



Addendum Report for Agenda Item 7
Addendum Report PC24/25-30

Report to	Planning Committee
Date	10 April 2025
By	Director of Planning
Local Authority	East Hampshire District Council
Application Number	SDNP/24/03588/REM
Applicant	Dandara Southern Ltd
Application	Reserved matters application pursuant to SDNP/18/06292/OUT, involving details of access, appearance, layout, scale and landscaping for a green space and the construction of 85 new homes with associated infrastructure including internal movement routes and sustainable urban drainage features.
Address	Land north of Buckmore Farm, Beckham Lane, Petersfield, Hampshire

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR AGENDA ITEM 7

Executive Summary

The main report for the consideration of the above proposals is included at item 7 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 disregarded.

Both reports should be read together.

The amended assessment primarily replaces paragraphs 7.9 to 7.15 of the main report with paragraphs 2.1-20 in this addendum report. The amended assessment is, otherwise, unchanged apart from references to the Design Framework replaced with more specific references to a design principle diagram and its core design principles instead. The Recommendation to refuse the Reserved Matters application remains as stated in the substantive report.

I. Introduction

- 1.1 This is an addendum report to the main report under consideration at item 7 of the committee agenda.
- 1.2 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.
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 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 7.9-7.15 of the main report regarding point (1) above. The new paragraphs are 2.1-20. 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.
- 1.5 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 appendix of the main report remain relevant.**

2. Replacement Planning Assessment

Principle

- 2.1 The application site is allocated for new residential development and new local green space in the Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan (PNDP). The site is also part of an Outline Planning Permission granted in 2020.
- 2.2 The Outline Permission goes beyond the red line area of this reserved matters application and covers land further south, where there is Reserved Matters approval for new commercial development and the access road which runs through it. Those approvals were granted in 2022 and 2023 respectively and at present only a minor element of the road has been implemented. Whilst the outline permission was granted 5 years ago it is extant and planning conditions enable different phases of development to be proposed within an overall period of 7 years.
- 2.3 The outline permission granted 'up to 85 residential dwellings.' This is less than the allocation in the Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan, which is for 101 dwellings. This is because the consent excludes further land to the east, which is understood to be in separate ownership.
- 2.4 This current application considers the public open space and new housing elements of the Outline Permission. The deliverability of the housing is also contingent upon the approval of the access under application SDNP/24/01907/REM, item 6 of the April committee meeting agenda.

Background

- 2.5 The Applicant approached the Authority for pre-application advice and a series of 5 design related workshops took place last year. The initial sessions focussed on evidence gathering

to consider the site characteristics and its landscape context, to underpin a future scheme. Subsequent sessions involved developing a layout and how this could accommodate the principles summarised at para 2.7 above, environmental enhancements, as well as attempting to understand the Applicant's intentions for the scheme.

- 2.6 The pre-application discussions unfortunately concluded without an agreed layout. As this was the focus of the workshops, there were not sufficient detailed discussions about the architecture other than a contemporary approach would be acceptable, subject to reinforcing Petersfield's character. The submission of an application was not encouraged at that time.
- 2.7 Following the submission of the application, there has been further engagement and significant amendments to attempt to achieve a more acceptable scheme. However, whilst the Applicant's efforts are acknowledged, competing priorities and views between officers and the Applicant have not been resolved.
- 2.8 The unresolved issues regarding the layout, in summary, primarily relate to achieving a landscape-led and ecosystems services approach insofar as:
- (1) Conserving and enhancing the site's natural functions of managing water and related habitat, which are characteristics of the site;
 - (2) Provide sufficient space to accommodate the above environmental characteristics including making space for appropriate SUDs, which relate to the natural drainage characteristics, rather than an overly engineered 'pipe to pond' solution; and
 - (3) Conservation, enhancement and provision of green infrastructure.
- 2.9 Whilst the Applicant and officers have engaged to try reach an acceptable scheme, in the planning balance officers have given greater weight to the landscape-led and ecosystems services and other related policies (i.e SD2, 4, 5, 17, 48, 50) when assessing the development as a whole and there has not been sufficient agreement on these aspects in particular. Consequently, the latest plans submitted in February and re-consulted upon represent a point at which the application should be determined.

