

**Addendum Report for Agenda Item 6**  
**Addendum Report PC24/25-29**

Report to	<b>Planning Committee</b>
Date	<b>10 April 2025</b>
By	<b>Director of Planning</b>
Local Authority	<b>East Hampshire District Council</b>
Application Number	<b>SDNP/24/01907/REM</b>
Applicant	<b>Dandara Southern Ltd</b>
Application	<b>Application for approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission SDNP/18/06292/OUT - Details of proposed road between Phase 2 employment site and the housing site.</b>
Address	<b>Land north of Buckmore Farm, Beckham Lane, Petersfield, Hampshire</b>

---

**ADDENDUM REPORT FOR AGENDA ITEM 6**

---

### **Executive Summary**

The main report for the consideration of the above proposals is included at item 6 of the committee agenda.

This addendum report replaces the planning assessment section (7) of the main report. Its purpose is to:

- 1) Clarify the starting point and scope of the assessment of the Reserved Matters in the context of the Outline Permission, and how the Design Framework document (May 2019) cited in the main report should be considered.
- 2) Replace the planning assessment (section 7) of the main report with the version in this report, which includes updated commentary relating to (1) above, for Members consideration. Section 7 of the main report should be discounted.

Both reports should be read together.

The amended assessment primarily replaces paragraphs 7.2-7.13 of the main report with paragraphs 2.2-15 in this addendum report. The amended assessment is, otherwise, unchanged.

The Recommendation to grant the approval of Reserved Matters, subject to the satisfactory resolution of highway safety matters, remains and is stated in the substantive report.

## I. Introduction

- I.1 This is an addendum report to the main report under consideration at item 6 of the committee agenda.
- I.2 The purpose of this addendum report is to:
  - 1) Clarify the starting point and scope of the assessment of the Reserved Matters in the context of the Outline Permission, and how the Design Framework document (May 2019) cited in the main report should be considered.
  - 2) Replace the planning assessment (section 7) of the main report with the version in this report, which includes updated commentary relating to (1) above, for Members consideration. Section 7 of the main report should be discounted.
- I.3 Regarding point (1), this report emphasises the starting point of the Outline Permission and its condition 5 for the considerations of the Reserved Matters application. Condition 5 specifically cites a design principles diagram (DPD) included in the 2019 Design Framework Document, which Reserved Matters are required accord with. This position needs to be clarified because the main report does not explicitly set this out and it also addresses the Design Framework as a whole.
- I.4 For completeness and clarity, the planning assessment from section 7 of the main report is set out in its entirety below, with the aforementioned amendments. The amendments primarily relate to paragraphs 7.2-10 of the main report regarding point (1) above. The new paragraphs are 2.2-13. The remainder of the original assessment remains the same, apart from minor amendments including where the Design Framework document is referred to as a whole document.
- I.5 The main report, except section 7, remains relevant. This addendum report should be read in conjunction with it. **To emphasise, this addendum relates to only the planning assessment (section 7) and all other sections and appendices of the main report remain relevant.**

## 2. Replacement Planning Assessment

### Principle and the Outline Permission

- 2.1 The site allocation policies and indicative masterplan for Buckmore Farm in the Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan (PNDP) identify the main access from Winchester Road to extend through the eastern area of the allocations, up to the housing area (**Appendix 2**). The indicative route cuts across the open space and through the existing protected tree belt, which marks the boundary between the open space and housing area.
- 2.2 Subsequent to the adoption of the PNDP, Outline Permission was granted in 2020 which extends from Winchester Road (the main access) and covers fields further north, within which new commercial, open space and housing is granted in principle. The permission encompasses a much wider area of land than the current application, given it is specific to the next phase of access road.
- 2.3 Condition 5 of the Outline Permission requires future Reserved Matters applications to specifically accord with a 'Design Principles Diagram' (DPD) contained within a Design Framework document (dated May 2019), which was submitted prior to the determination of the outline application. The condition does not cite the document as a whole. Furthermore, the DPD is specifically listed as an approved plan on the Outline Permission, not the entire document. The DPD is included in **Appendix 2** and the condition is stated below:

“Any reserved matters application(s) shall be in accordance with the approved Design Principles Diagram (pg.6 of the Design Framework May 2019).

