on the hill and under the hill...

We have doubts that anyone will be writing about the beauty and work of Bargate Homes in a hundred years.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

I object to the proposal due to concerns over increased traffic levels through the dangerous corners in Lower Road which I have almost collided on several occasions when visiting family in Lower Road. The village is unique and should be preserved for future generations. I do not believe any such development would enhance the area and the additional traffic would make the road a lot more dangerous.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

Access to this proposed new development is via Brookside Road or Bidbury Lane. The 50 houses will undoubtedly increase the level of traffic to an already inadequate vehicular, pedestrian, cycling and emergency services umbilical. Hampshire County Council's proposal to implement traffic lights and a "no right" turn at the junction of Bedhampton Road and Brookside is a disaster waiting to happen!

All aspects of the supporting infrastructure required for these additional homes will be over stretched and inevitably lead to even more frustrating waiting lists for schools, GP surgeries, dentists and public transport.

A concentration of two elderly persons residences right on the narrowest point of an "S" bend without any pedestrian footpaths is an overwhelming danger and one that must be urgently considered. To increase the traffic flows in and out of Lower Road via this "only" route is courting either a fatal or very serious accident. When one does happen, and it will, at least the locally elected councilor can quote these objections as prior warning!

Given the Havant Borough Council "Local Plan" has not received the statutory national inspector's review, it does seem very premature for Bargate Holdings to press for an easy win to build a small number of houses on a green field site. The objection is to preempting both the national inspector's decision and the impending result of the Conservation Area Review.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

Myself and my family are long term residents of Lower Road who strongly oppose to the proposed development of 50 houses on the land south of Lower Road.

I have two small children who I walk along the road with frequently, there are 3 blind bends along the road, the majority of these bends do not have a pavement so it is very dangerous for pedestrians with the current volume of traffic. If this amount of traffic increases there will be a very serious accident in the near future as people drive too fast around these bends.

Whilst driving along the blind bends I have been involved in many near collisions with drivers and cyclists who do not know the road so happily drive in the middle of the road forcing both of us to slam our brakes on or swerve to avoid each other.

A lot of cyclists use the road as a cut through to join the cycle route to Portsmouth, with the increased number of cars/vans on the road it would make this road too dangerous for them to use.

I do not believe that the local facilities can cope with the extra houses, the catchment area school is already under funded and at maximum capacity, I struggled to get my eldest daughter into the local catchment area school, I had to go on a waiting list and wait for a place for her. The doctors surgeries would not be able to cope with the extra amount of patients and the local roads are already too busy.

Old Bedhampton is a lovely place to live and I would like the area to stay peaceful and tranquil for my children to enjoy the area as I have done over the many years I have lived here for.

Save Old Bedhampton from the development of these houses.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

I do not live in Old Bedhampton but felt I must write and object to the proposed development of 50 homes on land south of Lower Road.

I am a frequent visitor to the area and thoroughly enjoy its tranquil and picturesque setting. It is a beautiful area, an area where I can sit and peacefully enjoy the wildlife that this area attracts. It is a truly lovely spot. The traffic has already increased in the 10 years I have been visiting Old Bedhampton and the triple bend in Lower Road with no pavement is particularly hazardous. The development will only cause an increase in the traffic flow and Lower Road will then become quite treacherous to navigate.

With other sites already up for development within the Borough this is one step to many. The developers plan is unimaginative and not in keeping with its surroundings at all. Lower Road is not a housing estate. The housing is all different which adds to its charm. The proposed development will be an eyesore. The development will ruin the tranquillity of the area and create noise and pollution. The wildlife that is so enjoyed by many will be compromised or lost. The development will add nothing just cause harm.

Old Bedhampton is a unique and beautiful area that should be prized by the Borough. The historic conservation area with its beautiful old buildings which is complimented so beautifully by its current surroundings.

This proposed development will add nothing to this area and just destroy an area that is enjoyed by all that experience it.

Therefore HBC please REJECT this proposal and preserve this jewel in Bedhamptons crown.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 09 Jun 2019

I wish to object to the above planning application which should be refused planning permission.

My reasons for saying this planning application should be completely rejected are as follows:

It will completely ruin the quiet, tranquil recreational area that is Old Bedhampton with its Conservation Area and Listed Buildings and which is accessed via Brookside Road, Lower Road and Bidbury Lane

Because the only way to reach Lower Road (a cul-de-sac) is via Brookside Road or the single track Bidbury Lane, there will be a massive increase in road traffic due to 50 more houses. This will be a great danger to the hundreds of families around Bedhampton and Havant who come to Old Bedhampton to walk, play and cycle with their children as well as dog walkers and elderly people.

There will be extreme danger to schoolkids and others both on bikes and on foot as well as elderly and disabled people, families and dog walkers who have to walk on the road

around the blind triple bends along Lower Road. This road is very narrow, has no pavements or room for any and is barely wide enough for 2 cars or Home Delivery vans to pass each other, let alone for children and families to be squeezed past by these vehicles.

Lower Road with its 2 blind bends is used heavily by schoolchildren going to and from school and by cycling commuters, as well as by leisure cyclists as a safe alternative to the busy main road. Massively increasing the car traffic from the 50 houses will put them at serious and unacceptable risk.

Obviously new homes need to be built but these should not be built in this area but in sites that have been built in before or with considerably better access available.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 08 Jun 2019

I strongly object to the proposed development.

Old Bedhampton is a peaceful tranquil area, for walkers, cyclists and joggers.

Access to the construction site is through the conservation area with narrow roads, blind bends and limited pavements.

With an extra 50 homes and the increased traffic the unique feel of a rural village will be lost forever, not to mention the congestion that will arise and the extra pollution from stationary cars trying to exit Brookside Road and join the roundabout and

Bidbury Lane will become a rat run for those wanting to go towards Havant

As a jogger who uses Lower Road, I have had near misses when cars have scraped past me as there are no pavements to go on and cars and vans driving too fast round the blind bends.

Looking at the proposed development, I notice in the use of materials there is a mention of solar panels but on the drawings of the houses I can't see any?

Likewise there does not seem to be any provision for electric charging? In this day and age of green energy surely all new builds must be eco friendly??

Whilst I understand the need for new homes, Lower Road is definitely not the place for 50 new homes, the character of Old Bedhampton will be gone forever.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 08 Jun 2019

I strongly object to the proposed development of 50 new houses in Lower Road.

This area is used by the elderly, families, walkers, joggers and cyclists who enjoy the peaceful nature of the location with its rural narrow lanes and beautiful listed buildings.

There is such limited access to the site ,only through the conservation area via Brookside Road or Bidbury Lane which is single track and will be used by cars to and from the Havant area, adding to the congestion on Behampton Road at peak times.

The increased traffic will put as all at risk as will the increased car fumes.

This is a greenfield site and is not necessary to use H20 to satisfy housing numbers and should only be used as a last resort.

Any urbanisation of a green filed site will degrade the ecology.

I urge the council to reject this plan and save Old Bedhampton for future generations to enjoy.

Is the destruction of Old Bedhampton worth it just to build 50 new homes?

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 08 Jun 2019

This is for homes on what currently is grade one agricultural land which is irreplaceable once building takes place on it. Furthermore, the site has been included in the HBC Local Plan to 2036 but that Plan has not yet been through Examination in Public. This Application is therefore premature and should not be allowed to proceed until such time as the conclusion of this process. It will send a seriously misleading message to other landowners and/or developers of Local Plan sites awaiting the Examination in Public, if this Application is approved, and HBC will not only find itself inundated with other Applications but it will also be subject to objections that it has failed to follow due process.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 08 Jun 2019

I wish to object to the above planning application which should be refused planning permission.

My reasons for saying this planning application should be completely rejected are as follows:

- It will completely ruin the quiet, tranquil recreational area that is Old Bedhampton with its Conservation Area and Listed Buildings and which is accessed via Brookside Road, Lower Road, Bidbury Lane and Kings Croft Lane.

- All Approaching traffic from the direction of Havant would naturally access via Kings Croft Lane to avoid the traffic lights and associated queues. Access to Kings Croft Lane is a blind left turn directly onto a single width section of road that has no pavements all vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists are head to head on this blind spot. A higher volume of traffic will certainly increase the risk of a serious accident.

- Many people cycle through the conservation area to link up with the cycle paths running into Portsmouth this would be very dangerous with any increased traffic flow and would almost certainly result in a collision.

- There will be a massive increase in road traffic due to 50 more houses. This will be a great danger to the hundreds of families around Bedhampton and Havant who come to Old Bedhampton to walk, play and cycle with their children as well as dog walkers and elderly people.

- There will be extreme danger to schoolkids and others both on bikes and on foot as well as elderly and disabled people, families and dog walkers who must walk on the road around the blind triple bends along Lower Road. This road is very narrow, has no pavements or room for any and is barely wide enough for 2 cars or Home Delivery vans to pass each other, let alone for children and families to be squeezed past by these vehicles.

- Lower Road with its 3 blind bends is used heavily by schoolchildren going to and from school and by cycling commuters who use the area to link up with the cycle paths to the west, as well as by leisure cyclists as a safe alternative to the busy main road. Massively increasing the car traffic from the 50 houses will put them at serious and unacceptable risk.

- Unbelievably, there is an Old Peoples Residential Home right in the middle of the blind bends with no pavement. It is outrageous that a planning application should be made which will double the cars and delivery vans squeezing past these elderly and often infirm old people, some in wheelchairs as they try to take some daily exercise. This planning application must be refused.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 08 Jun 2019

No pavement on the roads with increased traffic is a bad idea and will no doubt be accidents,

Changing the flow of traffic through this conservation area is a very bad idea as it will change the way it is used by everyone. Walkers, church goers, cyclists and anyone visiting will not be able to wander through as they currently do.

To try to build houses in this obviously unsuitable place goes to show the lengths that developers will go to for profit.

The increase in traffic is so much more nowadays with the constant vehicular access

required by endless home deliveries made by online shopping. The increase in traffic is much more than is submitted in the application.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 08 Jun 2019

I strongly object to this application. The proposed development will DESTROY this beautiful and special little island of tranquility that is enjoyed by residents, locals and visitors. It has been marked as an area of conservation and should be treated as such - even though the development is outside the conservation area, all the additional traffic will come right through it.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 08 Jun 2019

I wish to object to the above planning application on two counts:

1) It will have a negative effect on the character of the conservation area which is Old Bedhampton.

2) The sole vehicular access to the site at a point immediately after the blind double bend in Lower Road and the lack of any pavements between the bends preventing segregation of pedestrians from other road users will present a severe danger to drivers and pedestrians both during and post construction.

Whilst in principal I have no objection to fifty dwellings being built on the proposed site, anything more than pedestrian access to Lower Road will irrevocably change the character of the area and present a very real danger to all users of this and adjacent roads. For this reason and the points outlined above this planning application must be rejected.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 07 Jun 2019

I strongly object to the Planning Application APP/19/00427 for the development of 50 new houses south of Lower Road.

This will be a major development impacting the setting, safety and peacefulness of a historic village and is too important to be decided in isolation. I request that the question of how this good agricultural land in a unique historic setting best serves the Borough is discussed fully and openly at the Examination in Public of the Draft Local Plan 2036, only a few months away, before coming to a decision on this planning application which will have an impact for generations to come.

HBC is duty bound to assess the balance of harm done to the historic, attractive area of public amenity of the Old Bedhampton village against the claimed benefit of this development. There has been a strong public response raising many issues against this development already submitted to the consultation on the Draft Local Plan 2036. These issues are still there and must be addressed. New information has come to light on the historical importance of 'Narrow Marsh Lane' leading from Lower Road across the site to the brick railway bridge, summarily referred to in the developer's plans as just a 'farm track' which can be built over. The current review of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area must take this into account along with the full implications of building within the setting of the Conservation Area.

This development of 50 homes must be assessed in the light of all the proposed developments close by, contained in the Draft Local Plan 2036: Forty Acres (320 dwellings), Campdown (560), Littlepark House (50) and others. The cumulative growth in the whole residential area will put additional strains on the local infrastructure (traffic, school places, GP surgeries etc) which are not taken into account in this Planning Application.

Most of the concerns from people in the area who know Old Bedhampton village relate to access via the blind bends in Lower Road. Contrary to the developer's Traffic Assessment, the majority of us experience regular incidents of near-misses with oncoming vehicles, groups of cyclists and pedestrians on the narrow road with no pavement. The road is not 'safe' just because there has not (yet) been a serious accident. An increase of traffic due to nearly doubling the number homes along the only access road to the Lower Road / Lodge Road cul-de-sac will make this route more unsafe for walkers and cyclists, deterring children, parents and older people from using these sustainable and healthy forms of getting around. HBC cannot on one hand be planning a national cycle route and a possible 'safe walking/cycle route' for school children from the Forty Acres development along Lower Road whilst nearly doubling the traffic at peak times along the same narrow road.

There has been an accumulated increase in traffic both within the Old Bedhampton narrow lanes and along the main routes to Havant and the A27 / A3(M). Queues at peak times along the main routes to and from Havant and the Rusty Cutter roundabout are already becoming a regular issue and will become greater as other housing developments are delivered. This development feeds on to Bedhampton Road at the already busy junction with Portsdown Hill Road.

Reference to the important Grade II* listed building, The Elms, on one of the blind bends on Lower Road is missing from the application. It is a historic, prominent building, adding to the character of the village. The house is occupied by active older residents and the Waterloo Room is valued and used by the community for much needed local events. Safe access to this building by all is essential but will be compromised by the increase in traffic on the blind bend outside its gates.

The Residential home between two blind bends on Lower Road needs safe access for ambulances, staff and visitors. Its residents, sometimes being pushed in wheelchairs along the road are less able to quickly avoid traffic where there is no pavement.

Provision of amenity value and green places for local people to access on foot and from the wider area to safely enjoy are limited. We are reliant on our representatives on the Council to decide on behalf of the Community, the best use of the land in Old Bedhampton:

Either as a popular green space and amenity for the Borough

or for a small number of houses which could be readily located elsewhere.