The Outline Permission

- 2.10 Condition 5 of the Outline Permission requires future Reserved Matters applications to specifically accord with a 'Design Principles Diagram' (DPD) 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."
- 2.11 Whilst the whole document is not cited in the condition, additionally, the DPD is accompanied closely by commentary alongside it. This is on the same page within the Design Framework (**Appendix 2**), which 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**)

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

The Design Principles Diagram and the Core Design Principles

- 2.13 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 such as indicating a north-south orientation of frontages through the commercial and housing areas, a pedestrian route through the open space (to include the re-routing of a public right of way onto it), and areas of new and reinforced planting.
- 2.14 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, mixed accordance with what the diagram indicatively shows and the Reserved Matters proposals, as summarised in table 1 below.

DPD Parameter	Met/not met
Access (red arrow on diagram)	Not met. The proposed access does not follow the route through the open space and into the SE corner of the housing area. However, the revised route is considered to be acceptable in the report at agenda item 6.
Provision of open space (coloured green on plan).	Met.
Pedestrian route through the open space to the north-west corner of the site.	Met, albeit no diversion of the definitive PROW has been proposed/applied separately for.
Re-enforced boundary planting alongside the A3.	Met. New landscaping along this boundary acceptable in principle, albeit the proposed landscaping has not taken account of the definitive PROW.
Pedestrian route into Bell Hill Recreation Ground directly from the open space.	Not met. The route is north of the trees along the edge of the residential scheme, rather than via the open space. However, a route into the recreation ground through the housing area is proposed which is acceptable.
Retain existing TPO tree group between open space and housing are.	Met, albeit some concern raised by consultees regarding impacts upon them from the proximity of development (buildings and SUDs basins).
Housing within the area north of the trees (coloured orange on diagram).	Met.

DPD Parameter	Met/not met
North-south orientation of blocks/frontages for new housing	Not met.

Table 1 – description of DPD parameters (**Appendix 2**)

- 2.15 Turning to the Core Design Principles of the Design Framework, 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
- 2.16 Particular supporting paragraphs for each core design principle are stated below for additional context:
- 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 24)
 “Northern part of the site should be developed for a residential neighbourhood of up to 85 dwellings” (paragraph 27).
 - 3) Conserving and creating ecological networks
 “There are a number of green corridors and habitats within and on the boundaries of the site which must be safeguarded. These include the tree line around the northern field, A3 western corridor and eastern boundary to Bell Hill Recreation Ground” (paragraph 29).
 - 4) Safeguarding the setting of heritage assets
 “The setting of these [three listed buildings on Beckham Lane] buildings require careful consideration and must be safeguarded” (paragraph 32).
 - 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).
 - 6) Creating a north-south urban grain

“The arrangement of new development...should have their long axis and primary frontage orientated north-south” (paragraph 12).

- 2.17 There is mixed accordance with all of the above principles. Officers have previously advised that where there are good justifiable reasons to deviate from any particular aspects that this could be considered, whilst still achieving overall adherence given the outline permission is subject to a condition that informs the Reserved Matters stage.
- 2.18 This was on the basis that the detailed design considerations of the Reserved Matters, particularly the layout, needed more detailed contextual analysis to inform the scheme and accord with the Development Plan and relevant material considerations (eg, National Park Purposes). This has been the case with the proposed access, as outlined in item 6 of the meeting agenda, whereby following further site analysis the Applicant submitted revised plans which sought to avoid impacts upon protected trees and a veteran tree in the south east corner of the site in particular.
- 2.19 Principally, however, officers consider that fundamentally a landscape-led and ecosystems services approach has not been achieved within the parameters of the Outline Permission, in regard to the Core Design Principles. It is also considered that the detailed proposals still need to accord with the Development Plan policies as a whole. This, however, is not achieved as outlined in the assessment of the Reserved Matters below.
- 2.20 The issues raised range from aspects relating to layout, conserving and enhancing the environment, character of the public realm, to buildings addressing the positive vernacular of Petersfield to root the scheme in its context. These matters of judgement are made in the context of Development Plan policy, National Park Purposes and relevant legislation (eg. including the S245 duty).

