



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 29 April 2025

Site visits made on 28 and 30 April 2025

by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/W/24/3353895

Land north of junction between B2070 and Greenway Lane, Petersfield, Hampshire GU31 5SX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Amberleigh Projects Ltd against the decision of South Downs National Park Authority
 - The application reference is SDNP/23/04270/OUT.
 - The development proposed is a hotel (Use Class C1) and a cycle centre (mix of flexible Use Class E(a)(b)(c)) with access from B2070.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and outline planning permission is granted for a hotel and a cycle centre with access from B2070 at Land north of junction between B2070 and Greenway Lane, Petersfield, Hampshire GU31 5SX, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref SDNP/23/04270/OUT, dated 5 October 2023, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule at the end of this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. Several versions of the site address were provided within the submissions. That included in the banner heading above was agreed at the Hearing.
3. The description of development includes a cycle centre identified as a 'mix of flexible Use Class E(a)(b)(c)'. This broad definition generated some uncertainty over the balance and type of uses which would be permitted. At the Hearing the appellant confirmed that the intended use was for cycle hire, repair, and retail with ancillary food and drink provision on the premises, and the parties agreed that this could be appropriately clarified and restricted by condition. I have therefore considered the appeal on that basis, and omitted reference to Use Classes within my decision.
4. The application was submitted in outline with all matters except access reserved for future consideration. Detailed parameter plans have however been submitted, and the appellant wishes to be bound by them. Insofar as they limit scope for variation in terms of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, I have placed significant weight on the parameter plans in assessing the scheme.
5. The parameter plans were revised following refusal of planning permission, and the appellant undertook a public consultation exercise to publicise the changes. Other plans detailing off-site highways works were also revised and submitted during the course of the appeal following consultation with the Highways

Authority. For these reasons and given that the plans show no fundamental change to the scheme, their consideration as part of the appeal does not prejudice the interests of any party.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are whether the site is a suitable location for the proposed development having regard to:
- need;
 - whether it would conserve and enhance the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the South Downs National Park (the National Park);
 - whether it would minimise the need to travel by private cars and encourage access and/or subsequent travel by sustainable means;
 - highway safety; and
 - whether a suitable surface water drainage scheme could be implemented.

Reasons

Background

7. The site is located in the National Park within which there is a duty to further the purposes of designation. These comprise (a) to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, and (b) to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the National Park by the public. Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) additionally states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks. I shall consider the above further within my assessment below.
8. Whilst the Framework further emphasises that the scale and extent of development should be limited, the parties agree that the scheme would not constitute major development, and I see no reason to find otherwise.

Need

9. The site is located outside the settlement boundary of Petersfield and thus falls within the countryside for the purposes of the South Downs Local Plan 2019 (the Local Plan). Policy SD25 of the Local Plan states that development is permitted within the countryside provided it complies with other policies *and* meets one or more of a range of criteria. The most relevant criterion in this case is the need for a countryside location. Here the supporting text of Policy SD25 acknowledges that certain uses, including those relating to countryside recreation, may only be able to function fully successfully within such locations. Insofar as it also identifies Policy SD23 which sets additional criteria for tourism development in the countryside, its supporting text notably highlights the demand for all types of visitor accommodation within the National Park with identified gaps in Petersfield and along the South Downs Way (SDW). The promotion of sustainable tourism is additionally one of the priorities set out within the Partnership Management Plan.
10. The appeal scheme comprises uses which would provide both visitor accommodation and support countryside recreation. Insofar as hotels are however categorised within the Framework as a main town centre use, the

appellant has undertaken a sequential assessment which satisfactorily demonstrates the lack of suitable sequentially preferable locations. The proposed uses would otherwise complement one another to the extent that visitors to the hotel could use it as a base to explore the area by cycle. Indeed, whilst the site neither falls within Petersfield nor along the SDW it is conveniently located between the two and linked to each by established cycle routes and footpaths. These also provide direct access to the broader landscape of the National Park including the Queen Elizabeth Country Park. Both parts of the development would therefore address needs identified within the Local Plan and would together function most successfully within the countryside. That being so, a countryside location is justified.