Reason: To safeguard the landscape character of the site in accordance with policy SD4 of the South Downs Local Plan 2014-2033, BEPI of the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2028 and the NPPF.”
- 2.4 Whilst the whole Design Framework document is not cited in the condition, additionally, the DPD is closely accompanied by commentary alongside it on the same page within the

Design Framework. It outlines that the Core Design Principles in the Design Framework should be read in conjunction with the DPD. This commentary is below:

“The Design Principles Diagram sets out the broad disposition of development within Buckmore Farm North, the main site constraints and the Core Principles to be followed. The diagram should be read alongside the Core Principles described in the next section (Officer emphasis).” (paragraph 16, **Appendix 2**)

“All areas and routes shown on the Design Principles Diagram are indicative” (paragraph 17, **Appendix 2**).

- 2.5 In summary, to clarify, condition 5 of the Outline Permission, the DPD, and the Core Design Principles of the Design Framework (May 2019) represent the starting position and scope for how this Reserved Matters application should be determined.

#### The Design Principles Diagram and the Core Design Principles

- 2.6 The DPD (**Appendix 2**) illustrates the areas for commercial, open space and residential development. It also indicates a route for the main vehicular access through the overall site, leading from Winchester Road to the south-east corner of the area of housing and through the tree belt. The diagram includes other aspects but the access route is the most relevant to this current application.

- 2.7 There is some inconsistency between the DPD and the PNDP indicative plan (**Appendix 2**), insofar as the DPD route is more tightly drawn to the eastern site boundary. The proposed access is considered further below.

- 2.8 The Applicant contends that the Reserved Matters should be considered within the context and parameters of the DPD, as per condition 5 of the Outline Permission. Officers agree with this view. There is, however, some inconsistency regarding the indicative access route between the DPD and the application proposals. The proposed access has a ‘S bend’ through the open space and its access is through the trees further west than shown on the DPD. Whereas, the DPD shows a straight access through the south-east corner of the site. The proposed access is considered further below.

- 2.9 Regarding the Core Design Principles, to be read alongside the DPD, these cover the commercial, residential and open space as a whole and the Design Framework describes them as being fundamental to for a successful development as a whole. They are:

- 1) Landscape-led approach
- 2) New employment, residential uses and green space
- 3) Conserving and creating ecological networks
- 4) Safeguarding the setting of heritage assets
- 5) Attractive access across the green space
- 6) Creating a north-south urban grain

- 2.10 The most relevant principles in this Reserved Matters application are no.(1) overarching and more specifically nos.(2) and (5). Relevant supporting paragraphs in the Design Framework for these principles are below:

#### 1) Landscape-led

“Landscape must come first in the master planning of the site, with the design and layout of proposals drawing on the existing landscape context and green infrastructure assets, which are unique and distinctive elements of the site...” (paragraph 19).

“Development should enhance, respect and reinforce the landscape through a landscape-led design approach, informed by a contextual analysis of local landscape character and built character...such as topography, landscape features, historic landscape features, the water environment (officer emphasis), biodiversity and other ecosystems services....” (paragraph 20)

“The landscape framework should reinforce existing and introduce new landscape elements...” (paragraph 21)

## 2) New employment, residential uses and green space

“The central body and north western part of the site should be retained and managed as part of the green infrastructure...” (paragraph 26)

“Northern part of the site should be developed for a residential neighbourhood of up to 85 dwellings” (paragraph 27).

## 5) Attractive access across the green space

“The layout and design...should deliver a network that promotes easy and efficient movement, with high levels of pedestrian and residential amenity and an attractive environment. This should be achieved through a hierarchy of streets and routes which respond to different travel needs” (paragraph 34).

“The character of the access road as it crosses the central open green space (fig.06) should reflect the landscape setting and the needs of pedestrians moving east-west along the recreational route” (paragraph 36)

“Whilst the design of the main access road has not been determined, the optimum access point for the residential area is likely to be towards the eastern boundary and south eastern corner of the northern field...” (paragraph 37)