Proposed access and layout (Reserved Matters)

- 2.21 The proposed vehicular access and a small part of the new public open space are under consideration in application SDNP/24/01907/REM (agenda item 6). This new access has been heavily influenced by the need to retain veteran and protected trees within the tree belt which defines the southern boundary of the housing area.
- 2.22 In principle, the location of the access into this part of the wider site through the tree belt is supported. This is because it would be the least impactful point into the housing site to conserve important trees, efficiently manoeuvre through the new open space, and link with the approved access further south which runs through the approved employment site. Proposed access to the wider countryside from the NW site corner and access to the Bell Hill recreation ground are also supported.
- 2.23 Turning to the housing layout, the outline consent granted ‘up to’ 85 dwellings and it is considered that this number could be achieved in principle, subject to an acceptable design. Officers advocate an approach to a layout which incorporates the following in principle:
- A perimeter block arrangement
 - A range of flats and size and type of houses
 - A road hierarchy, with some shared surfaces, with good legibility through the site
 - Containing SUDs north of the tree belt
 - SUDs and landscape features within streets
 - Conserving and enhancing existing habitat and trees on site.
- 2.24 Whilst such elements to varying degrees are shown, they are not satisfactorily employed within the layout itself. Underpinning the above, of key consideration for officers has been how the layout accommodates existing natural drainage patterns and wetland rush habitat, so as they are conserved and enhanced. These are key characteristics of the site and important to address in relation to the central objectives of the Local Plan of a landscape and ecosystems services approach to development.

- 2.25 The site topography slopes down from the north-west to the south east. The rush habitat is approximately in central and southern parts of the site and reflects where water is more at surface than elsewhere on site due to its geology. The habitat has local ecological value as outlined by the county ecologist, landscape officer and the Applicant's own ecological report.
- 2.26 Officers have sought a layout which conserves habitat and the site's natural drainage, yet much of this habitat and natural drainage would be built upon, with some habitat translocated into the new SUDs basin as mitigation. This is not an acceptable approach insofar as policies SD2, SD4 and SD9 in particular. It is also at odds with the core principles associated with the DPD regarding conserving and enhancing ecology.
- 2.27 Consequently, whilst the density of the scheme has been somewhat increased through the process and the SUD basin enlarged in the central area (by 45%), it remains that the layout still does not sufficiently account for the site's features and characteristics and the scheme adopts an overly engineered approach to the drainage strategy of a pipe to pond solution.
- 2.28 There also remains a large SUDs basin south of the trees in the narrowest part of the open space which somewhat constrains the useability of this area of the open space, albeit it does represent a small proportion of the open space, as a whole, and concern for protected trees.
- 2.29 There is also insufficient space within streets to incorporate sufficient meaningful SUDs to manage water at source and instead a predominantly engineered approach has been adopted. Furthermore, available space within streets constrains the ability to include meaningful green infrastructure which would assist with water management and enhance the character of the public realm. Some street trees are proposed, but this provision is inadequate. A greater density of development would have assisted with addressing these concerns.
- 2.30 Regarding other aspects of the layout, the large block of flats at the site entrance would not create an attractive entry to the site given the siting scale and design. The street scene behind these flats and the adjacent block would result in a poor street scene. The 16 spaces here and the street's width would create an environment dominated by on street parking and hard surfacing with sparse new planting which would not be sufficient mitigation for these issues.
- 2.31 Opposite these flats, the road hierarchy and character of the secondary route leading to the north-west site corner is an issue. Its road hierarchy is at odds with the number of dwellings served. This shared surface route would be a more direct route/desire line to the north-west area and, in this respect, it could directly serve more properties than the larger central route running through the scheme, yet this secondary route has been designed with a lower status. Its character would also be dominated by car parking, with communal parking areas and on street parking, with a lot of hard surfacing. This 'hard' environment would not be mitigated for by sufficient landscaping and this character would undermine the environment sought to be created by the large SUDs basin.
- 2.32 The regimented rows of properties in the centre of the site would not create a positive character. Whilst tandem parking and garages set back is not an unacceptable approach to parking in principle, the street scenes would comprise consistent sized and form of dwellings with identical spacing between properties, same sized front gardens and consistent building lines which, all combined, would create a very suburban character in an edge of countryside location. The heights of these properties would step down with the slope of the site but this variation in heights would not sufficiently mitigate the negative effects.
- 2.33 Overall, it is considered that the Core Principles associated with the DPD are not accorded with and the scheme is contrary to SD5, SD45, and the Design Guide SPD in particular.
- Highways/access technical considerations – internal roads & parking
- 2.34 The internal roads are not proposed to be adopted. This is not necessarily an issue subject to suitable management arrangements and it can enable more flexibility in layouts, the character of street scenes and surfacing materials for instance. Officers have previously