11. The availability of direct access to the A3 was clearly also a factor in the appellant's selection of the location. This would enable the hotel to serve a year-round market, including both visitors to the National Park and travellers passing through on the A3. Despite the Authority's more specific focus on the growth of tourism, the Local Plan's reference to 'all types of visitor accommodation' does not explicitly exclude that which might also serve a broader market, and which might thus be attractive to national or international hotel operators. The submissions show that existing visitor accommodation in the area currently similarly serves a varied market.
12. Concerns that the development might undermine the aspiration for a new hotel in Petersfield set out within the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (the NP) and generate competition for other businesses in the area, are brought into focus by the recent approval of the 'Recharge' scheme on an adjacent site. Amongst other things this would deliver a hotel and chalets providing 100 visitor beds. However, whilst the NP is not directly applicable to the site, the Local Plan sets no cap on the level of new visitor accommodation required. The fact that schemes continue to be brought forward is itself a reflection of continuing capacity within the market, as demonstrated by up-to-date evidence provided by the appellant. As such, there appears to be no reason in principle why the development would make the delivery of a hotel in Petersfield any less likely. Nor would the development necessarily directly compete with existing small operators such as pubs and bed and breakfasts, given the differing appeal of such accommodation and the slightly different market served. Insofar as it is relevant, there is therefore no reason to believe that the scheme would be incompatible with the social and economic wellbeing of the local community.
13. Given that the development would draw visitors into the National Park, acting as both a base for further exploration, or as a stopping point for those using long distance trails and routes, it would further the second purpose of the National Park's designation as set out above. Even in relation to those passing through on the A3, it could help raise awareness.
14. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the site is a suitable location for the development in relation to need. It therefore complies with Policy SD25 of the Local Plan as outlined above, and one criterion set for tourism development in the countryside by part (g) of Policy SD23 of the Local Plan, given that the site is closely associated with the public rights of way network.

Natural beauty

15. The site is a gently sloping field currently covered by grass and partly bisected north-south by a public right of way (PROW). The field did not appear to be in

any active agricultural use at the time of my visit. It is for the most part heavily enclosed by tall trees and hedges, and bounded on 3 of its 4 sides by roads and a railway line. Two of these roads and the railway line are elevated above the ground level of the field, and in some places considerably so. As such, passing vehicles and trains are visible from within the field including the PROW, even with boundary vegetation in leaf. Though limited southward views of the broader landscape of the National Park are also available, a sense of disconnection exists due to the high level of physical and visual enclosure of the site by transport infrastructure. This sense of disconnection is heightened by street lighting and signage around the adjacent roundabout, and the loud and more or less continuous level of noise generated by passing vehicles. This causes the site to be far from tranquil.

16. Though the site has been described as a field of historic origin, its shape was altered by construction of the adjacent section of the A3, and a boundary which previously ran along the line of the PROW no longer exists. The only historic boundary not fixed by an extant or former road is that separating the site from a field to the north. Both this and all the other boundaries would be retained. An opportunity could otherwise be taken to echo the lost historic boundary through the scheme landscaping, as is suggested by the indicative landscaping plan.
17. The PROW continues through the adjoining field, which has a somewhat domesticated character. But though it forms part of the immediate setting of a historic dwelling known as Maple Durham, the evidence before me does not support the Authority's assertion that it is a historic park or garden. The field is similarly bounded by the A3 and railway line and can be accessed via a small industrial estate on the other side of the railway line. Differences in ground level limit the extent of intervisibility between the field and site until crossing the boundary between. Though a pleasant, elevated view of the broader landscape toward the south is available to walkers upon approaching the site boundary, the short walk along the PROW provides little direct experience of the landscape quality of the National Park. The view itself would not be disturbed by the proposed development based on the disposition of buildings and spaces shown on the parameter plans.
18. Maple Durham has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset, the significance of which appears to reside in its historic design and past status as a farmhouse. Within this context the site may once have formed part of its landholding. However, there is nothing to clearly indicate this on the ground, and, as noted above, Maple Durham is largely viewed within the context of the adjoining field. Whether or not there is some past association between the site and Maple Durham the development would not adversely affect the ability to appreciate its significance.
19. Aside from roads and the railway line, the immediate setting of the site includes a roundabout, scrap yard, a ribbon housing and the Recharge site. The sweep of open land rising toward the south on the opposite side of the roundabout appears distinctly separate, and this is again emphasised by adjacent roads. To the extent that limited views into the site are possible from within the immediate setting, including rising land further to the south, it is recognisable as both a field and an open green space. However, its disconnection from the surrounding landscape is once again appreciable. Within

this context the field makes little contribution to the rural character or quality of the broader landscape.