Please listen to our views that this gem must not be compromised now and for the future.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 07 Jun 2019

Would you kindly add my objection to the proposed 50 house development in Old Bedhampton (Lower Road).

Objection:

Having resided in the above stated residence for 38 years I have witnessed a marked increase in traffic, noise, congestion and accidents along with near misses in the vicinity of Brookside Road and Lower Road.

The rear access of my property opens onto Brookside Road just south of the junction with Bedhampton Road.

For the past few years cars are almost constantly parked along the west kerb up to a matter of metres from the junction.

These vehicles being there both day and night. (Non residents during the day and residents at night)

This parking seriously reduces visibility of the junction on its approach from Brookside Road and especially when turning left out of our drive which services two other dwellings each with multi car ownership.

The problem comes with cyclists and pedestrians turning right when travelling east along Bedhampton Hill Road into Brookside Road. As there is no footpath to the western side they enter Brookside Road in the north bound lane their presence masked by the parked vehicles as they traverse the junction in the centre of the carriageway, directly in the path of oncoming traffic.

I have both witnessed and experienced many near misses in relation to the reduced visibility of their presence:

With a further increase of traffic this can only substantially increase the risk of a serious accident.

In addition to the approach to the junction over the past few years Brookside Road seems to have increasingly become a car parking location for non resident 'Car sharing' leading to parking on both sides of the road significantly narrowing the width of the road, often to one lane only.

Again increased traffic will only lead to increased risk of damage and or injury accidents.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 07 Jun 2019

See representation under documents tab dated 07.06.19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 07 Jun 2019

I moved into The Elms in January 2019 and love the area. I have noticed the regular flow of traffic in and out of this one entrance/exit road.

With another 50 houses and potentially 100 plus vehicles it would be very busy and extremely congested trying to get out and come in to this road.

The road isn't designed for that amount of traffic and so that would make it dangerous.

The noise and vehicle pollution would increase.

There are cycle routes through this area and again more vehicles would make it dangerous.

The lovely area of old Bedhampton and its heritage would be spoilt by a brand new housing estate. In my view that land should be "green belt" and not built on at all. The area should be protected for conservation as well.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 07 Jun 2019

Re:Planning Application APP/19/00427 Building application by Bargate Homes to build 50 houses south of Lower Road in Old Bedhampton I wish to object to the above application which should be refused planning permission for the following reasons:

-It will completely ruin the small hamlet of Old Bedhampton -The only access is via three blind 's'bends that are barely wide enough for two ordinary sized cars to pass each other.

-There is no pavement at present and there MOST CERTAINLY is NOT room to add one .

-The traffic in the area is already at breaking pointadding another 50 houses worth of cars is just ludicrous and highly dangerous.

-It is the only unspoilt green area left in Old Bedhampton where people and families can walk and enjoy green space .

-The reports from the developers contradicting the unsuitability of the access and the available space to put in a pavement are complete fiction they have massaged their monitoring of traffic levels to suit their application not reflecting the truth experienced by residents on a daily basis.

I have lived in Lower Road for eleven and a half years and many other residents for much longer ... we know the true devastation that this development will have on this small as yet unspoilt area of Havant

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

Hello (Redacted text) I live in bedhampton since I was 14 now 30 and very concerned about the field you have chosen to build on. Because over the years of staying in bedhampton I would visit old bedhampton to enjoy the quiet and peaceful. Old bedhampton area also I enjoyed spending time watching are wildlife in the field from bees to birds and rabbits .slow worms are just a few of the wild life I had the chance to see in old bedhampton I believe you would be destroying this wonderful retreat for are wildlife also a great retreat for us many times I spent there just time to reflect.

I also enjoy looking at the the old houses in the area has some very interesting history old bedhampton

I also think the roads in this area are very narrow for more traffic at the moment nearmiss have Been experience in the past by myself and friend who would visit the area and already we have noticed the traffic noise in the bedhampton area. it's affecting people We need quiet places in this area just to get away from all the noise of life. I enjoyed playing the bagpipes in old bedhampton for the residents also. Would like to see the field reserved for are wildlife and people to enjoy as I and my kids do now. I don't believe by building 50 houses in old bedhampton you would be making a huge difference to the house crisis we do need a lot more than that we should consider somewhere more beneficial for everyone. Not just places where house company's can make a lot of money for building in a history rich and more appealing area means . We as a community loose are much loved area. It's a great shame to see your happy just to let things this happen

In areas like this.

I know you have done your research but have you lived in the area and had the chance to live here and see what I seen and menny others you appreciate why old bedhampton deserves to be saved from development thank you.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I strongly object to the planning application to build 50 houses south of Lower Road in Old Bedhampton.It will ruin the tranquil area with its listed buildings and narrow rural lanes.The council should take into consideration the need for green spaces for the wild

life and for the wellbeing of the people who visit and live in and around Bedhampton. We all should be conserving the environment for future generations, we are in danger of creating concrete jungles and calling it housing development. We hear all the time about the decline of the insects and bird population and Bargate have been known to net areas because of wild life.

The increased traffic on these narrow roads that have no walkways and treacherous blind bends will cause danger and misery not only to the young and elderly but to the many people on bikes and parents with pushchairs and the disabled who all enjoy this area for what it offers and it could all be ruined if this plan gets put forward.

We have an opportunity to save a bit of history that is Old Bedhampton we owe it to the next generation.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I am writing to ask you to reject the proposal by Bargate homes to build 50 houses in Lower Road, Old Bedhampton.

Firstly before outlining my objections I would like to draw your attention to a worrying perception among the public about the whole process of the planning consultation.

The opinion of the many people that I have spoken to on Bidbury Park, where I walk the dog daily is that the housing development is a 'done deal' and that the council have already decided to approve it. They say this process of submitting objections is just ticking a box and will make no difference.

They point to the fact that on the proposed site workers have already been onsite measuring up and clearing hedges. People are wondering are they just jumping the gun?

However I am submitting my objections in good faith as I am sure my confidence in the integrity of the planning process is justified.

It is for these reasons that I ask you to reject the planning application APP/19/00427 for 50 houses on land south of Lower Road, Old Bedhampton:

Old Bedhampton is a little oasis in the middle of a heavily built up residential areas. It is used by people all over the area and beyond to walk dogs, cycle down the cycle trail, take kids round the mead on their bikes, sit by the stream on Brookside or go for a run along the lanes.

It is a recreational zone for all ages. People flock to it especially at the weekend. As someone said

' I exhale as I walk down Brookside and see the old houses and the church and hear the stream '

With the ever increasing number of houses already being built round the area - we need an area like this - in fact I believe the council should be putting in place measures to protect it for that reason.

Fifty houses doesn't sound a lot but it will double the cars coming through Brookside Road and Bidbury Lane. Add to that the construction traffic during the build, delivery vans and visitors to the houses - and the whole peaceful atmosphere of the conservation area will be shattered.

Havant council have themselves put forward initiatives for the health of the borough amidst concerns about childhood obesity levels, adult obesity and all the health concerns attached to a overweight, unfit population. In fact in recent weeks Havant have published a paper about new builds and how they are taking the initiative in creating healthy, sustainable new environments for people to live. They have talked about cycle

routes and places for families to exercise together - recreational areas.
This is what you have in Old Bedhampton now ! Don't ruin one environment to create another!

I believe that in granting permission for this housing estate Havant would be contradicting their own policies as if the houses are built they will have such a detrimental impact on an already established recreation zone - its green lung for residents who flock here.

Already there are issues - what makes the area so appealing also creates problems - the pavementless rural roads and blind bends do not lend themselves to lots of pedestrians with bikes, buggies, wheelchairs, dogs and kids. My daughters walk down Bidbury Lane and Brookside, one to catch the bus to our local secondary school and the other to walk to the local primary. I already worry that it is dangerous! It will be so much worse if these houses are built with the extra cars, vans, lorries and construction traffic with many of the drivers unfamiliar with the dangers of these lanes.

There are daily near misses - I myself, whilst driving slowly came face to face with an elderly gentleman walking in the road round a blind corner. I had to slam on my brakes. Such near misses are a daily occurrence - the fact that no one has been hurt is just pure luck.

Another 100 plus cars along with delivery vans on these rural style roads will make these roads very very dangerous whatever the traffic assessment of Bargate homes tells us!

Believe me I live here and they don't!!

Bargate's assertion that the drivers around Old Bedhampton are courteous to other road users sounds as though it comes from the principles of the ' shared space scheme' that was based on the theory that drivers will reduce speed because of uncertainty about who has priority. Tellingly the Department for Transport have called for a suspension of these schemes after a number of people were killed by a taxi in a 'Shared space ' which is what Brookside Road, Bidbury Lane and Lower Road are. Surely Havant Council must follow this guidance? Without being overly dramatic it is not incomprehensible that a tragedy like this could occur on our blind corners.

This area of Old Bedhampton has been used by generations of families and is a real jewel. I feel so strongly that we have a duty to protect such a jewel for future generations rather than to sacrifice it for the sake of fifty houses.

The harm caused to so many people by building them would be so much greater than any advantage of the houses.

I appeal to the council to turn down this application so that it's not on the watch of us all that this lovely slice of English heritage is changed forever.

Please come here on a sunny Sunday morning and watch how this area is used and what we all stand to lose if this estate goes ahead.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

Re: Planning Application APP/19/00427 (Bargate Homes application to build 50 houses south of Lower Road in Old Bedhampton)

I wish to object to the above planning application which should be refused planning permission.

My reasons for saying this planning application should be completely rejected are as

follows:

This will cause a danger on the roads and the flow of traffic will quadruple, when there is a football match now the area can hardly cope.

I fear if this could cause risk of life as many young children, families, Dog Walkers use this area daily especially near the natural stream.

This will destroy a historical part of our community which no amount of money could replace!

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I would like to lodge my objection to this application.

Old bedhampton is a conservation area and as such should be preserved.

The traffic at the roundabout is bad enough already with the addition of houses on the old homebase site

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

Re: Planning Application APP/19/00427 (Bargate Homes application to build 50 houses south of Lower Road in Old Bedhampton)

I wish to object to the above planning application which should be refused planning permission.

My reasons for saying this planning application should be completely rejected are as follows:

It will completely ruin the quiet, tranquil recreational area that is Old Bedhampton with its Conservation Area and Listed Buildings and which is accessed via Brookside Road, Lower Road and Bidbury Lane

Because the only way to reach Lower Road (a cul-de-sac) is via Brookside Road or the single track Bidbury Lane, there will be a massive increase in road traffic due to 50 more houses. This will be a great danger to the hundreds of families around Bedhampton and Havant who come to Old Bedhampton to walk, play and cycle with their children as well as dog walkers and elderly people.

There will be extreme danger to schoolkids and others both on bikes and on foot as well as elderly and disabled people, families and dog walkers who have to walk on the road around the blind triple bends along Lower Road. This road is very narrow, has no pavements or room for any and is barely wide enough for 2 cars or Home Delivery vans to pass each other, let alone for children and families to be squeezed past by these vehicles.

Lower Road with its 3 blind bends is used heavily by schoolchildren going to and from school and by cycling commuters, as well as by leisure cyclists as a safe alternative to the busy main road. Massively increasing the car traffic from the 50 houses will put them at serious and unacceptable risk.

Unbelievably, there is an Old Peoples Residential Home right in the middle of the blind bends with no pavement. It is outrageous that a planning application should be made which will double the cars and delivery vans squeezing past these elderly and often infirm old people, some in wheelchairs as they try to take some daily exercise. This planning application must be refused.

Other reasons :

It is also my belief that all planning applications that included a ???Shared space for traffic??? should be refused as per a directive from the Department of Transport early

last year. This scheme definitely falls within this as it is impossible to give a pavement for pedestrians around the blind bends.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I make my objection for several reasons.

1. My main objection being the major traffic effect on Brookside Road as this impacts most upon me. At public meetings the impact on Lower Road has been discussed but as Lower Road flows into Brookside Road the impact here will be catastrophic. This is a country lane rather than a modern road already suffering the effects of over use! At present during the morning rush hours six or seven cars queue to turn left on to the main road waiting for a break in the morning traffic, already having an impact on us at the top trying to leave our driveways. The Application states 136 car spaces, if one estimates 50 of those will be taking children to school between the hours of 7.30 and 8.30 am there will be gridlock! Again during the afternoon and evening the problem will be getting back into Brookside Road. As you are no doubt aware the roads throughout the Havant area are totally congested so more cars turning right from the main road will impact back to the roundabout and on to the whole area. Bidbury Lane should not be considered as part of relieving the problem it is totally unsuitable for through traffic.

2. Both Lower Road and Brookside Road have areas where there are no footpaths but there is a constant stream of pedestrians, lots with dogs, passing through on their way to the recreation ground or to Broadmarsh via Mill Lane. The "Brook" is also a magnet for children to play, many are aged between 10 and 14 and unsupervised. Why do locals use this road, because it is a tranquil area to walk or play! 136 cars up and down can only spoil this, never mind the safety aspect which the recently erected sign showing an adult and child hand in hand won't solve!

3. The urbanising of a green belt area adjacent the unique Old Bedhampton Conservation Area within the Havant Borough I find unfathomable and objectionable. This is a small special area of the borough steeped in history (I had distant relatives from Canada visit last year specifically because of the Keats connection) which should be preserved.

As this has been my family home for more than fifty years, I have seen many disruptions in the area, one of which was when the land in question was a strawberry farm. The impact on the area then was chaotic for six to eight weeks of the year, I can only visualise a similar chaotic situation permanently if this application is approved.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I am objecting to the planned proposal of 50 homes on the land south of Lower Road, Old Bedhampton. I am objecting on the basis that Old Bedhampton is a Conservation area and that the proposed development would cause a huge increase in traffic to the area which in turn would present a risk to local residents and visitors walking in the area, especially as there is no pavement on Brookside Road. I also feel that it would ruin the tranquility of this lovely conservation area.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I am pleased to read that the Council's information on Old Bedhampton classified the site proposed as a "conservation area", and therefore saddened that, whereas the site

proposed for construction does not directly come under the (recently re-demarcated) conservation area for Old Bedhampton, the introduction of the new dwellings would be against the Council's own Policy (AL8) on Local Green Space. I urge the Council members who will be reviewing this proposal to invest the time to immerse themselves in the ambiance of Old Bedhampton, which is delightfully summarised in the Council's Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Appraisal of January 2019. I bring the following statements to the Council's attention:

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2018) is quoted on Page 3-
*Whereas the development may not be directly within the boundary of Old Bedhampton, however its presence will significantly negatively impact the area and is highly likely to devalue the concept of conservation in the area.