### The proposed access

- 2.11 The access from Winchester Road up to Beckham Lane has been built, under a separate application. Beyond this point, Reserved Matters approval has been granted for new commercial development and the next phase of road running through it. As the current application seeks approval for the details to extend the road further, its connection with the commercial scheme is fixed by these approvals.
- 2.12 From that point, the original plans for the application proposed a route which responded to the DPD, with the access proposed in the very south-east corner of the site. However, following further assessment, its point of access through the tree belt was revised and is now further west. This is to avoid significant impact or loss of a veteran oak tree in the south-east corner of the site. The access is now through a more feasible gap between trees. This proposed entry point is more acceptable for these reasons plus it also responds to concerns raised by consultees and third party representations.
- 2.13 As each end of the proposed access are considered to be fixed, in order to safeguard trees, the route runs through the open space with two bends to join these two points. It avoids and minimises incursion into root protection areas. The need to fell any important mature trees is avoided which reflects a landscape-led approach.
- 2.14 Given how its route has been influenced by the above, it does not explicitly follow the route shown on the DPD (**Appendix 2**). However, the DPD is indicative and the core design principles outline that the layout of the access is not fixed. This allows for some flexibility and the impact on trees is a sufficient material consideration in determining the acceptability of the proposed access.
- 2.15 Achieving a sensitive design beyond this, in the context and focus of this Reserved Matters application is its scale, appearance, drainage and landscaping. A landscape-led approach has been sought so far as possible given the aforementioned tree constraints.

### Scale and appearance

- 2.16 The access has been designed to be as narrow and short as possible, given the above considerations, and the need for adequate vehicular and pedestrian accessibility. There is, therefore, limited further scope to address consultee advice about its scale.
- 2.17 However, this has resulted in the Highways Authority raising safety concerns. They consider that the access once built would result in conflict between users (eg, how vehicles interact passing one another on the bends). The Applicant’s highways consultants dispute these

views and have provided further information to demonstrate that the road meets with the Highways Authority's principle guidelines.

- 2.18 The Highway Authority's views about road dimensions, vehicle tracking and visibility, do appear resolvable to SDNPA officers. As a further review, a Road Safety Audit (which has been requested) would provide further clarification on its acceptability. A resolution to grant reserved matters approval subject to the submission of a Road Safety Audit from the Applicant, plus further consultation with the Highways Authority, is recommended, so as to address highway safety matters and policy SD21.
- 2.19 Regarding the access' siting and impact on trees, conflicting consultee advice has been received. The accuracy of tree RPAs, particularly for the large veteran tree, has been raised. Parts of eastern pavement encroach into the RPA and the road would further encroach into it if the RPA was underestimated. However, other consultee advice has not raised an objection to the submitted Arboricultural Assessment and Method Statement. Overall and on balance, provided suitable construction methods, materials, and protections measures are employed no objection is raised regarding impact on trees. Therefore, the proposals could accord with policy SD11.
- 2.20 Turning to the access' appearance, it inevitably requires a degree of engineering to accommodate up to 85 dwellings. To manage vehicle speeds, a raised table within the road is proposed which does add to its overall engineering, however, this appears unavoidable in order to achieve a safe functioning access balanced with safeguarding protected trees.
- 2.21 The road and pavements would be tarmac, which is typical of rural roads. If block paving was proposed for example, it would be inconsistent with the commercial scheme and paving can also appear more suburban
- 2.22 There is some concern about how the road would work with existing contours and it has the potential to appear raised and more pronounced compared to surrounding ground levels. Notwithstanding the information provided, agreement of final levels are recommended to be conditioned so as these are considered in more detail.
- 2.23 Regarding pedestrian access, a single pavement is proposed along its eastern side. There is a smaller length of pavement on its western side, where it would join the approved commercial scheme and the footpath leading into the open space. Not having two pavements either side for its full length helps to reduce its width, engineered appearance, and address tree constraints.
- 2.24 The pedestrian crossing would join up with the existing footpath. The crossing does not explicitly follow the definitive PROW as this cuts straight across the bend in the road, however, the County Council have not raised an objection to this provided there is a degree of signage. The PROW team have agreed with officers that the county guidelines of needing white give way lines and other road signage for the crossing is not needed in this instance in order to not overly suburbanise and engineer this semi-rural location.
- 2.25 The route of the path crossing the road is of a simple design. It would not significantly impact upon the amenity and accessibility of the existing PROW. Overall, the location and appearance (subject to agreeing materials, way markers via condition) of pedestrian crossing and its relationship with the PROW are acceptable.

#### Landscaping (Reserved Matter)

- 2.26 The scheme proposes introduces native planting at the SUDs basin and elsewhere. Consultee advice supports additional native shrub planting in principle as compensation for the loss of existing vegetation to create the access, but further work is needed to introduce a more diverse range of species to benefit wildlife. The overall parameters of the landscape plan provided do not appear wholly unacceptable. Consultee advice recommends conditioning the landscaping details further in the interest of biodiversity and landscape character, as per the recommendation in the substantive report. In these respects, enhancements for biodiversity and landscape character would accord with policies SD4 and SD9.