supported considering such flexibility in the interests of better achieving a more characterful scheme and avoiding an overall highly engineered approach.

- 2.35 That said, the proposed road layout is not overly complex or intricate. Only the secondary route appears less standardised given its shared surface. Yet, the Highways Authority raise a multitude of concerns regarding visibility and vehicle tracking for instance, with some visibility splays appear reliant on crossing private curtilages. In the absence of being able to demonstrate the safe vehicular and pedestrian access through the site, either subject to Highways Authority standards or otherwise (eg. national design guidance 'Manual for Streets'), unfortunately a reason for refusal on this basis is recommended.
- 2.36 160 parking spaces are proposed, which does involve some of the larger detached properties having 4 spaces plus garages which is somewhat excessive. Overall, the total number of parking spaces would be below what the SPD parking calculator requires, however, the SPD does allow flexibility depending on the circumstances of individual sites. The site is within reasonable walking and cycling distance with the town centre, railway station and bus services. No objection is raised in regard to the total amount of parking.

Appearance (architecture)

- 2.37 A contemporary approach in principle is considered acceptable. Regarding the houses, the use of gables and proposed roof pitches are considered to be acceptable and as well as their overall scale and massing as two storey properties. However, consultee views that the elevations are "rather flat and fail to provide interest which more articulated elevations, more typical of Petersfield provide (such as the use of bays, oriels and other projections)" and that their window fenestration should have a more vertical emphasis to reflect Petersfield character are supported.
- 2.38 There are also numerous dwellings which have two elevations facing the public realm. Yet, such properties have poorly articulated flank elevations and dwellings should be designed as specific corner units to address both directions. For these reasons, those particular units do not have an acceptable design.
- 2.39 Regarding the 3 blocks of flats, overall, their designs do not relate to Petersfield's positive character and are not supported for the following reasons:
- The roof pitches are not locally characteristic (too shallow).
 - The buildings are too flat, lack interest and appear as large masses.
 - Brick detailing makes the buildings appear longer.
 - Material changes give the buildings a visually horizontal emphasis which does not break up perceived mass of buildings.

Block A:

- Long and monotonous ridge line.
 - Balconies integrated within brickwork would be a more attractive approach.
- 2.40 Regarding the proposed materials across the site, an entirely slate roof scheme would be uncharacteristic of Petersfield. It is more characterised by plain clay tiled roofs and a more contextual approach would be for this to be the dominant roof material, especially around the edges of the scheme for the more visible properties. Slate in principle is acceptable, however, it should be on a minor proportion of roofs.
- 2.41 Bricks should also be a deeper red or orange colour to resemble positive character in Petersfield, as opposed to the lighter colour shown. The black timber cladding is not a characteristic material for domestic buildings in Petersfield. It is also arbitrarily employed on the upper floors of the flats. Whilst conditions could secure any future agreement on alternative materials, this approach would involve notable changes to the scheme before Members.