Ref to Page 36 - 4.26 *Old Bedhampton is a wonderful example of meandering views that are appreciated and positively commented upon by many visitors.

Ref to Page 37 - 4.27 *Scenery is evocative - it attracts people and ultimately, money to the area. To lose our appeal in order to meet short term gain is nothing but short sighted. Having previously discounted the site for development, it is nonsensical for the Council to devalue a local asset for this proposal.

Ref to Page 37 - 4.28 * Our heritage is irreplaceable. At a time when we are considering our national history, identity and legacy, we should be preserving and celebrating every piece we still have.

Please refer to Page 28 / 29 summary of features which is an excellent list.

These statements from the Council's own report, are an excellent summary of the nature, history and charm of Old Bedhampton and its surrounding area and provide a compelling case for rejection of this planning application. The Council have previously deemed Old Bedhampton to be "the most least-favoured site" (Havant Borough Local Plan informal consultation May June 2012). 7 Years later the Council's own conclusions seem to be being ignored. Government pressure should not belittle the conclusions made previously.

The issues of increased traffic volumes around the nominated access points, which themselves require transit along a narrow, non-paved, historically significant road and a triple blind bend, have not been addressed over 7 years. Whereas the site itself may be able to accommodate 50 more homes, the access points to and from the site for construction and the subsequent traffic levels from homeowners endangers all users in the area.

I request that alongside this proposal, deliberation is made as to;

The damage to Old Bedhampton Village:

? For over 7 years, the Council has ruled this location to be unfavourable.

? The Council recognises the character and charm of Old Bedhampton, and should not be prepared to accept that the village's character will be irretrievably lost for the sake of 50 new homes.

The potential damage to the heritage of the Havant as well as the Old Bedhampton area:

? Our heritage is irreplaceable.

? We should be preserving and celebrating every piece we still have.

? The heritage of the area could be capitalised upon to draw more visitors to Havant; 50 more homes will draw a finite amount of people only.

The additional danger to pedestrians and car drivers alike presented by increased traffic volumes:

? Official Statistics do not exist as the police will never been called to the scene, however bumps, scrapes and near misses are more common than perceived.

? Given personal experience I have had several near-miss incidents involving pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles; the road only just copes as it is with the traffic volumes.

? Any development must avoid access through Old Bedhampton.

The potential impact to the Council's reputation will last beyond the decision:

? Given the volume of objections raised to the council over the years about the dangers presented by the road, it is reasonable to assume that if approved, the authorising Council and Bargate Homes signatories for this development will need to be held fully and unreservedly accountable for any injury or loss of life caused as a direct result of its approval.

Previous studies have shown how valuable Old Bedhampton is as an asset to the area. This application is, in summary, too dangerous to provide safe access, too damaging to the character of Old Bedhampton and of too little benefit to be of tangible value to anyone other than the Bargate Homes Shareholders.

I have confidence that the decision makers at Havant Borough Council will continue to conclude as they have done so many times before, that Old Bedhampton is too important an asset to Havant and its surrounding area's allure and appeal for this proposal to be ratified.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I wish to object to this proposal by Bargate Homes. Old Bedhampton is an area of Special Interest, including, from the Council's own report:

- Earliest surviving network of lanes and routes;
- Sections of a surviving network passing east-west through the heart of the settlement;

- Protected trees including those under specific Tree Preservation Orders;
- Natural springs, ponds and network of streams including The Brook;
- The Mill complex of buildings, a number of which are listed, upper and lower, associated millponds, mill races with heads and tails, sluices, weirs and dams and Hermitage Stream;
- Victorian railway bridge along Mill Lane;
- Church of St. Thomas's and its cemetery, listed Grade II;
- The Manor House of 17th century origins with timber framing to rear elevation, listed Grade II;
- The Old Rectory, listed Grade II;
- Manor Cottage, Grade II listed;
- The Elms and its front garden, gates and piers, listed Grade II*;
- Notable non-designated heritage assets including a Locally Listed Historic Park & Garden.

Outside but adjacent to the boundary of the Conservation Area there remains:

- The sunken 'rural' lanes including King's Croft Lane and Bidbury Lane;
- Open green Bidbury Mead which creates a centre piece to the settlement;
- Rural and former coastal setting.

I am sure that the Council will agree that these statements from the Councils own report, are an excellent summary of the nature, history and charm of Old Bedhampton and its surrounding area and provide a compelling case for rejection of this planning application.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I am privileged to reside in a small, peaceful, beautiful and unspoiled Hampshire gem, nestling in the heel of the A3.

This area where I live is the envy of all my friends because of its heritage, the tranquillity, history and security that Old Bedhampton provides.

I object to this proposal as it would destroy Old Bedhampton's character.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I object to this proposal - the fields south of lower road are part of Old Bedhamptons charm.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

My primary concern relating to the building of 50 houses on the land adjacent to Lower Road, is with regard to the access along Brookside Road, Bidbury Land and Lower Road to/from the new development - which I am sure you are aware has blind bends, a narrow road and no pavements for much of the way. My husband and I attended the public consultation and exhibition which was held in Bedhampton by Bargate Homes in March 2018 and yet nothing we saw or heard at the meeting (or subsequently) has done anything to alleviate those concerns. We spoke to a representative from the Highways Agency who tried to explain why he believed the additional traffic will not pose a problem - one of the reasons being that there had not been any fatalities in the last 18 years - is that what it takes to stop this development?!?!? Every single one of the local residents has numerous stories to tell of near misses with other vehicles, bikes or pedestrians who disregard the fact there are two blind bends - not to mention cars regularly parked in the road at either end of those blind bends - and the situation will not improve if 50 more houses are built there. The number of large vehicles and traffic involved in the development alone will have a massive detrimental impact on the road and area - even before the volume of traffic generated by the new home owners start to take over. There is very little scope, if any at all, to improve the current road situation and therefore I strongly believe that the farmland should not be developed.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I strongly object to the proposal to build houses south of Lower Road.

I believe that the proposed development would significantly degrade the conservation area of Old Bedhampton and irretrievably spoil the heritage without making a significant impact on the local need for affordable housing.

However, my main reason for objecting is on the grounds of increased traffic. The roads around the area are extremely difficult to negotiate with the number of cars parked on Brookside and the bends in the road leading to Lower Road and Bidbury Mead where cars and vans are regularly over the central white line. By adding additional houses it will only be a matter of time before there is a serious accident, involving either cars, bicycles or pedestrians. Many people with children and /or dogs walk to the park and the lack of pavements makes it very difficult. The increase in traffic will no doubt have a negative effect on the air quality and the tranquillity in the area.

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

See further Representation in Documents: Object - Recd 06/06/19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

The proposed development of a fifty house building site in Lower Bedhampton if completed, will give rise to acute vehicle congestion

and which will pose safety problems to local pedestrians and motorists alike. The narrow and twisted access road, is a major factor in this respect and it's improvement is virtually impracticable. The junction of the access road with the main road leading to Bedhampton Hill and Havant, is constricted due to the opposing roundabout and additional emerging traffic would cause further delays and possible hazards to users of both roadways. Coupled with these factors, is the environmental and historical importance of this area, and which will be significantly and irreversibly, undermined by the addition of the proposed housing estate. There is a need to retain the relief afforded by the existing rural vista and also to ensure the prevention of future, widespread, non-agrarian developments in this area.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 06 Jun 2019

I wish to object to the above planning application which should be refused planning permission.

My reasons for saying this planning application should be completely rejected are as follows:

- It will completely ruin the tranquil hamlet that is Old Bedhampton with its rural lanes and beautiful, listed buildings.
- The only access to this proposed new development is through the conservation area via Brookside Road or the single track Bidbury Lane. The 50 houses will create a massive increase in traffic which will shatter the peace and tranquillity of the area.
- The increased traffic on these often narrow, pavementless roads with their already treacherous blind bends will cause a very real danger to us all. Walkers cyclists, school children, parents with prams, along with the disabled and elderly- all will be put at danger.
- The impact that this housing will have on the area will be detrimental to the environment and the hundreds of people who use the area as a 'green lung' for recreation and exercise in the midst of a heavily built up urban environment.
- As a council Havant should be providing leadership by for example providing ...better cycling and walking routes ... green spaces.
- We already have designated cycle route (Lower Road) and a beautiful green space in the whole of Old Bedhampton- we just want to keep it for us all to enjoy as generations have done before us.
Do not ruin one environment to create another!
- We strongly urge the council to reject this plan and let us preserve the jewel that is Old Bedhampton.
- Let it not be on our watch that this haven for all is lost to us and future generations!

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 05 Jun 2019

APP/19/00427

MANAGEMENT COMPANY

At the DCF Bargate Homes stated that the proposed site would be handed over to a

Management Company on completion of the development. Cllr Diana Patrick (Stakes) and myself sought further clarification, in particular concern was expressed about the poor records of Management Companies, especially imposing ever rising annual fees on the residents.

Bargate Homes (BH) stated:

BH would not hand over the development to an independent Management Company, but rather they would appoint an Agent to set up a Residents Management Company (RMC).

Also, that the Residents could change and appoint their own Agent in due course if required.

No further detail was given so I asked two questions:

a. Who would actually 'own' the common 'green' areas of the, which may include children's allotments and recreation facilities?

b. Will the proposed properties be leasehold or freehold?

BH responded that the common land areas would be owned by the Residents Management Company and that the proposed (15) Affordable Homes would be Leasehold with the remainder (35) being privately owned Freehold properties.

As I was unable to ask supplementary questions or raise issues at this meeting, I forwarded the following to HBC for the appropriate Committee's careful consideration:

a. Is it right to assume that the RMC will have to be a Limited Company registered with Companies House?

It clearly should be with Officers appointed from the private ownership residents as well as an officer from HBC appointed to the Limited Company to be responsible for the Leaseholders interests.

b. Will the new roadways, paths and street furniture be formally and legally adopted by Hampshire County Council?

I now understand that this will not be the case.

c. If not, will the RMC will be responsible for the maintenance and associated Public Liability and Indemnity Insurance for these?

My understanding is that the RMC will be responsible.

d. As the common 'green' areas will be owned as an asset by the RMC, it will have to take out the necessary Indemnity and Insurance cover.

Yes

e. Should the RMC 'fail' for any reason, then these assets above may have to be sold in full or part. Then the danger is that the site could be developed further than initially permitted, if this current proposal is approved.

This is a most important point for HBC to consider before deciding whether to approve this development.

f. The complexities and expenses of running an efficient and effective Residents Management Limited Company should not be underestimated. Clearly the Housing Association will have to appoint a representative, on behalf of the Leasehold properties, to the RMC Committee. The other positions, not least Treasurer, should be filled by Residents. The key to success will then be harmonic agreement on all related matters.

Again this is a key issue that must be taken into account before any decision to approve this development is taken.

g. If the development is approved, will BH make these issues and responsibilities clear to prospective purchasers?

As any such implications are unlikely to be made voluntarily by Bargate Homes, what will HBC do to require that BH does? No guarantee / contract should mean that this development cannot be approved.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF OVERALL SITE

Finally, it is considered that the question as to any future and further development of the two adjacent areas of farm land was inadequately addressed at the Forum, especially as this does have considerable bearing as to whether the Council approves this proposed Lower Road development or not.

There is a clear danger that should this development go ahead, then the argument of precedent will be used to apply to build on these two adjacent sites.

What can the Council do, if anything, to prevent legally this situation arising?

There are approximately 200 existing residential homes within the confines of Old and Lower Bedhampton. As an example, should the whole of the Lower Road site (3 areas) be developed, then the potential exists to double the number of houses in this historic old village, adjacent to a conservation area.

This potential obviously undermines BH's assertion that the current proposal is low density.

Comment submitted date: Wed 05 Jun 2019
BEDHAMPTON ROAD / BROOKSIDE ROAD ACCESS

Whilst the Forum quite rightly focussed on the inherent (and unsurmountable) dangers that increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic will bring to Lower Road, I do not consider that sufficient emphasis was placed on the access from / to Brookside Road. I appreciate that this issue did not fall within the DC Forum's remit of queries being addressed to BH, nevertheless it is intrinsically part of and a major issue to be taken into

account when consideration is given to BH's proposed development.

It continues to be considerably more difficult, due to increased traffic flows along Bedhampton Road, to depart Brookside Road and to conduct a 345 degree turn around the mini roundabout. This is because one first has to get across to the second lane leading onto the roundabout. This manoeuvre frequently results in near misses when the near side lane allows a car out of Brookside Road, but a generally speeding motorist comes up the outer lane on the blind side.

Also, the short median lane for turning off Bedhampton Road into Brookside will soon be incapable of taking extra traffic, especially during rush hours, and the mini-roundabout's other accesses will be blocked.

What viable action(s) is/are being taken by HBC and HCC to re-address this inevitable issue?

To date, this remains wholly inadequately addressed and some of the 'ideas' that have come into the public domain would exacerbate rather than provide a sensible solution to this issue.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 05 Jun 2019

I'm amazed that this proposal has not yet been consigned to the file marked 'not feasible'

The double bends past brook side into lower road are, or can be quite dangerous; even with the light traffic on it now.

Any increase in traffic around these bends will exponentially increase the safety of pedestrians or cyclists negotiating this section.

This is notwithstanding the current difficulty exiting Brookside onto Havant road, any increase in traffic will have a similar effect.

Leaving aside the potential danger to pedestrians, cyclist or motorists; the area of old bedhampton encompasses a conservation area.