20. A sliver of the site is visible from a short section of the northern flank of Butser Hill. This prominent landmark otherwise provides a 360° view from its highest point. However, as the site is not visible from the top, it does not feature in any of the breathtaking views described in the South Downs National Park View Characterisation and Analysis 2016. Whilst the northern flank of the hill nonetheless provides a view across the Rother Valley towards the Greensand Hills, the contribution made to this by the site is insignificant. Its peripheral position within the view is chiefly drawn to the attention of the viewer by noise emanating from the adjacent junction of the A3 and the stark white frontages of the ribbon of houses opposite the site. Within the same view the Recharge site is both slightly closer and far more exposed. Both relative to that, and based on the parameter plans, it appears unlikely that the proposed development would be either particularly prominent or noticeable, even during winter. It would not therefore diminish the quality of the view, or have any cumulatively harmful effect. It would also not give rise to any appreciable change in the historic scattered pattern of development characteristic within the wider landscape.
21. Together with development of the Recharge site the appeal scheme would nonetheless consolidate and expand the existing cluster of development adjacent to the roundabout. Together they would give rise to an increase in activity. However, experienced close at hand this would not be sufficient to 'urbanise' the location, to have any significant effect on tranquillity, or break down any broader pattern within the landscape. This would be due in large part to the very clear and close relationship that would exist between both Recharge and the appeal scheme with the A3. It would also be due to the retention of a considerable amount of open space within the site.
22. The scheme has been criticised as relying on the screening that would be provided by vegetation. Much of this vegetation already exists, is a well-established feature of both the site and its setting, and is likely to remain so. It is therefore wholly appropriate for the physical and visual role vegetation plays to be taken into account within the design process. This inevitably includes in relation to screening views in. Even where ash dieback is apparent along the adjacent part of the A3, it can be reasonably anticipated that other trees will eventually fill any gaps. No meaningful view into the site is in any case possible whilst driving along the A3. The scheme landscaping itself remains to be fixed, and within that context there appears ample scope for enhancement.
23. The boundary along the southeast side of the site contains a number of mature trees including one very large oak. The latter can be considered 'veteran' on account of its apparent age. Although it appears likely that it would at least partly overhang the access, the submitted arboricultural evidence indicates that no works would be required to the tree, and no concerns were raised by the Authority prior to the appeal. Protection for this and other notable mature trees along the site boundaries can be secured by condition, together with a method statement which takes into account the final layout of the development.
24. The gently sloping topography of the site means that some modification of levels would be required to accommodate the proposed development. However, within those parts of the site where construction is indicated on the parameter