- 2.42 Overall, it is considered that the Core Principle of a landscape-led approach to design, which includes buildings and their materials, is not accorded with as well as policy SD5 and the Design Guide SPD in particular.

Housing mix

- 2.43 A predominant mix of 2 and 3 bed properties is supported in principle. Whilst there is a greater proportion of larger 4 and 5 bed properties than policy SD27 explicitly outlines, overall the mix is acceptable and the smaller properties would go towards meeting local need. Building typology and density of the development has, however, been a consistent issue throughout the process regarding the environmental considerations raised concerning a landscape-led and ecosystems services approach.

Landscaping (Reserved Matter)

- 2.44 Landscaping considerations are in part covered within the layout considerations above. Furthermore, overall, achieving 85 dwellings in this layout does result in a constrained amount of space available for meaningful landscaping within street scenes. For instance, the two aforementioned central regimented rows of detached properties have no planting in the public realm on their side of the road. Overall, the character of the scheme would not be of tree lined streets.
- 2.45 Regarding boundary treatments, longer garden boundaries facing the public realm have walls which is positive, however, there remains many areas close boarded fence seen in street scenes which could be avoided.
- 2.46 The open space south and west of the existing tree belt would be provided in line with the outline consent. A central path running through it is also supported, albeit this does not follow the definitive route of the PROW, which runs close to the A3 embankment. Additional landscaping around the southern and western boundaries of the open space is acceptable in principle, however, there is concern that the planting on the west boundary disregards the definitive route of the PROW.
- 2.47 Consultees have also raised concerns about planting within root protection areas of existing trees. This is an approach which is not supported as currently proposed, in the absence of any further details regarding extent and species composition.

Impact on trees

- 2.48 Consultee feedback raises concern about impact on trees. Certainly, the block of flats in the south east corner of the site does encroach into the root protection area of a veteran tree. SUDs basins also encroach into RPAs elsewhere. This is addressed by the Applicant's arboricultural consultant. The Authority is awaiting consultee advice from the District Council arboricultural officer and Members will be updated with any further information regarding impacts upon trees.

Ecology

- 2.49 Mandatory biodiversity Net Gain is not relevant in this instance given the timing of the application. However, there is potential for on-site enhancement and the need to accord with policy SD9 as well as the First Purpose.
- 2.50 Consultee advice has raised concern about the loss of the rush habitat on site and recommends revising the layout, which supports officers' views concerning the layout taking better account of this habitat and natural drainage. They have also raised concern about the landscape approach of new planting within existing tree RPAs and the lack of planting within street scenes to support wildlife.
- 2.51 Regarding protected species, consultee advice outlines that for bat and dormice mitigation the landscape scheme should be re-visited. The ecology report outlines other mitigation of bat boxes within mature trees and bat bricks within 42 dwellings which is a positive element.
- 2.52 Reptile mitigation involves using the north west corner of the open space as a temporarily fenced off area to translocate captured reptiles to during construction and then for a knee high rail to be installed and a sensitive grassland management scheme to be employed.

Consultee advice is that the entire open space could be managed in a way which is conducive for reptiles, which is supported. Notably, fencing off this area would also conflict with the definitive PROW which runs through it.

- 2.53 Overall, whilst elements of the enhancements and mitigation could be conditioned to agree further detail, the landscape scheme and its details need notable further consideration for the approach to address consultee advice and given the sparse planting amongst the housing it is considered that SD4 and SD9 is not accorded with.