It is a conservation area for reasons that the council are fully aware of and uphold, vigorously, when planning or tree preservation matters are applied for by residents.

It is blatantly obvious that Bidbury and Kingscroft would be used as a 'rat run' for excessive traffic that will be avoiding the Brookside/Havant road junction.

This, inevitably and unarguably will damage, alter or otherwise detract from the conservation of old bedhampton.

Should the council approve this plan, they should immediately remove any conservation status of this area; as the council themselves will be contradicting it's own legal view of the area.

We would all then be at liberty to chop down our annoying trees, and make money from the land we own by building houses on it..

Which is exactly what is being proposed on the development outlined in the plan.

No one in this area would argue against the need for new housing developments, what they would argue against is the effect this plan would have and the irreparable damage it would cause to a conservation area.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 05 Jun 2019

To: Planning Services, Havant Borough Council, Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road, Havant, PO9 2A

Email : planning.development@havant.gov.uk

To: Havant Council Re: Planning Application APP/19/00427 (Bargate Homes application to build 50 houses south of Lower Road in Old Bedhampton)

I wish to object to the above planning application which should be refused planning permission. My reasons for saying this planning application should be completely rejected are as follows:

- It will completely ruin the tranquil hamlet that is Old Bedhampton with its Conservation Area, rural lanes and beautiful, listed buildings.
- The only access to this proposed new development is through the conservation area via Brookside Road or the single track Bidbury Lane. The 50 houses (with no doubt 2 cars per property) will create a massive increase in traffic which will shatter the peace and tranquillity of the area. The increased traffic associated with the new development will cause a very real danger to walkers cyclists, school children, parents with prams, along with the disabled and elderly. This road is very narrow, has no pavements or room for any and is barely wide enough for 2 cars or Home Delivery vans to pass each other, let alone for children and families to be squeezed past by these vehicles. Lower Road with its 3 blind bends is used heavily by schoolchildren going to and from school and by cycling commuters, as well as by leisure cyclists as a safe alternative to the busy main road. Massively increasing the car traffic from the 50 houses will put them at serious and unacceptable risk.
- There is an Old Peoples Residential Home right in the middle of the blind bends with no pavement. It is not reasonable that a planning application should be made which will at least double the cars and delivery vans on this road which is used by elderly and often infirm old people, some in wheelchairs.
- The impact that this housing will have on the area will be detrimental to the environment and the hundreds of people who use the area as a 'green lung' for

recreation and exercise in the midst of a heavily built up urban environment. Massive developments have already taken place, or are planned, in the area as a whole and there is a very real risk that all green spaces will disappear under concrete.

- The environmental impact would be profound with a loss of habitat for wildlife and a potential problem with flooding as more and more land is lost. There is also the social and psychological aspect to be considered as increasing studies show anti-social behaviour and poor mental health are associated with lack of access to nature. To say nothing of the increased congestion, pollution and stress on local facilities.

- Old Bedhampton is beautiful and of historic and cultural importance and should be preserved.

- More attention should be paid to utilising brownfield sites for housing. Much of Havant is no longer commercial and could be used for housing instead. I believe the land south of Lower Road is Grade 1 agricultural land and should only be used as a last resort. The Local Planning Authority has a statutory obligation to safeguard heritage and Old Bedhampton is most certainly a heritage asset, possibly a unique one in the borough.

- The application seeks to achieve an advantage by being lodged before the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Review has concluded. This is totally unacceptable.

- I strongly urge the council to reject this plan

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 05 Jun 2019

See Representation in Documents: Object - recd 05/06/2019

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 05 Jun 2019

I most strongly object to the proposed development of 50 homes to the South of Lower Road .50 houses =100 cars at least plus vans etc these people may use for work.Tradesmen delivery vans &lorries not to mention the traffic whilst building on this site.A lorry got stuck on the bend recently & everyone was held up for 45 minutes whilst the driver had to manoeuvre its way back.This area is totally unsuitable for additional houses due to the restricted access.The narrow lanes in this area 3 blind bends with no footpath on one stretch of the lane is already a hazard for people who use the lanes on a daily basis.We have all experienced near misses broken wing mirrors etc.My sons friend was knocked off his bike on the blind bend.When my son was old enough to ride to the park it was a constant worry .Now I worry about my grandchildren.These homes would be occupied by families so there would be at least a 100 or more children walking or riding their bikes to Bidbury park.The area is well known for coming round these hazardous bends to come up against wheelchairs mobility scooters and people pushing prams etc.To increase the population in this area would be ludicrous & could only result in a serious accident just waiting to happen.All this apart from the destruction of an area of outstanding natural beauty which is not only enjoyed by local residents but many people who live outside of the area.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 04 Jun 2019

See representation in Documents.

Comment submitted date: Tue 04 Jun 2019

See representation in Documents.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 04 Jun 2019

I strongly object to the proposal to build houses south of Lower Road.

I believe that the proposed development would degrade the conservation area of Old Bedhampton and irretrievably spoil the heritage without making a significant impact on the local need for affordable housing.

However, my main reason for objecting is on the grounds of safety. Much of Brookside Road has no pavements and the road narrows just before the junction with Lower Road. The northern part of Lower Road itself is narrow and has sharp bends; there are also no pavements along part of the road. Vehicles often do not/cannot keep to one side of the road as they take the bends and I have frequently seen the need for sudden braking. Turning between Brookside Road and Bidbury Lane is also dangerous because Bidbury Lane is narrow and again, vehicles do not/cannot keep well to their side of the road. The number of parked cars, particularly at the narrowest part of Brookside Road and at the junction with Bedhampton Road, has increased recently, adding to the difficulties of driving, cycling and walking. Bidbury Lane, being a sunken lane, is only wide enough for one vehicle along some of its length and also has a sharp bend, making it a dangerous alternative route.

The increased traffic relating to the proposed development, both domestic vehicles and delivery vans, will undoubtedly increase the risks of accidents and injuries, as well as causing great detriment to the tranquillity of the area.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 04 Jun 2019

I strongly object to the proposal to build houses south of Lower Road.

I believe that the proposed development would significantly degrade the conservation area of Old Bedhampton and irretrievably spoil the heritage without making a significant impact on the local need for affordable housing.

However, my main reason for objecting is on the grounds of increased traffic. The roads around the area are extremely difficult to negotiate with the number of cars parked on Brookside and the bends in the road leading to Lower Road and Bidbury Mead where cars and vans are regularly over the central white line. By adding additional houses it will only be a matter of time before there is a serious accident, involving either cars, bicycles or pedestrians. Many people with children and /or dogs walk to the park and the lack of pavements makes it very difficult. The increase in traffic will no doubt have a negative effect on the air quality and the tranquillity in the area.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 04 Jun 2019

I would like to Strongly object to this application on 3 grounds

1. The impact on the wildlife that this area provides.

2. The proposed access point to the site is down a very narrow lane that with additional traffic will potentially create more danger for local residents.

3. With the mass increase in application in the local area, no effort is apparent on how the local infrastructure will cope with the additional house holds, e.g. schools at max capacity, sewerage pipes are near max capacity and will be over capacity if all applications are approved. Finally entertainment for youths are no existent.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 04 Jun 2019

See representation under document tab dated 04.06.19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 04 Jun 2019

See representation under documents tab dated 04.06.19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 25 May 2019

I have to object to the proposal to build 50 new houses on land in Lower Road as I believe that there will be serious risks as regards traffic on foot, cycle and in vehicles. The road is fairly narrow in places anyway, and there have been many near misses on the two blind bends already. The size of construction traffic can only add to what is already a dangerous road.

I regularly see people walking their children to school, with some in buggies/prams as well as on foot. This would be very difficult to do safely if there were a lot of construction traffic. Similarly there are a number of elderly residents who use electric buggies to get around, or walk slowly, again very difficult to do safely with construction traffic.

As I sit here typing this I have just seen 12 cyclists pass - a not uncommon number, particularly at peak times of the day.

As well as residents vehicles, we get numerous taxies, and delivery vans during the course of any day, adding to the traffic, especially at busy times like the build up to Christmas.

I would like to see an independent traffic survey carried out which measured not just cars and other vehicles, but pedestrians and cyclists too. The previous one was completed by the prospective builders and the figures were never explained satisfactorily at any of the meetings I went to.

I believe people's safety and lives are much more important than putting in more houses.

Should the proposal be passed I would expect to see traffic lights whilst the construction is carried out, which would be very difficult given the number of houses on the bends, and a separate series of traffic calming measures in place too once it were finished in order to slow vehicles on the bend - including a 5mph speed limit.

Comment submitted date: Sat 25 May 2019

I have to object to the proposal to build 50 new houses on land in Lower Road as I believe that there will be serious risks as regards road safety to traffic on foot, on cycle and in vehicles.

The road is very narrow in places anyway, and there have been many near misses on the three blind bends already. The fact that none have been recorded is probably due to the fact that incidents such as hitting wing mirrors or minor scrapes are usually dealt with by the individuals concerned, without seeing the need to report them. The size of construction traffic can only add to what is already a dangerous road, as will the potential increased traffic.

I regularly see people walking their children to and from school, with some in buggies/prams as well as on foot. This would be very difficult to do safely if there were a lot of construction traffic or increased traffic. Similarly there are a number of elderly residents who use electric buggies to get around, or walk slowly, again very difficult to do safely with more traffic.

The documentation suggests that a minimum of 0.75m width is needed per pedestrian. If lines were painted at this width on the road, then I am sure it would be too narrow for 2 vehicles to also pass safely.

The comment that there is a 1 in 56000 chance of two cars and a pedestrian on the road simultaneously happening is flawed as it has happened to me several times as both a pedestrian and a driver. I do not believe that the figures recorded accurately reflect what happens on a daily basis. Last week I passed 7 cars whilst negotiating the 3 bends. I'm sure that is not reflected in the figures.

As I sit here typing this I have also just seen 12 cyclists pass - a not uncommon number, particularly at peak times of the day.

As well as residents vehicles, we get numerous taxies, and delivery vans during the

course of any day, who do not know the road and often drive far too fast, adding to the traffic, especially at busy times like the build up to Christmas. An accident waiting to happen as you sometimes have to drive up on to the verge or brake swiftly in order to avoid being hit.

In amongst the comments in the report it states that "there are large numbers of pedestrian and cycle movements in Lower Road".

It goes on to say (6.1.5) that "the current use of Lower Road as a shared surface is suitable for the proposed development of 50 dwellings and has been agreed by HBC. The shared surface is in line with the following criteria

*it is lightly trafficked with slow traffic speeds

*it has an impeccable safety record

*the road is STRAIGHT, street lit and has forward visibility to pedestrians of 30m"

Since when has Lower Road been straight? You are looking at 3 blind bends. These criteria are definitely not being taken into account correctly. In section 3 image 3.2 showing a pedestrian walking on Lower Road facing north illustrates the first bend perfectly.

5.1 of the traffic report states that "Safety issues identified during the audit and site inspection that are considered to be outside the Terms of Reference but which the Audit Team wishes to draw to the attention of the Clerk Organisation are set out in this section. It is to be understood that, in raising these issues, the Audit Team in no way warrant that a full review of the highway environment has been undertaken beyond that necessary to undertake the Audit as commissioned."

I would like to see an independent traffic survey carried out which measured not just cars and other vehicles, but pedestrians and cyclists too, again. The previous one was completed for the prospective builders and the figures were never explained satisfactorily at any of the meetings I went to. There were also no previous audit figures which could be compared, thus making for a very unscientific survey.

I believe people's safety and lives are much more important than putting in more houses.

The report is taken in isolation, but if you include increased traffic from the proposed development of 300 houses nearby, then there is bound to be an impact on the Rusty

Cutter roundabout in particular, which is already gridlocked regularly at peak times, affecting other roads nearby.

Other grounds for objection include the loss of habitats for wildlife, potential risk of flooding, and lack of local facilities such as schools and doctor's surgeries.

Comment submitted date: Wed 29 May 2019

See representation in Documents.

Comment submitted date: Tue 04 Jun 2019

Traffic objection.

Further to my previous email, there was a comment in the section on the traffic survey which stated that the average speed recorded on Lower Road was 21mph, which meant that 30 yds visibility is required in order to comply with safety regulations.

The speed limit on Lower Road is 30 mph, and cars regularly travel at this speed and higher, so surely the visibility distance should be increased. I would imagine it should be at least 40m.

This needs to be checked accurately against Hampshire County Council visibility splay documents, then checked by taking further measurements in Lower Road.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

Comment submitted date: Tue 04 Jun 2019

I strongly object to the proposed development for the following reasons:

Bidbury Mead is one of the few enclosed spaces in Bedhampton where I feel I can exercise my dog safely, I do not drive and the only way to reach the Mead is to use my legs and walk. I visit the Mead three times a day and I can attest to the fact that pedestrian access via Brookside, Kingscroft Lane, and Lower Road is wholly and woefully inadequate, there is no continuous footpath on any of these roads which necessitates pedestrians like myself either having to keep crossing the road to reach the relative safety of a footpath or, where there is no footpath at all, having to walk on the narrow roads whilst negotiating blind bends, only yesterday I witnessed a near miss between two cars entering and exiting Kingscroft Lane at Brookside. I also use Brookside and Lower Road to access the Portsmouth cycle path, it is already a somewhat white knuckle ride cycling around blind bends but my great fear is that the additional traffic to and from the development will inevitably result in a fatal accident for a cyclist or pedestrian. The roads are far too narrow to accommodate passing cars and pedestrians.

I specifically moved to this area to enjoy peaceful space and escape from the increasing build up of London suburbs, which has turned once leafy areas into faceless housing estates, but already, in my time here, Bedhampton has offered up Scratchface Lane and Portsdown Hill for housing developments, the proposed development of Old Bedhampton would irretrievably change the unique nature, tranquillity and historical value of this hamlet, do not let it become just another part of a sprawling urbanisation.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 03 Jun 2019

See representation under documents tab dated - 01.06.19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 03 Jun 2019

See representation under documents tab date 29.05.19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 03 Jun 2019

see representation under documents tab dated 03.06.19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 03 Jun 2019

I object to the plans to build 50 dwellings on land functionally linked to Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area.