- plans, the slope is not such that significant engineering would be required. Details can be secured by condition.
25. The indicative designs have been criticised as failing to respond to local design guidance and agricultural character. However, whilst the parameter plans to some extent define the likely form of the proposed buildings, their detailed design remains to be fixed. In each regard there is no particular reason why an agricultural theme should be considered either necessary or appropriate. Aside from the fact that the site is a field, there is nothing to suggest that an agricultural design would serve any useful purpose given that the immediate context is dominated by non-agricultural features and uses. Insofar as various modern agricultural structures can otherwise be seen from Butser Hill, few appear to enhance their settings. In this regard the plans show scope to achieve a more interesting design solution.
26. The development would mean that the site would no longer be identifiable as a field, its openness would be reduced, and the brief experience of passing through it along the PROW would change. Glimpses of the buildings might also be possible from both near and afar. However, change of this nature should not be considered automatically harmful simply because the site is located within a National Park. Indeed, my findings indicate the negligible contribution that the site makes to the natural beauty and special qualities of the National Park, and the minimal effects that the development would have. When additionally taking into account the identified need for the development, the site appears ideally suited to absorbing such change. Moreover, subject to careful handling of the design, it appears likely that the development could integrate successfully, and in serving as a gateway into the National Park, could make a positive contribution to the visitor experience.
27. The development would therefore further the first purpose of the National Park's designation. This is insofar as it has been demonstrated that a scheme can be delivered that would conserve, and in some ways enhance the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the National Park.
28. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposed development would conserve and enhance the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the National Park. This would meet the remaining criterion set for tourism development in the countryside by part (g) of Policy SD23 of the Local Plan which seeks a positive contribution. It would also comply with SD4 of the Local Plan, which similarly seeks to conserve and enhance landscape character; Policy SD6 of the Local Plan, which seeks to preserve the scenic quality of the National Park, including views; Policy SD7 of the Local Plan which seeks to conserve and enhance relative tranquillity; Policy SD5 of the Local Plan which seeks to secure landscape led design; and Policy SD1 of the Local Plan which generally seeks to secure sustainable development. Other policies cited in the decision notice relate to ecology and biodiversity which is not a matter subject of dispute. However, to the extent that it remains relevant I shall consider the matter further below.

Travel

29. Given that the site is located just off the A3, outside the built-up area of Petersfield, it is likely that some visitors would arrive by car. This would be particularly true of hotel patrons passing through on the A3. In the latter case the directness of access from the A3 to the proposed hotel would however

mean that any additional travel would be negligible, thus reducing its environmental impacts to a bare minimum.

30. The site is otherwise located on national cycle route 222 which provides a direct link into Petersfield where rail services can be accessed. A bus stop with regular service is also located along the site frontage and there are other bus stops nearby. The proposed cycle centre would itself promote and support cycling, and a good level of accessibility to both walking and cycling routes would facilitate both arrival and 'onward' travel by these means. As visitors and employees alike could therefore arrive and depart by a variety of modes, the development would not be car dependent.
31. Even in relation to those visiting by car, charging points would support electric vehicle usage, and this would be further encouraged if the charging centre which forms part of the approved development of the Recharge site is delivered as anticipated. In this way, as well as in others, the appeal scheme and Recharge would support complementary uses.
32. For the reasons set out above the site is a suitable location for the proposed development in relation to travel. This is insofar as it would minimise the need to travel by private cars and would encourage access and/or subsequent travel by sustainable means. It would therefore again comply with Policy SD23 of the Local Plan whose broader provisions seek to secure the same, and Policy SD19 of the Local Plan which amongst other things requires development to be located and designed to minimise the need to travel, and to promote sustainable modes of transport.

Highway safety

33. The roundabout located immediately towards the south of the site forms a meeting of four routes, locally known as Buriton Cross, which includes slip roads/connections to each side of the A3. Cycle route 222, which was opened in 2016, approaches the roundabout from the northeast, running on a pavement alongside the B2070. It leaves the roundabout towards the southwest on a pavement which runs along the opposite side of the slip road to the southbound carriageway of the A3. Getting between requires the use of 2 uncontrolled crossings with central islands. One over the slip road, and the other across the branch of the B2070 from which the site would be accessed. This partly serves as a link to the northbound carriageway of the A3. As established above, it is likely that visitors to the proposed development would make use of route 222 to access Petersfield to the north, the Queen Elizabeth Country Park and SDW to the south, and other routes to which route 222 provides access.
34. Whilst the Highways Authority claims that route 222 was only intended for experienced long-distance cyclists, no data has been presented which identifies who uses it, for what purpose, and to what extent. There is also no means of control over these matters. Therefore, whilst the proposed hotel and cycle centre could provide a useful stopping point for long distance cyclists, there is no reason why route 222 could not also be used on a more localised recreational basis, or any reason to believe that this isn't one way in which it is used already. That being so, use of route 222 by visitors to the appeal site other than long distance cyclists would be acceptable in principle. It would furthermore be wholly consistent with the objective of promoting visitors to and tourism within the National Park as considered above.