Technical drainage matters & flood risk

- 2.54 No objections concerning foul drainage have been raised. The Lead Flood Authority has raised concern about the location of the underground attenuation tanks next to the central SUDs basin and new road. They have requested cross sections of this area to clarify whether they would support the underground attenuation tanks in this location. They also request further technical calculations to confirm whether the drainage scheme sufficiently accommodates storm events.
- 2.55 A reason for refusal is recommended which outlines that due to a lack of information the technical acceptability of the scheme has not been demonstrated. This is a specific technical reason for refusal on what is proposed. If the Lead Flood Authority were satisfied on the detailed matters, this would not overcome the separate reason for refusal concerning the need to adopt a better landscape-led and ecosystems services approach to the layout and drainage strategy.

Impact on definitive public right of way

- 2.56 Concern is raised regarding how the proposals interact with the definitive PROW running through the open space. The PROW runs east to west through the southerly area of open space to the western boundary, where it then runs north-south tightly alongside this boundary.
- 2.57 The proposed landscaping along this boundary and the location of the proposed acoustic fence appear to conflict with its route. Furthermore the ecological mitigation in the north west corner of the site is proposed to be fenced (knee high rail) yet the PROW runs through this area. The Applicant has not clarified how the siting of the acoustic barrier may impinge upon the PROW. Even if this were not to occur, a PROW running alongside this barrier would harm its amenity.
- 2.58 A better solution would be to move the definitive PROW onto the proposed new path which would run centrally through the open space up to the north west site corner where it would meet the PROW leading out into the countryside. This would be supported by the County Council PROW team but they have requested a financial contribution in regard to maintaining the PROW if the diversion were it to be secured.
- 2.59 In all of the above respects, a reason for refusal (no.5) is recommended and the proposals do not accord with policies SD19 and NEP2 in particular.

Impact on surrounding amenities

- 2.60 Given the enclosed character of the housing site and proximity to surrounding properties there would be no impact upon their amenity. The open space similarly would not impact upon surrounding amenities and improve local recreational facilities. The access with Winchester Road is agreed in principle and the additional traffic that would be created would not cause any significant amenity impacts within the vicinity of this junction. Overall, no objection is raised regarding the impact upon surrounding properties.

Cultural heritage

- 2.61 The site is within an archaeologically sensitive area. The proposals have been informed by archaeological information and assessment and the County Archaeologist raises no objection subject to conditions.

2.62 The proposals are also a sufficient distance with limited intervisibility with the listed buildings on Beckham Lane, between which is a consented commercial scheme. It is considered that the setting of these heritage assets would not be impacted upon.

S245 duty

2.63 Within the overall planning balance, the scheme as a whole would not further Purpose 1 of the National Park insofar as the landscape and design related matters. Purpose 2 is furthered given better access to the countryside via an improved pedestrian link to the PROW in the north west corner of the site; there would be improved access and amenity within the created open space with wider views south towards Butser Hill.

Housing land supply

2.64 The Authority can demonstrate a sufficient housing land supply at present. Furthermore, the Government's Housing Delivery Test does not apply in National Parks. In these respects, the status of the relevant Development Plan policies, and paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF 2024 regarding the 'tilted balance,' the contribution of the delivery of this site is not outweighed by the concerns raised in this report.

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

2.65 For completeness and consistency between the two reports, the following changes to the main report are also made.

2.66 The 8th 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 **the Design Principles Diagram and Core Principles of the Development Framework (May 2019)**. Additionally, PNDP policy sets out design principles for the site.

2.67 Paragraph 2.3 (planning history) cites the Design Framework, whereas more specifically this should refer to 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.

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 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.

Tim Slaney

Director of Planning

South Downs National Park Authority

Contact Officer: Richard Ferguson

Tel: 01730 819268

Email: Richard.Ferguson@southdowns.gov.uk

Appendices 2 - Outline PP Design Framework Plan 2019

SDNPA Consultees Legal Services, Development Manager

Background Documents: [SDNP/24/03588/REM | Reserved matters application pursuant to SDNP/18/06292/OUT, involving details of access, appearance, layout, scale and landscaping for a green space and the construction of 85 new homes with associated infrastructure including internal movement routes and sustainable urban drainage features. The outline application was not an EIA application. | 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](#)