The Red Line of Development is stated as being 3.8Ha which is more than a third of Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy study field H05A which has been designated a Secondary Support Area for SPA bird species Curlew and Brent Geese. The proposed housing development located where it is would completely compromise the whole of H05A which has an area of about 9 Hectares. If this application is approved SWBGS Mitigation Guidance should be applied to the entire area of Functionally Linked Land lost to development @ £85,464 per hectare x 9 Hectares = £769,176.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 03 Jun 2019

See representation in Documents.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 02 Jun 2019

1 Loss of Prime agricultural land in keeping with the Old Bedhampton area.

2 Old Bedhampton only two narrow road accesses and no pedestrian pavements or room to provide them.

3 Access to Lower Road is via a very sharp narrow blind bend with no pedestrian pavements. In addition there is a residential home right on the corner with elderly/infirm at greatly increased risk from increased traffic.

4 Old Bedhampton Village Conservation Area has its own special character and building more houses so close will only be of detriment to such an important community Area.

4

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 02 Jun 2019

This plan assumes ownership of Narrow Marsh Lane, excepting the bridge.. There has never been a title attached to Narrow Marsh Lane which indicates common ownership. It was of such importance to warrant the construction of a railway bridge in the 1840's. The lane was in use till the construction of the A27 bypass which has now separated the northern and southern thirds. It has not been possible to track a legal closure order. The northern third was in use by local residents for walking till circa 2008 at which time the farmer barricaded the gates and fence line. It has not been possible to confirm ownership through deeds or land registration. Whilst it is not registered as a public right of way on Definitive Maps this does not mean that this is its legal status. Steps are being taken to register Narrow Marsh Lane on a definitive map, to designate the Lane and railway Bridge as heritage assets and for their inclusion in Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. The destruction of the lane by any development should be avoided in the interim.

Comment submitted date: Sun 02 Jun 2019

Bargate Homes predicate their planning application on the basis that there is a requirement for HBC to meet its 5 year housing target and land supply and that this justifies the use of Grade 1 agricultural greenfield land in the setting of a conservation area. They may consider they are doing HBC a favour! The housing supply figures are a moveable feast and what may have been possible to justify in 2016 is no longer the case in 2019 and even less likely in 2021 when the first dwellings may have been completed. Greenfield sites should be reserved for last resort especially in a situation where the resulting good from such a development will be outweighed by the potential harm to heritage, safety, wellbeing and amenity. This application should be rejected.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 02 Jun 2019

Reference number : APP/19/00427

I am writing to object to the building of 50 houses along Lower Road.

As a regular visitor to the area on foot and by car I feel building these houses will ruin the character of the area.

Whilst visiting the area I have seen a number of elderly residents and young families with children enjoying Old Bedhampton, from the church, Mill Lane, Broadmarsh, Brookside Road and Lower Road. If these houses are built I feel this will affect the safety of these people and also cyclists as there will be more traffic on the road, especially Lower Road where there is no pavement.

I also work locally in the area and already the amount of traffic at peak times along by Brookside Road and the Rusty Cutter roundabout causes traffic to build up, let alone when you build 50 more houses.

The roads within Old Bedhampton are already narrow, how would more traffic in the area cope? Have you thought about how the local doctors surgeries/schools etc will cope?, with the growing number of houses as it is already difficult enough to get a doctors appointment.

The area you plan to build on is home to alot of local wildlife.

As my grandparents lived in the area for over 50 years, they both had alot of memories/stories about Old Bedhampton and the surrounding area to tell us over the years and as a family we made alot of memories in Old Bedhampton. We feel it would be right to preserve Old Bedhampton for future generations to enjoy and protect their future.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sun 02 Jun 2019

I wish to make three key points in objection to this application:

1. Major safety concerns due to the significant increase (at least double the current load. 50 houses is potentially 100 more motor vehicles driving through this area regularly) in traffic that will transit down Brookside Road and then Lower Road. There are 2 blind corners directly outside our house with no pavements for pedestrians. This is already a dangerous bend and the danger of serious accidents involving traffic and pedestrians will hugely increase. The Elms (Grade 2 listed) residential building housing elderly and vulnerable people will be heavily impacted by this. In addition the junction with Brookside Road and the B2177, which is already difficult, will become even more congested and may even require traffic lights to ensure traffic flows.

2. Impact on the Conservation Area. The review of this impact is not yet complete, which would make it impossible to grant this application. Importantly, the Old Bedhampton conservation area is an important and historically significant are that will be devastated by this development. In addition, the agricultural character will be lost and an important green belt in an area which is already dense with A Roads (A327) and the so the south coast railway line. The relative tranquility and peaceful setting will be lost to visitors and residents alike.

3. Finally, the quality of this proposal is poor and does not enhance the area. It will irrevocably alter the character and historic significance of the area. It is unsympathetic to the overall aesthetic and attractiveness of the area.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 01 Jun 2019

01.06.2019

Please find enclosed my objections to the proposed development Lower Road:

Any development would not respect local context and would be entirely out of character of the area to the detriment of the local environment.

I consider any proposed development to be a direct contravention of the objective to protect or enhance local environment including wildlife habitats, trees and parks.

This area is an open space of natural beauty valued by residents and people walking through this conservation area. Cyclists, dog walkers and people in wheelchairs also enjoy this social amenity enjoying the beauty of this conservation area on a daily basis.

Access to the site is limited. The access road is extremely narrow with very sharp blind bends which need to be navigated with extreme caution. There is barely room for 2 cars to pass

safely. Any development will put walkers and cyclists at risk walking along the road. There are a number of elderly residents from The Lodge residential home who take short walks from the home they would be put at increased risk from any increased traffic.

It would create adverse effects on public services such as drainage and water supplies.

I believe any development in this area would be of detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area as I have outlined in the points above.

I would be grateful if the Council would take my objections into consideration when deciding the proposed housing development.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 01 Jun 2019

01.06.2019

Please find enclosed my objections to the proposed development Lower Road:

Any development would not respect local context and would be entirely out of character of the area to the detriment of the local environment.

I consider any proposed development to be a direct contravention of the objective to protect or enhance local environment including wildlife habitats, trees and parks.

This area is an open space of natural beauty valued by residents and people walking through this conservation area. Cyclists, dog walkers and people in wheelchairs also enjoy this social amenity enjoying the beauty of this conservation area on a daily basis.

Access to the site is limited. The access road is extremely narrow with very sharp blind bends which need to be navigated with extreme caution. There is barely room for 2 cars to pass safely. I have had several near misses when driving along the road due to the fact cars coming from the opposite direction have been on the wrong side of the road as it is too narrow for 2 cars to pass safely. On the day the refuse collector comes if you are behind them you are unable to pass safely and have to wait until they have finished which can cause a traffic jam. More cars in the area would add to this problem. Any development will put walkers and cyclists at risk walking along the road. There are a number of elderly residents from The Lodge residential home who take short walks from the home they would be put at increased risk from any increased traffic.

It would create adverse effects on public services such as drainage and water supplies.

I believe any development in this area would be of detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area as I have outlined in the points above.

I would be grateful if the Council would take my objections into consideration when deciding the proposed housing development.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 01 Jun 2019

01.06.2019

Please find enclosed my objections to the proposed development Lower Road:

Any development would not respect local context and would be entirely out of character of the area to the detriment of the local environment.

I consider any proposed development to be a direct contravention of the objective to protect or enhance local environment including wildlife habitats, trees and parks.

This area is an open space of natural beauty valued by residents and people walking through this conservation area. Cyclists, dog walkers and people in wheelchairs also enjoy this social amenity enjoying the beauty of this conservation area on a daily basis.

Access to the site is limited. The access road is extremely narrow with very sharp blind bends

which need to be navigated with extreme caution. There is barely room for 2 cars to pass safely. I have had several near misses when driving along the road due to the fact cars coming from the opposite direction have been on the wrong side of the road as it is too narrow for 2 cars to pass safely. On the day the refuse collector comes if you are behind them you are unable to pass safely and have to wait until they have finished which can cause a traffic jam. More cars in the area would add to this problem. Any development will put walkers and cyclists at risk walking along the road. There are a number of elderly residents from The Lodge residential home who take short walks from the home they would be put at increased risk from any increased traffic.

It would create adverse effects on public services such as drainage and water supplies.

I believe any development in this area would be of detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area as I have outlined in the points above.

I would be grateful if the Council would take my objections into consideration when deciding the proposed housing development.

Showing 71-80 of 162

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 01 Jun 2019

I strongly object to the application for the following reasons,

1. It will completely ruin the tranquil hamlet that is Old Bedhampton and have a devastating and lasting impact on the Conservation area.

2. The document itself states there is an exemplary safety record on lower road, which I find hard to believe as there is no pavement. As there is a lack of recorded data how can this be justified. I believe that this is speculation and not factual evidence of safety.

3. The view point of walkers and cyclists safety in the report is taken from the south aspect, this being the nursing home ahead of you to the left. If the report took a viewpoint from the most dangerous point just before the blind left hand bend opposite the nursing home, you would see a very different risk profile. Why was this not presented in the traffic report submitted in the planning application?

3. As a resident who has just retired, I can assure you that I have had many a near miss, day & night, having to take evasive action on many occasions to avoid Cyclists /Vehicles over the years, even though only doing 10 - 15 miles an hour.

My observations are :

a. Other road users are unpredictable and often don't follow the highway code. Cyclists, Young and Old come round the bend in pairs, often in the centre of the road. Cars are dilly dallying looking for parking spaces when visiting the nursing home. Delivery vehicles still park on the road despite the newly painted single white lines, mainly because they have nowhere else to go.

b. In my experience of driving that route many times a day over the last 10 years, Vehicles regularly come round the blind bend over the middle of the road due to the narrowness of the road and the beach hedge on the left, which during the summer months is actually in the carriageway. The traffic report failed to note the summer impact of the beach hedge, even though that's when most people are walking or cycling.

These safety issues need to be addressed properly, considering the problems they can and do cause and not the 'best view/least greenery' option.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 31 May 2019

I have read the traffic assessment and its recommendations and want to raise safety concerns that are not covered.

The document states an exemplary safety record on lower road, where there is no pavement, based on a lack of recorded data. I believe that is a random outcome and not evidence of safety.

The view point of walkers and cyclists safety in the report is taken from the south aspect ie the nursing home ahead of you to the left. If the report took a viewpoint from the most dangerous point ie just before the blind left bend opposite the nursing home you would see a very different risk profile. Why was that not presented in the traffic report submitted in the planning application? When will it be done?

As a resident I can advise you that I have to swerve or stop a few times a year, even though I'm probably doing 15 miles an hour. My observation is :

1. other road users are unpredictable and not following the highway code. This is to be expected. Young cyclists come round that bend in pairs. Cars are dilly dallying looking for where to park when visiting the nursing home. Delivery vehicles still park on the road despite the newly painted single white lines, because they have nowhere else to go.

2. In my experience of driving that route 3 or 4 times a day over 10 + years, Vehicles regularly come round the blind bend over the middle of the road due to the narrowness of the road and the hedge on the left, which during the summer months is actually in the carriageway. Did the traffic report note the summer impact of the hedge? I cant see it mentioned, and that;s when most people are walking and cycling.

Please address these safety issues properly, considering the problem case scenario and not the 'best view/least greenery' option. What if it was your kids using that road in summer?

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Letter in document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Letter in document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

Showing 81-90of 162

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

Showing 91-100of 162

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

Showing 101-110 of 162

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter with comment on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

Showing 111-120 of 162

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

Standard letter on document tab

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 30 May 2019

See representation under documents tab dated 30.05.19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 29 May 2019

I strongly oppose builders placing 50 dwellings on this proposed site.

The site itself is adjacent to a conservation area, and not one I personally live in, BUT the Old Bedhampton environment is one I cherish.

Do not let people's greed over-rule the damage this proposal would impose on the local community.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 29 May 2019

I write to object to the proposal to build houses on land south of Lower Road Havant (HBC:APP/19/00427)

Entering and exiting Lower road is dangerous as it is without more traffic making the situation much worse

As it is, there are no footpaths either side of the road on the dangerous bends

The cycle path coming from the Bedhampton Hill roundabout has increased cyclist using the road substantially in recent years

(Redacted Text)

There are probably many other residents of Lower Road who have the same fear when walking in this dangerous area

Traffic coming to the mini roundabout at the top of the hill and wanting to turn into Brookside Road would cause a backlog of traffic as there is only places for about three cars to turn into the filer lane

The area is a beautiful area and would be spoilt by erecting houses

I strongly object to this proposed development

Yours Sincerely

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 29 May 2019

I object on the grounds that this will be a totally unsuitable development for this area. As local residents we already suffer from the aftermath of the development of the old Homebase

and bowling centre site on Portsdown Hill Road where a large number of new dwellings were constructed with no significant improvement to the local infrastructure or road access. As a result traffic at peak times in this area is now significantly worse than before. The addition of 50 houses to the Lower Road site will increase the traffic impact on the local infrastructure. It will also ensure much greater traffic on Brookside Road and Lower Road, neither of which are suitable for the increased volume of traffic. It will have a serious detrimental safety impact on the two roads which are also important pedestrian and cycle routes.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 29 May 2019

I wish to register my objection to the Bargate Homes planning application for the land south of Lower Road in Old Bedhampton.

Whilst I recognise the need to provide new housing in the borough, construction on this site would fundamentally and irrevocably change the character of the area. The village of Old Bedhampton is a Conservation Area, offering a unique combination of historical buildings and green recreational space which must both be protected. It is one of the few areas in the Borough which provides a clear link to its history dating back hundreds of years. The area is used and enjoyed by the residents of Bedhampton and beyond.

The roads in the village are very narrow and in several places unsuitable for two cars to pass (particularly the bends adjacent to the proposed site). The road was constructed at a time when vehicular traffic was not a problem, but now that most households have at least one car this is already a concern from both a safety and logistical perspective. In some places the road not wide enough for a pavement, causing pedestrians, cyclists and dogs to walk in the road. I regularly see 'near misses' particularly around the double bend outside The Elms where there is no pavement and visibility can be poor. Construction of 50 new dwellings would increase these risks significantly.