35. Concerns have nonetheless been raised that the 2 crossings would pose safety risks and would be unsuitable for all users. These concerns principally relate to road speeds and have been informed by guidance contained within Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20). This was published in 2020 shortly after route 222 opened. Though its focus is on the design of new routes, it can still be considered of some relevance. The implication is therefore that what was considered technically acceptable in 2016 was technically unacceptable just 4 years later. Even so, some 5 years on, no improvements appear to have been made to the crossings, none are planned, and route 222 remains operational.
36. Moreover, similar concerns do not appear to have been raised by the Highways Authority in relation to Recharge. This is notwithstanding the fact that Recharge would also include cycle hire provision alongside visitor accommodation, all of which would be likely to give rise to increased use of route 222, and both of the crossings in question.
37. The Highways Authority did not attend the Hearing to provide further explanation or to present its case. But, whatever the reason for the matter having been apparently overlooked previously, I am mindful of the greater emphasis of the current appeal scheme on cycling, and having used the crossings I am also mindful of the speed at which traffic passes through and approaches them. As the reference within LTN 1/20 to 'all users' is intended to include children, families, older and disabled people using three or four-wheeled cycles, I must also have due regard under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (EA 2010) of the requirement to take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a protected characteristic.
38. The appellant has proposed improvements to the crossings which would see the width of the central islands considerably increased, with a proportionate reduction in the width of the carriageways. The central islands could more comfortably accommodate more people and larger cycles. Whilst the reduced carriageway width could have some effect in relation to slowing vehicle speeds, it would also reduce the time taken to cross the road. This could be supplemented by the provision of warning signs. These measures would not deliver the level of infrastructure deemed by LTN 1/20 to make the crossings suitable for all users. However, it remains the case that the crossings already exist, that in the absence of the development they would see no improvement, and that in each case the improvements proposed would reduce risk. This would not only provide increased safety for future users of the development, but would be of benefit to everyone using the section of route 222 in question. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed improvements, which would be secured by the submitted Unilateral Undertaking (UU), are necessary, appropriate and proportionate and that the needs of persons who share a protected characteristic have been adequately addressed. The UU as such passes the tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 as amended (the tests) and paragraph 58 of the Framework.
39. The Highways Authority has raised additional concerns over the existence of a pinch point in route 222 further to the north. This would be encountered by anyone cycling to or from Petersfield, or seeking to use route 222 to access the Shipwright's Way. At this point cyclists are required to dismount given narrowing of the pavement. The appellant has not proposed any improvements, and nor is it likely that any practical solution exists given the

constraints imposed by the width of the railway bridge over which the route runs at this point. Once again, the pinch point is an established feature of the route, and though navigating it is presumably made more time consuming when the route is busy, it appears that this could continue in much the way as at present without any necessary increase in risk.

40. The application was also partly refused on the basis of concerns about adverse effects on the PROW, the matter was resolved following provision of the revised parameter plans. Though the Highways Authority has continued to raise concern over the arrangement of the shared surface at the site access, this would compare favourably to the adjacent section of route 222 with which it would connect.
41. For the reasons outlined above and having due regard under Section 149 of the EA 2010, I conclude that the site is a suitable location for the proposed development in relation to highway safety. It would therefore comply with Policy SD19 of the Local Plan insofar as this requires the continued safe and efficient operation of the road network, and Policy SD21 of the Local Plan insofar as this requires development to protect and enhance highway safety. Though Policy SD22 of the Local Plan is also cited in the decision notice, this more specifically relates to parking than highway safety.