### Drainage

- 2.27 The road incorporates a small swale and SUDs basin on its western side. Consultee concern ranges from the technical aspects of the Lead Flood Authority needing to be addressed (eg, drainage calculations), to whether the scheme is overly engineered and adopts a landscape-led approach.
- 2.28 Given the route itself, the most logical point for the SUDs basin is on its western and lower side. It is considered that the detailed drainage scheme can be conditioned to consider drainage in further detail. The Lead Flood Authority and other consultees would be consulted on the detailed engineering works and their prominence (eg, outfall headwalls in the SUDs basin, culverts). Regarding water quality, the SUDs basin would capture surface water and combined with the choice of species could reduce sediment and filter contaminants from run-off. Overall, the proposals could accord with policies SD17 and SD50.

### Ecology

- 2.29 The approval of reserved matters for outline planning permissions are not within the scope of mandatory biodiversity net gain. However, on-site enhancements would be achieved within the landscaping scheme. Furthermore, specific mitigation and enhancement for protected species is recommended to be conditioned given consultee advice. No objections are raised on ecological grounds and conditions to secure landscaping, mitigation and enhancement measures are recommended.

### Impact on surrounding amenities

- 2.30 The proposed access is a good distance from the nearest residential properties to the east, on the opposite side of the recreation ground. There would not be any discernible impact upon those properties and similarly those to the south of the site. The proposals would also not impact upon the amenities of the adjacent recreation ground.

### S245 duty

- 2.31 Within the overall planning balance, the scheme as a whole would further the purposes of the National Park insofar as the development safeguards important mature oak trees and seeks to enhance biodiversity.

### Other minor amendments to the main report in addition to the planning assessment above

- 2.32 The 3rd bullet point in the executive summary key matters of the main report refers to the Design Framework document, whereas for accuracy it should read (in bold) as follows:
- The Outline Planning Permission includes a condition which requires the detailed design to accord with a **Design Principles Diagram within** a Design Framework document (May 2019). Additionally, PNDP policy sets out design principles for the site.

- 2.33 Paragraph 2.3 (planning history) of the main report also cites the Design Framework. It should, however, more specifically reference the DPD and core design principles. A revised paragraph is below:

The 2020 Outline Permission includes a condition requiring future Reserved Matters scheme to accord with **the Design Principles Diagram and its associated Core Design Principles within a Design Framework document (May 2019)**. There is an associated Section 106 Agreement which in summary secures the following: affordable housing (30%), custom and self build dwellings, highway contribution and highways works, travel plan and open space.

- 2.34 Paragraph 8.3 of the main report cites the Design Framework. Whereas it should more specifically reference the DPD and core design principles. A revised paragraph is below:

It is considered that the access does not wholly accord with the conditioned **Design Principles Diagram insofar as the route shown is straight to the south-east corner of the housing site. However, the avoidance of significant impact to protected trees is a sufficient material consideration to justify the alternative route and the core design principles also allow some flexibility to achieve this.**

**The proposed access is, however,** subject to further more detailed consideration as per the Recommendation in the substantive report.

### **3. Conclusion**

- 3.1 This addendum report has set out the starting point and scope from which to determine the application. It is recognised that the principle of development of a new access crossing the new open space is acceptable and that the parameters for decision making are subject to the conditioned Design Principles Diagram of the Design Framework and its inherent impacts considered in the Outline Planning Permission. For the aforementioned reasons in the assessment, there are material considerations in regard to safeguarding protected trees which sufficiently justify the revised proposed access.

**Tim Slaney**

**Director of Planning**

**South Downs National Park Authority**

Contact Officer: Richard Ferguson

Tel: 01730 819268

Email: [Richard.Ferguson@southdowns.gov.uk](mailto:Richard.Ferguson@southdowns.gov.uk)

SDNPA Consultees: Legal Services, Development Manager

**Background Documents:** [SDNP/24/01907/REM | Application for approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission SDNP/18/06292/OUT - Details of proposed road between Phase 2 employment site and the housing site | Land North of Buckmore Farm Beckham Lane Petersfield Hampshire](#)  
[South Downs Local Plan \(2014-33\)](#)  
[Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan - South Downs National Park Authority](#)  
[South Downs National Park Partnership Management Plan](#)  
[SDNPA Supplementary Planning Documents and Technical Advice Notes](#)