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, back to the 'Rusty Cutter' roundabout and to the junction with Hulbert Road.

Increasing the number of vehicles in Old Bedhampton (which have no alternative but to drive up Bedhampton Road from Brookside Road to the mini roundabout, irrespective of which direction they wish to travel) would exacerbate the safety and traffic issues here. Combined with the proposed new 300 houses at Forty Acres off Havant Road, which would impact on the same network of roads, this would significantly increase congestion.

The fields adjacent Lower Road also provide a welcome green space for the residents and wildlife of the area. The fields are actively used for agriculture and provide strong ecological value for wildlife. This is something that must be protected for all.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 29 May 2019

Dear sirs,

re. Planning Application APP/19/00427 to build 50 dwellings on land south of Lower Road, Bedhampton

I object to this on the ground that it will create a major traffic hazard at the junction of Brookside Road with Havant Road. Exit from Brookside Road is already difficult, as it involves uphill access to a tight roundabout. For any vehicle turning right or half-right or eastwards towards Havant this means crossing a dual carriageway. The volume of traffic generated by an extra 50 dwellings will make this junction more congested and potentially dangerous.

Furthermore Brookside Road and Lower Road at present provide cyclists and walkers with safe and quiet access to Mill Lane and Broadmarsh. The traffic generated by events at St Thomas's Church and Bidbury Mead already puts strain on these roads and is apt to disturb the peace of residents.

I trust that you will give serious consideration to these matters.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

See letter in document tab

Showing 121-130 of 162

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

I object to this proposal on a number of grounds:

1. Safety. The lack of pavement on the two bends in Lower Road leading to the site mean people & children have to walk on the road and with a significant increase in the number of cars due to the additional and extension of the housing, it will undoubtedly increase the risk of severe accidents. This is especially the case for:

- a) cyclists who regularly use the route when commuting from the Havant area to Portsmouth, Cosham and the surrounding areas
- b) elderly residents of the care homes on the two-bends of Lower Road who frequently walk (accompanied and unaccompanied) around Old Bedhampton
- c) any children on the new development walking to local schools/Bidbury Mead park

OBJECTION SUMMARY: Increased traffic will decrease safety and increase the possibility

of a serious injury or death.

2. Traffic capacity at top of Brookside Road. From the roundabout, there is only capacity for 2 cars to queue on Bedhampton Road before turning in to Brookside Road, without blocking Bedhampton Road and traffic heading to Havant. The housing (and any future housing should the original application be successful) will increase the number of cars accessing the area, making it more likely traffic jams will occur. During rush hour, existing traffic queues are solid from the A3, past the Rusty Cutter onto the small roundabout in Bedhampton Road, further increasing the risk of severe traffic congestion.

OBJECTION SUMMARY: Approach road infrastructure unsuitable to accommodate increase in traffic leading to major traffic jams

3. Degradation of the local area. However 50 dwellings will degrade heritage assets and setting. There will be further urbanisation which can't be reversed, a doubling 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.

Additionally the LPA has a statutory obligation to provide housing and also safeguard heritage. Considering Old Bedhampton undisputed heritage (quote from Bargate's Landscape assessment in their application " this is almost unique to the borough, a rural village conserved with heritage assets in a rural setting", this application should be refused

OBJECTION SUMMARY: Development will have a negative affect on Old Bedhampton and the surrounding conservation area

Other reasons I object

4. Constructing 50 dwellings is positive but this number only 0.5% of 2036 target. Fifteen affordable homes will not even dent what is the real need of the borough.

5. Brownfield sites should be prioritised over Grade 1 agricultural land.

6. Unnecessary to use this land to satisfy the housing numbers or land supply for the area. There are plenty of other sites being targeted without a conservation area close by.

7. Ecology. Any urbanisation of a greenfield site will degrade the ecology.

8. Prematurity of application. This application seeks to achieve an advantage by being lodged before the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Review has concluded. The outcome of which could profoundly affect decisions regarding the proposal.

It also seeks an advantage by avoiding an Examination in Public by an Independent Inspector of the Borough LP 2036 which is scheduled in the autumn of this year.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

I write to submit an objection to the above planning application to build 50 homes immediately on the land south of Lower Road, Bedhampton which is adjacent to the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

Dear sir/madam

as a resident of Lower Road, I would like to make the following objections against the proposed new development on the fields south of Lower Road, Old Behampton.

Access

1. Access to the site would be on the bend of a very narrow road. As a resident who has to travel on Lower Road, this section of the road is extremely dangerous, the bends are narrow and blind. As a motorist, the road is not wide enough to accommodate two cars comfortably and being blind bends, most motorists therefore approach these bends by driving in the middle of the road, as a consequence, I am constantly having to slam on my brakes to avoid oncoming traffic coming even though I am driving on the very edge of the road.

2. This road has constant pedestrian (walkers, runners, joggers, dog walkers) and cycle traffic along it, the road itself has no pathways, an increase in traffic would therefore be a danger to these people as the road is narrow with blind bends. There is also a Residential Home - The Lodge - which is located on the bends, whose residents take frequent walks along this road. Walking, running and cycling is beneficial for health, and people should be able to continue to gain health benefits without having to be in fear, and to be able to continue to choose a beautiful and peaceful road to travel along.

3. As a working resident and having to travel by car to work, getting out of Brookside Road in the mornings is a constant head-ache due to the volume of traffic heading towards the mini

roundabout and onto the main Bedhampton roundabout, coming home is also a nightmare as traffic is constantly backed up Bedhampton Hill Road. An increase in traffic from this development would only add to these roundabouts that already cannot cope as it is, there has already been an increase in traffic due to the new developments already built on the old Bowl Plex site as well as those built behind Penhurst Road in Bedhampton.

Heritage

4. The village of Old Bedhampton is a Conservation Area with its own special character. It has a long history with many fascinating aspects and attractive, historic old buildings. Building more houses so close would completely destroy the essence of this for the communities of both Bedhampton and Havant.

5. The proposal goes against the primary principles of planning which should ensure development is 'in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and should conserve or enhance the setting of the adjacent conservation area'. This new proposal does not fit this description.

6. Havant Council's own Local Plan includes provision for Dedicated Open Space Areas for residents to enjoy. By including the Lower Road fields in a housing development would be a serious missed opportunity to use existing natural beauty of the area, along with the Church, historic buildings and Bidbury park, to make Old Bedhampton village a dedicated open space area for all to enjoy.

Environment

7. The fields are a known feeding site for migratory wildlife such as a Brent Geese, an ecologically threatened species whose numbers are in decline as habitats are under increasing threat by human building.

8. The fields are prime agricultural land, planted with crops on a yearly basis, and represent the last accessible rural area around Old Bedhampton. It represents a rural, social amenity, not just for nearby residents, but for the whole of Bedhampton and Havant. Each year many hundreds of people visit and walk through the Conservation Area and along Lower Road, just to stroll, often with children, cycle, and walk the dog. Many disabled people in wheelchairs also enjoy passing through.

This proposal would seriously impact the area and people on many levels and should not be approved. The beauty and peacefulness of this last rural area, should not be allowed to be destroyed, it would be a mistake to lose the heritage of Old Bedhampton.

I urge this proposal not to be granted.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

I would like to lodge an objection against the application to build 50 homes in Lower Road, Bedhampton (APP/19/00427).

As a resident of Bedhampton with young children I already have concerns over the level of traffic and the speed in which people travel in the area and more homes will only make this issue worse. The roads down to Bidbury Mead/Mill Lane have very few pavements and so

provide little safety, when walking to the only catchment school in the area, away from the congested main road and additional housing will increase this risk. Additionally the loss of wildlife in the conservation area is also disturbing and deemed an unreasonable loss of habitat for migrating birds etc.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

Ref:-APP/19/00427

I strongly object to the plans to build houses on land south of Lower Road, Bedhampton.

This area of historic importance and it would be a shame to ruin the Conservation area of Old Bedhampton just to please Bargate Homes and line their pockets to the detriment of the area.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

Planning officers

We feel we must once again strongly oppose the planning application app/19/0047. Old Bedhampton is a beautiful historic part of the area which will be completely destroyed with a housing estate built on it. The impact on the residents will be huge it will cause major disruption. The narrow road and dangerous bends are a cause to be concerned the huge lorries that will be delivering goods to the site as they will completely block both sides of the road and bends. It will not be safe anymore to walk as there are no pavements. The increase in traffic potentially another 100 cars getting in and out of the road will become a nightmare its bad enough now. Nearly every open space between Havant borough and Chichester has been taken by developers its like a building frenzy. There seems to be no thought on the impact on our 1 hospital schools and doctors also the wildlife here will be destroyed. There is also a cycle route along lower road which has already seen many near misses also the proposed plan is right on top of a conservation area. There will be no open spaces left in the Havant borough area if this building of houses is allowed to continue

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

See Representation in Documents: Object - Dated 28/05/19

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

I object to the building of the 50 dwellings planned for Lower Road, for the follow counts -

1. Use of Grade 1 agricultural land. Good practice is to build out on brownfield sites before using greenfield prime agricultural land. At present it is not necessary to use H20 to satisfy the housing numbers or land supply. The use of land south of Lower Road should be used in last resort.

2. Every Local Planning Authority has a statutory obligation to provide housing and also safeguard heritage. Equal weight is applied to these 2 demands. Therefore the acid test is that the good arising from development must outweigh the harm that might be caused to heritage during and after the process of development.

This is a quote from the Bargate's Landscape assessment in their application " this is almost unique to the borough, a rural village conserved with heritage assets in a rural setting" referring to Old Bedhampton. This is not consistent with the impact of this particular submission.

Building on H20 will directly degrade the setting.

Constructing 50 dwellings is positive but this number only 0.5% of 2036 target. Fifteen affordable homes will not even dent what is the the real need of the borough. However 50 dwellings will degrade heritage assets and setting. There will be further urbanisation which can't be reversed, a doubling 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, spirit, sense of well being and safety in Old Bedhampton. It does not take a genius to deduce that development does not warrant the infliction of all these adverse factors.

3. Incremental and cumulative effects of completed developments and those in the pipe line will exacerbate congestion, pollution, stress on schools, stress on QA and medical facilities as well the stress on the financial stability of residential care homes.

4. Ecology. Any urbanisation of a greenfield site will degrade the ecology.

5. Prematurity of application. This application seeks to achieve an advantage by being lodged before the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Review has concluded. The outcome of which could profoundly affect decisions regarding H20.

It also seeks an advantage by avoiding an Examination in Public by an Independent Inspector of the Borough LP 2036 which is scheduled in the autumn of this year.

6. It is true that nobody has been killed or badly injured because of the narrow roads and blind corners, but there have been plenty of incidents, cyclists coming off their bikes, a car into the hedge and another into the brook with plenty of mirrors left in the hedge. The fact that the western and northern verges of the bends have been markedly eroded is testament to the fact the road is not fit for purpose (speed and numbers) at present.

7. Using Lodge Road cut as an alternative to using the Lower Road bends is not an alternative. It is too narrow for motability scooters and prams to pass. You can't see the far

end of the cut from either end. Intimidating at night and in winter.

8. Traffic statistics - I feel the current forecasts are notoriously inaccurate, significantly underestimating the subsequent reality.

The additional traffic requiring access and egress to the roundabout at the Bedhampton Hill junction will necessitate some form of major revision. This would make entering and exiting my property on the lower slopes of Bedhampton Hill extremely dangerous/difficult

9. There is a proposal for post development site management for roads and open spaces to be devolved to an independent organisation. This approach has a poor track record in other parts of the country with lack of control and escalating costs. The site should be adopted by HBC and HCC.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

I object to the building of the 50 dwellings planned for Lower Road, for the follow counts -

1. Use of Grade 1 agricultural land. Good practice is to build out on brownfield sites before using greenfield prime agricultural land. At present it is not necessary to use H20 to satisfy the housing numbers or land supply. The use of land south of Lower Road should be used in last resort.

2. Every Local Planning Authority has a statutory obligation to provide housing and also safeguard heritage. Equal weight is applied to these 2 demands. Therefore the acid test is that the good arising from development must outweigh the harm that might be caused to heritage during and after the process of development.

This is a quote from the Bargate's Landscape assessment in their application " this is almost unique to the borough, a rural village conserved with heritage assets in a rural setting" referring to Old Bedhampton. This is not consistent with the impact of this particular submission.

Building on H20 will directly degrade the setting.

Constructing 50 dwellings is positive but this number only 0.5% of 2036 target. Fifteen affordable homes will not even dent what is the the real need of the borough. However 50 dwellings will degrade heritage assets and setting. There will be further urbanisation which can't be reversed, a doubling 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, spirit, sense of well being and safety in Old Bedhampton. It does not take a genius to

deduce that development does not warrant the infliction of all these adverse factors.

3. Incremental and cumulative effects of completed developments and those in the pipe line will exacerbate congestion, pollution, stress on schools, stress on QA and medical facilities as well the stress on the financial stability of residential care homes.

4. Ecology. Any urbanisation of a greenfield site will degrade the ecology.

5. Prematurity of application. This application seeks to achieve an advantage by being lodged before the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Review has concluded. The outcome of which could profoundly affect decisions regarding H20.

It also seeks an advantage by avoiding an Examination in Public by an Independent Inspector of the Borough LP 2036 which is scheduled in the autumn of this year.

6. It is true that nobody has been killed or badly injured because of the narrow roads and blind corners, but there have been plenty of incidents, cyclists coming off their bikes, a car into the hedge and another into the brook with plenty of mirrors left in the hedge. The fact that the western and northern verges of the bends have been markedly eroded is testament to the fact the road is not fit for purpose (speed and numbers) at present.

7. Using Lodge Road cut as an alternative to using the Lower Road bends is not an alternative. It is too narrow for motability scooters and prams to pass. You can't see the far end of the cut from either end. Intimidating at night and in winter.

8. Traffic statistics - I feel the current forecasts are notoriously inaccurate, significantly underestimating the subsequent reality.

The additional traffic requiring access and egress to the roundabout at the Bedhampton Hill junction will necessitate some form of major revision. This would make entering and exiting my property on the lower slopes of Bedhampton Hill extremely dangerous/difficult

9. There is a proposal for post development site management for roads and open spaces to be devolved to an independent organisation. This approach has a poor track record in other parts

of the country with lack of control and escalating costs. The site should be adopted by HBC and HCC.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 May 2019

I agree with many local residents that this proposal would cause significant difficulties and destruction to the heart of Bedhampton. The road structure is not adequate to accommodate the increased level of traffic due to 50 new homes. The conservation area will be hugely disrupted affecting wildlife. The area is currently the heart of the community with the park at the centre.

This proposal has little regard to the area as it is and affect it will have on the residents and surrounding community.

Showing 131-140 of 162

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 27 May 2019

We object to yet more houses in Bedhampton on a green field space next to a conservation area. We do not believe access and safety have been sufficiently addressed. Specifically, there are blind bends with no pavement and the road is used a lot by walkers with children or dogs. In summertime, the park and stream in Brookside Road attract children who play in the stream, often cycling abreast in the blind bends. We have had to break heavily to avoid hitting them as they weave around the road, sometimes on the wrong side of it. The erosion on the bends shows how lorries and cars are already driving badly. With more traffic this would increase. Added to all of this, Lower Road is a cycle way to Havant, which just exacerbates the situation as some cars impatiently pull out around them, near the bends. We frequently meet cars who drive in the middle of the road around the bends.

We also feel that with the amount of houses built or approved within a mile of the area (over 1400 of them) the roads, especially the mini roundabout, roundabout by the Rusty Cutter and access roads to the M27 cannot cope with even more traffic. Bedhampton Hill Road is already completely backed up most rush hours. The feed to Lower Road only accommodates 2 cars. An extra 50 houses would produce many more cars, which could cause even more traffic problems as people trying to go straight through to Havant would be blocked by cars trying to turn into Lower Road.

We believe this is one of the last little beauty spots in the borough-as evidenced by the amount of weekend walkers. Building on it would wreck the peaceful nature of it and be detrimental to wildlife.

With all the extra building work recently, and with this Proposal, there has been no attempt to improve the infrastructure of the area. We object.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 27 May 2019

I object to the application to build 50 houses in Lower Bedhampton because:

Access to and from the site is via Brookside and Lower Road. In some places in Brookside there are no pavements. In Lower Road there are no pavements. Increased traffic would be dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This is particular so on the S bend near "The Elms".

Old Bedhampton is a quiet and pleasant part of the area with historic connections which would be destroyed by increased traffic.

The area around the Belmont roundabout would become increasingly congested. (More so recently since the new estates were built at the top of Maylands Road and off Portsdown Hill Road. In peak periods traffic backs up to the Rusty Cutter roundabout). It has been reported that to accommodate the extra cars this roundabout would be removed and traffic lights installed. This would mean residents of Lower Bedhampton and Nursery Road/Tulip Gardens wishing to drive east towards the Post Office, medical centre and shops would have to travel west down to the already congested Rusty Cutter roundabout to come back (or use the narrow single lane Kingscroft Lane).

In periods of snow the steep top of Brookside becomes very difficult for drivers.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 27 May 2019

Re APP/19/00427 The 2 access roads into Old Bedhampton are not fit for the increased traffic that will be caused by 50 new homes. Kings Croft Lane is a narrow sunken road with no footpaths. Brookside Road has no continuous pavements and is already busy with traffic which has to queue at the top end to get onto the main road . Bedhampton Road has increasing heavy congestion and at times is used as the diversion for all kinds of vehicles when the A27 is closed.

All the traffic caused by 50 new homes will exacerbate congestion, pollution and safety issues in the immediate area particularly for cyclists and pedestrians.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 27 May 2019

I am sure you keep yourself as up to date as possible with important court's, SoS and Inspectorate decisions that may be regarded as precedents. I am not attempting to 'teach my grand mother...'

Just in case you have been so busy lately, and having found similar circumstances in many parts of the country, I am sending you 3 recent local decisions in case you might have missed them. You will notice that the Conservation Area Heritage Consultant was involved in the first two.

You will see that these all focus on the harm to the setting of a single nearby heritage asset, similar to the grade II* The Elms, rather than the detrimental impact upon the conservation area as a whole.

The SoS was involved in this one,

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/576231/16-12-12_DL_IR_Sandgate_Nurseries_Horsham_3001703.pdf

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/576231/16-12-12_DL_IR_Sandgate_Nurseries_Horsham_3001703.pdf

PINs Ref: APP/A1720/W/18/3199119 Land east of Posbrook Lane, Titchfield, Fareham Hampshire PO14 4EZ (LPA Ref P/17/0681/OA).

I hope these save you some time and help.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 25 May 2019

This proposed development in Lower Road will destroy the Old Bedhampton as a village. The road infrastructure around the village is not sufficient to support more cars and through traffic. The problem with the roads is already bad especially at weekends with traffic to Bidbury Mead Park. The fields at Lower Road are one of the only green spaces left in the area and should be left as such.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 25 May 2019

The historic village of Old Bedhampton has been officially designated a Conservation Village now for many years. 'A conservation area is an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance (Section 69 of The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act).'

The main attributes that define the special character of an area are its physical appearance and history, i.e. the form and features of buildings and the spaces between them, their former uses and historical development (The spaces between them meaning the roads, lanes and paths, hedges and trees, any fields as well as the interstices of each adjacent building).

The council has to consider the possibility of a development being perceived as devaluing the status of the conservation area as a whole. The village is the total environment, and that includes the roads, pathways, hedges and trees that together make it redolent of the once peaceful ambience, and should be as free as possible from noisy, polluting and potentially dangerous internal combustion engine traffic of modern times.

It is not possible today realistically to expect to be able walk and wander in the village as did our forebears entirely free from such traffic, but at least the purpose of the Conservation Zone exists, and that is that nothing should be done that would lead to an increase on the already undesirable levels of traffic, both light and heavy vehicles.

The Manor Trust is a charity based in Old Bedhampton and features The Elms at 2 Lower Road, which is a Grade II * Listed Building with its architectural Gem of Bedhampton (Nicolas Pevsner) and feature turret entrance to the historic Regency Banqueting Hall, known as the Waterloo Room. Grade II * Listed Buildings are in the top 8% of Listed Buildings in the country (Ref: LPOC 2018). The Room is a centre of social activity in the village and many walk to its events, although in places the road has no path. The Elms has apartments for the elderly, and the Trust also houses fourteen elderly people in the character building The Lodge at 8-10 Lower Road, adjacent to The Elms.

The two homes are on the most steep and blind bends in the village, just where the road narrows and the elderly, some frail, walk, often aided, enjoying the ambience of the village. But the threat of traffic is a deterrent to some of the elderly from going beyond the boundary of their property, so impinging on their freedom. These bends intrinsically are a hazard to road users, and more traffic use increases the level of risk.

The Conservation village is set between two residential areas where the access road system created is effectively a cul-de-sac. Virtually all the village traffic goes via Brookside Road using the T-junction onto Bedhampton main road (B2177) at a very awkward junction on a

steep slope immediately adjacent to a busy roundabout. The approaches on Brookside Road to that junction are frequently hindered by parked traffic forcing traffic to drive on the 'wrong' side of the road. The whole junction area is a hazard and increase use raises the risk. The only other way out of the village is the narrow part single-carriageway by Bidbury Mede (Kings Croft Lane), which has some blind curves making this route mostly untenable.

A development of fifty houses will generate about 75 movements through the village and so past The Elms and the Lodge twice a day. New homes tend to be predominantly occupied by young adults and their families, and for most couples both will be working and need two cars; with 'stay-at-home' children there may be more.

The nationwide planning policy of building housing estates with a single access to and from the main road for safety reasons has to be called into question in this case, because there was no foresight when building the Maple Wood estate to make access through from the western end of Lodge Road.

As a Conservation Village, it is an attraction that visitors from far and wide to Hampshire will often choose to come and see. However, the village cannot be appreciated from a vehicle. There is a well-documented pedestrian route that visitors can walk to be able to take in all the village features.

The Manor Trust wishes to stress to the guardians of the Conservation Village, namely Havant Borough Council that if the village gets a reputation of being spoiled by the amount of traffic always passing through it, that will deter visitors with an attendant loss of a very necessary tourist attraction in the Borough.

In summary, the Manor Trust contends that this application goes against the Havant Borough Council's objectives of working working towards a Cleaner, Safer and More Prosperous Borough.

We have addressed and stated there is an issue of safety. Cleaner means not only the removal of human debris and detritus, but refers to atmospheric and sound pollution. This application if granted will harm both because of the increase in traffic, immediately from the outset, and then ongoing. Hope that vehicles will be electric may be realistic for cars in the near future, but there is no immediate prospect that lorries, trucks and vans will be free from causing environmental air and sound pollution. Arguably the Council will gain financially from more homes paying Council Tax, but that will be offset by a heavy cost burden in supplying the services the Council supplies. But the loss of Tourism indirectly detracts from the objective of More Prosperous.

Overall, the major over-riding concern is the fear of neglectful or wanton spoiling of the objectives of the designation of Old Bedhampton as a Conservation Village, viz., the 'special character of an area are its physical appearance and history, in its form and features of buildings and the spaces between them, their former uses and historical development.'

The Trustees and Governing Committee of The Manor Trust unanimously believe this proposal to build should be refused.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 25 May 2019

1) The access to the proposed development APP/19/00427 is via a very hazardous triple bend on Lower Road with a Residential Home in the centre and no pavements at all on one section.

2) The increased traffic especially from delivery vans in this internet shopping age would be a serious danger to pedestrians, including dog walkers, children and cyclists and completely destroy the tranquillity of this rural area and the crucially important setting of the Conservation Area itself.

3) fields opposite Lower Road are also a site for wildlife whose habitats are under increasing threat by the ever constant building. These include waders and Brent Geese.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 24 May 2019

I am writing regarding the proposed planning application APP/19/00427 Land South of Lower Road.

I do appreciate the pressing need for more housing and can see how this piece of land looks suitable on the face of it. However, the problem with this site with its narrow access through a conservation area seems to me insurmountable. Even if the grass verges ? a stated feature of the conservation area ? were used to widen the road where possible, the two tight and dangerous bends would remain, as would the difficult junction between Brookside Road and Bedhampton Road. Any widening if deemed necessary would only harm the character of the area without allowing properly for the increased volume of traffic which would, in itself, ruin the tranquillity of the road which is used by walkers, runners, cyclists, children and horse riders. Also the application doesn't appear to have enough parking within the site for the obvious number of vehicles that 50 houses would generate. How can the need to conserve this part of Old Bedhampton be reconciled with development on this scale? I simply don't think it can.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 24 May 2019

I strongly object to this proposal on several levels. Firstly the reduction in habitat for the wild animals and creatures that nest feed and generally inhabit this area.

Secondly the restricted access via Brookside Road and Lower Road, the increase in traffic would make the likelihood of accidents much greater, I am suprised that anyone who had traveled down these roads would even consider increasing car numbers, surely 50 houses would mean at least 75 more vehicles.

Thirdly our Doctors, Dentists and Schools in the area are already struggling to cope why increase the pressure on them.

And finally this is right on the edge of a Conservation area that would be threatened by this developement spoiling one of the few tranquil areas left in the borough

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 24 May 2019

I wish to register my opposition to the above planning application to build 50 homes on the land South of Lower Road adjacent to the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area.

This new development will ruin the Conservation Area of Old Bedhampton for all who enjoy

its peace and tranquility and add further traffic to our already congested and hazardous roads in the area.

As a pensioner resident of Bedhampton for many years I humbly request that my objections are noted. We want to save Old Bedhampton for future generations and enjoy exercise in the few remaining green lungs for this area.

Showing 141-150 of 162

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 24 May 2019

I whole-heartily object to this proposal on a number of grounds:

1. Safety.

The lack of pavement on the two bends in Lower Road leading to the site mean people & children have to walk on the road and with a significant increase in the number of cars due to the additional and extension of the housing, it will undoubtedly increase the risk of severe accidents. This is especially the case for:

- a) cyclists who regularly use the route when commuting from the Havant area to Portsmouth, Cosham and the surrounding areas
- b) elderly residents of the care homes on the two-bends of Lower Road who frequently walk (accompanied and unaccompanied) around Old Bedhampton
- c) any children on the new development walking to local schools/Bidbury Mead park

OBJECTION SUMMARY: Increased traffic will decrease safety and increase the possibility of a serious injury or death.

2. Traffic capacity at top of Brookside Road.

From the roundabout, there is only capacity for 2 cars to queue on Bedhampton Road before turning in to Brookside Road, without blocking Bedhampton Road and traffic heading to Havant. The housing (and any future housing should the original application be successful) will increase the number of cars accessing the area, making it more likely traffic jams will occur. During rush hour, existing traffic queues are solid from the A3, past the Rusty Cutter onto the small roundabout in Bedhampton Road, further increasing the risk of severe traffic

congestion.

OBJECTION SUMMARY: Approach road infrastructure unsuitable to accommodate increase in traffic leading to major traffic jams

3. Degradation of the local area

However 50 dwellings will degrade heritage assets and setting. There will be further urbanisation which can't be reversed, a doubling 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.

Additionally the LPA has a statutory obligation to provide housing and also safeguard heritage. Considering Old Bedhampton undisputed heritage (quote from Bargate's Landscape assessment in their application " this is almost unique to the borough, a rural village conserved with heritage assets in a rural setting", this application should be refused

OBJECTION SUMMARY: Development will have a negative affect on Old Bedhampton and the surrounding conservation area

Other reasons we object

4. Constructing 50 dwellings is positive but this number only 0.5% of 2036 target. Fifteen affordable homes will not even dent what is the real need of the borough.

5. Brownfield sites should be prioritised over Grade 1 agricultural land.

6. Unnecessary to use this land to satisfy the housing numbers or land supply for the area. There are plenty of other sites being targeted without a conversation area close by.

7. Ecology. Any urbanisation of a greenfield site will degrade the ecology.

8. Prematurity of application. This application seeks to achieve an advantage by being lodged before the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Review has concluded. The outcome of which could profoundly affect decisions regarding the proposal.

It also seeks an advantage by avoiding an Examination in Public by an Independent Inspector of the Borough LP 2036 which is scheduled in the autumn of this year.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Fri 24 May 2019

I write to raise my serious concerns about the impact of this proposed development, should it go ahead, on road safety.

As many others who have commented have noted, Lower Road is narrow, includes several sharp curves and does not have pavements in places. It is also a popular route for cyclists, being a much safer alternative to the main routes through Bedhampton. The extra traffic that would inevitably result from so many new homes would be a serious risk to walkers and cyclists.

I live in Havant and commute by bicycle into Portsmouth to work. It is much better for my health and the environment than driving into the city every day would be. It is very noticeable to me that much more is being done in Portsmouth than in Havant to encourage more people to cycle, including measures to make it safer to do so. The recognised safest route to get to the coastal path is to cycle around the south of Bidbury Mead and along Lower Road, coming out by the Bedhampton roundabout. (This is also the route I take to go West to Drayton and Cosham.) At the moment the road is generally quiet, and motorists drive slowly, aware of the probability of needing to allow space for pedestrians and cyclists.

I am most surprised that no allowance has been made in these plans for any kind of scheme to ensure that cyclists and pedestrians are protected from the inevitable increase in traffic from these new homes. If homes must be built on this piece of land, I believe it would be necessary to block off some of the surrounding roads so that cars could not get all of the way around Bidbury Mead, allowing a safe route for people on bicycles and on foot. Otherwise many people will be discouraged from walking and cycling, and our traffic problems (along with the resulting noise and pollution) will continue to get worse.

I do not know if the borough (or indeed county) council has any kind of strategy or plan for cycling, but if not, it should do. Pushing people to make more of their local journeys by car is a backward step, but I think this is what will happen if this development goes ahead. Those who already live in the area, and also those who move into the new properties, will not feel safe getting into Havant and going to other areas unless they are in their car.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 23 May 2019

With regards to the above application I would like to raise the following concerns..

New Application ? Why is there a new Application.. there is a current application for the

same development and this is awaiting some impact assessment, Why is a new application in place??

This application is raising a lot of concern in the area and I am hoping that the council members will focus time on this and think of the impact this will have on the area over the coming years.

I am not opposed to additional housing and I am not opposed to the principle of development on this site.

I am very much opposed to the infrastructure proposal around this.

The road access to this site is in most part a single track road and very often treated as a pedestrian zone with many walking and cycling visitors from all over the area.

In the coming years the demographic in the lower road area will change and there will be an increase in cars there due to younger families moving in.

Even over recent years there has been a marked increase in traffic and with that a number of close misses where cars and pedestrians/cyclists have been involved. We are lucky to date that there has not been a serious accident.

It is painfully obvious that this road is not in anyway suitable to serve a new development.. In fact you may even have to make some additional calming measures to ensure safety now.

A new access road is the only sensible way to serve this development and must be in place before any development starts.

Old Bedhampton has a very strong community and this has been built up over many years. You are in danger of ruining this unique environment for the sake of taking short cuts.

I would be sure in stating that no development would allow a road of the size and layout to be part of a new plan and so cannot understand why you would assume it be allowed to be the access to the development.

I would urge any council members involved in this application to visit the area and consider what they can do to preserve and better the area not to ruin it.

In summary, there is fierce opposition to this application and has been for some years. To spend more public money of looking for a cost saving short cut would be utterly shameful and would mean you loosing the unique environment that is present there now.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 23 May 2019

Just emailing to object to Bargate homes planning application for 50 + houses in old Bedhampton ! Access down a quiet rural road where people walk with children and dogs is totally unacceptable ! This area is a haven for socialisation every single day ! There is cricket and football in the beautiful park, a beautiful old church where weddings and christenings take place ! It is already well used area by local residents who welcome the quiet and relaxing environment which will be badly affected by increased traffic as well as parking problems ! Please do not build here ! It is totally unsuitable !

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 23 May 2019

Dear Sirs,

Being a resident of Lower road I have grave concerns over the proposed development of 50 houses on land adjacent to it. There are many reasons why I believe it would not be feasible:-

The road in and out of Lower road is very narrow, with 2 sharp blind bends, some parts do not even have pedestrian pavements, and no room to widen it to make it safer. The extra traffic that this development would create, during its development and after completion, would make it very dangerous to everyone who uses the road, either on bikes, in cars, or on foot. There are many elderly residents who frequently take walks from the local residential home which resides on the double bend, their safety would be greatly at risk from the increased traffic that this development would bring.

The traffic from the A3(M), Harts farm way and the Havant road cause tailbacks along the Bedhampton Hill road, which would certainly increase if you were to double the amount of houses already on Lower road.

Old Bedhampton is a conservation area, and building 50 houses in nearby fields would absolutely destroy its unique and tranquil character. It is a beautiful quiet area which is not only enjoyed by the local residents, but by many other people, old and young from the surrounding areas.

The fields which the proposed development is to be on, is home to many types of beautiful wildlife, it makes me angry that all this development goes ahead with no thought to the local wildlife. Brent geese are known to have used this field for feeding in the past, and are a threatened species.

It saddens me as we have fought this fight before, and the plans were rejected, nothing has changed in the area so why are we having to do this all again.

Thank you for considering my views on this matter,

Yours Faithfully,

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 22 May 2019

There is insufficient access for 50 new dwellings. The current roads surrounding Lower Road are already under pressure due to the high volume of traffic particularly around peak times. The land is close to conservation areas, the new housing development would increase the strain in preserving our lovely old buildings. The lorries and building work would no doubt cause structural damage to the surrounding properties and roads. The area is well known for flooding, the new dwellings will increase the flood risk.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 22 May 2019

We have attended various meetings concerned with this application but any concerns raised by the public have not yet been addressed by the developers; specifically those concerning road safety and increased volume of traffic; general infrastructure to the area especially GP practices and schools and damaging impact on the environment.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 22 May 2019

We have serious concerns about the safety on the 3 bends on Lower Road because of the increase in traffic associated with 50 new dwellings and heavy plant during the construction. Our understanding is there are no plans to put in pavements on the bends. We often have near misses when walking. We have witnessed people with prams or pushchairs almost being hit

by a car or bicycle. We often meet oncoming traffic in the middle of the road on the bends when driving, this happens at least on a weekly basis. There is a care home for older persons, and The Elms has an elderly population. Both these establishments are beside the bends in the road. We are aware that Bargate's own traffic survey did not highlight this as a concern. This survey does not accurately represent the risk. Currently people who drive on Lower Road are in the main residents or visitors so are aware of the tight bends and moderate their driving accordingly. It would be unsafe to leave the road as 'shared space'. The fact that there has never been a serious accident or fatality does not reflect the risk of having such a significant increase in traffic.

We are concerned about the impact of increased traffic associated with 50 new dwellings, when turning right into Brookside Road from the main road. Currently at peak times, it is difficult to turn into Brookside Road and this has been increased by the new development on the old bowling alley site.

We do not have off road parking so are concerned about the increased demand for parking in the road which is not wide enough for two way traffic and would be a problem for emergency vehicles.

We are concerned about the impact this proposal will have on the conservation area and general tranquillity of Lower Road and Old Bedhampton which is enjoyed by not just by the residents.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Wed 22 May 2019

Re:- Objection to plans to build 50 new houses on the field South of Lower Road, Old Bedhampton

We are shocked to see the above proposal and very surprised that although we are aware of the Government's house building mandate, we did not expect it to totally disregard the irreparable damage this proposed development would have on the Conservation Area of 'Old Bedhampton', the oldest Settlement in the Borough.

We have lived in Brookside Road for over 21 years and see more of the activity in the area than most people as we walk our dogs twice a day - sometimes at busy 'rush hour' times and sometimes not ? basically giving a fully informed view.

I would like to ask the planners to confirm how they would overcome the following-

Access:

The only way to access the proposed site is via a Restricted and Dangerous Road incapable of improvement:-

The proposed development will effectively double the domestic traffic in Old Bedhampton, exacerbated further by delivery traffic using the route. Currently there are approximately 80

houses accessed via Lower Road, and this proposed development would increase this by two-thirds

The vehicle access can only be via the two-way narrow, blind and winding bends at the start of Lower Road which has no footways.

There is no prospect of changing this arrangement.

There are two elderly accommodation homes located on these bends, whose residents frequently walk (accompanied and unaccompanied) around Old Bedhampton, and increased traffic will surely increase the possibility of a pedestrian being injured or killed.

Even with the current traffic volume, there are near misses most days on the bends and on the approach at the end of Brookside Road where cars park close to the bend, with close shaves between vehicles being very common and happening several times a day. There was a very close 'head-on' collision on the narrow bends only a couple of weeks ago between a Dustbin Lorry and car, resulting in the Lorry having to stop suddenly and reverse to enable the car through.

To make things more hazardous, the route though Lower Road forms part of the cycle network linking onto the coastal route to Portsmouth. This has resulted in greater use by cyclists, mainly responsible ones, but there are also a number of others who cut corners and display no lights in Winter Months - Any additional traffic would make this area even more dangerous, increasing the chances of a fatality (I guess the local council will have to make sure their liability insurance is up to date and sufficient if risks are increased further by increasing traffic volume).

We have seen a number of cyclists fall from their bikes on Lower Road whilst attempting to avoid oncoming cars. As pedestrian dog walkers using these bends most mornings, (peak cyclist time 7.30 ? 8 am), we have to be very careful of oncoming cyclists who approach fast and often don't see us until the last minute and have to take sudden avoidance action (swerving) to avoid collision. Most vehicles approaching the bends (from either direction) use the centre of the road, instead of the left (and fast), which puts any oncoming cyclist (and us) in danger. Any increase in traffic will increase the chances of a serious accident happening.

There is again, no prospect for improvement.

Access via Brookside Road:

The volume of traffic trying to use the mini-roundabout at the top of Brookside Road (bottom of Bedhampton Hill Road) with the junction of the B2177, has already increased to breaking point due to recent nearby developments. This roundabout only has a two vehicle waiting bay if you are waiting to turn into Brookside Road, causing traffic to back up onto the junction creating serious risk of accident.

We have seen numerous car and cycle accidents at the top of Brookside Road (minor and major collisions) caused by increased traffic volume stemming from this roundabout.

Additional increased traffic volume caused by the proposed development in Lower Road would certainly create some serious accident risk.

Brookside Road does not have a footway all the way to the end due to the Hermitage Stream that runs beside it. This acts as an informal traffic calming and is a scenic Oasis used by families, children dog walkers & wheelchair users. More traffic volume on the scale proposed would be dangerous to say the least.

There is again, no prospect for improvement.

Increased Traffic Volume effect on A3M junction & A3M

One of the most alarming 'major accident' potential areas we see as locally observant dog walkers, which almost certainly will result from increased traffic volume from a development in Lower Road, would be from the fact that this extra traffic will impact on the B2177 junction with The Broadmarsh roundabout, already the biggest 'snarl up' and scene of the most collisions we see each day. More traffic volume would also cause more back-ups onto the A3M Broadmarsh junction, potentially creating queues onto the A3M itself.

This 'will definitely occur' if the larger development being planned for the fields west of the Broadmarsh roundabout goes ahead, which seems very likely.

Could you please confirm to us all the Access problems noted above have been discussed with 'Highways Agency'.

Nature Conservation

We understand this land has been identified as 'important' as a Brent Goose site, and used as a resting spot.

The hedge bordering the proposed site is one of the only places in the surrounding area where there are at least two flourishing Sparrow flocks, which have been resident for many years.

For the increased traffic volume problems alone, or in combination with our other concerns we therefore feel it entirely wrong to raise any expectations of development south of Lower Road.

Yours Sincerely

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 21 May 2019

Plan is totally out of character for the area. Safety is paramount and being completely ignored by the Council.

The access from Lower Road and the additional traffic created will be dangerous, particularly to the young and old living there.

Common sense should prevail and this application be refused.

Showing 151-160 of 162

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 18 May 2019

Objection to 50 houses proposed at Lower Road

Siting of these houses is in the wrong area and on agricultural land adjacent to a conservation area which will destroy the peace and tranquillity of this area as well as the abundance of wildlife and will destroy the natural habitats of birds and insects

Lower Road starts at the bottom of Brookside Road and has a narrow Zed bend leading to the proposed site. It is very difficult to negotiate with vehicles especially heavy lorries which would find difficult to pass in the narrow road

This route is also used by cyclists bypassing the main road to meet up at the Rusty Cutter roundabout

Also, there is no pedestrian path. Walkers have to proceed in the road

Residents in the proposed houses would find it very difficult to walk anywhere without encountering a dangerous situation

It must be noted that some of the residents will have children going to the local school and if they had to walk to school, they would encounter a very dangerous situation especially if the parent had more than one child and was using a push chair or pram

It is believed that the local School is oversubscribed so where would these children attend school?

The second area of concern is the exit from Brookside Road onto the main road

This is very close to the mini roundabout and feeding into this road especially when going in the direction of Havant is very difficult and dangerous

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 14 May 2019

Given the significant amount of negative reaction from the community it should be obvious that many will object to this proposal.

The historic fabric of Old Bedhampton will be negatively affected by the increased traffic and noise that this development will generate, which will be to the detriment of all who enjoy this peaceful haven in the heart of Havant.

The impact on traffic both in and out of the village increases the risk to all road users and will make Kingscroft lane a very risky proposition. It is perhaps time to designate this ancient lane as a one way exit from the village. A one way zone from the St Thomas car park through to the recently developed school site would seem to be essential if this planning application is successful.

With environment so in focus, steps should be taken to protect historic communities from further development, now is the time to introduce more thought into the planning process.

Showing 161-162 of 162