Drainage

42. The application was partly refused on the basis that insufficient information had been provided to demonstrate that surface water could be managed successfully. The Lead Local Flood Authority removed its objection following the provision of further information including the revised parameter plans submitted as part of the appeal. It however noted the need to relocate the dry basin shown on the plans given that it partly falls within an area at risk of surface water flooding in a 1:1000 year event. Taking site topography and the PROW into account this would however be impractical as it would involve relocating the basin upslope.
43. Whilst a 1:1000 year risk is very low, the appellant claims that recent revision of the flood mapping has seen it removed. Additional attenuation measures that could, if still deemed necessary, be incorporated as part of a detailed site drainage scheme have otherwise also been identified. This could be achieved within the parameters set by the submitted plans, and secured by condition. It is thus a matter that can be resolved at a later stage whether or not a very low risk of surface water flooding still exists.
44. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that a suitable surface water drainage scheme could be implemented, and that in this regard the site is a suitable location for the proposed development. It would therefore comply with Policy SD49 of the Local Plan which generally seeks to secure development that reduces the impact and extent of all types of flooding, and Policy SD50 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure no net increase in surface water run-off.

Other Matters

Wildlife and biodiversity

45. The application was not refused on the basis of adverse effects on wildlife, despite reference to applicable policy within the decision notice. It is however a

matter relevant to the first purpose of the National Park's designation as set out above.

46. A number of protected species have been identified on and using the site. In these regards suitable avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures have been identified and can be secured by condition. This would include through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). Though a CEMP was not covered within the proposed list of conditions, it is listed as a requirement within the submissions and typically precedes a LEMP. This would enable holistic coordination of measures relating to several species. Insofar as a license would be required from Natural England in relation to dormice, having regard to my duties under Regulations 9(1) and 9(3) of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, and the information provided, I have no reason to doubt that a license would be granted.
47. The scheme pre-dates the mandatory requirement for biodiversity net gain, but this is otherwise a general requirement of Policy SD09 of the Local Plan. The potential to achieve a gain of more than 10% was demonstrated within the context of the indicative scheme. Details of how a gain can be delivered within the context of the reserved matters can be secured by condition.
48. My findings above provide an additional indication of the scheme's furtherance of the first purpose of the National Park's insofar as this extends to the conservation and enhancement of wildlife.

Agricultural land

49. Some uncertainty exists over the agricultural land value of the site which is broadly classified as 'Grade 3'. However, this was again not a matter subject of dispute between the main parties. Even if it the site was found to fall within Grade 3a, and thus to represent best and most versatile agricultural land (BMVL), it is such a small and disconnected area that its cultivation could pose practical difficulties. Taking both this and my findings above into account, the scheme would achieve compliance with Policy SD2 of the Local Plan which seeks to secure development that has overall positive impact on the natural environment including in relation to BMVL.

Other obligations

50. Obligations within the UU also cover works required to facilitate turning into the site, relocation of the bus stop and provision of a travel plan to further promote sustainable travel. I am satisfied that these obligations also pass the tests.

Conditions

51. A number of conditions were the subject of discussion at the Hearing. I have imposed conditions based on the content and outcome of that discussion, with further refinement as necessary, and as set out below.
52. Conditions (1) - (4) identify the reserved matters, the time periods for their clearance, and for commencement of development, and identify the approved access plan for sake of certainty.
53. Condition (5) requires clearance of the reserved matters to be guided by the submitted parameter plans, again for sake of certainty and as discussed above.

54. Conditions (6) secures the provision of revised/finalised arboricultural evidence in the interests of safeguarding on-site and off-site trees. This is required at an early stage to ensure sensitive design.
55. Condition (7) secures a finalised drainage scheme to be submitted with the reserved matters to ensure its proper integration into the design of the scheme.
56. Condition (8) secures provision of a lighting strategy in the context of the reserved matter of appearance. This reflects the site's location in the buffer zone of the Dark Skies Reserve, and is otherwise required to avoid adverse effects on bats and other species.
57. Condition (9) secures provision of levels and sections to be detailed in the context of the reserved matters of layout, scale and landscaping. This is to assist in illustrating the way that the development would integrate with the topography of the site.
58. Condition (10) secures the provision of a scheme detailing how a net gain in biodiversity will be delivered on site. As Policy SD9 sets no specific figure, none is specified within the condition.
59. Condition (11) secures the provision of a CEMP, required in the interests of safeguarding both on-site and off-site ecology as outlined above. The condition necessarily applies pre-commencement given that measures will be required from the outset.
60. Condition (12) secures the provision of a Construction Management Plan in the interests of neighbour amenity and highway safety. The condition again necessarily applies pre-commencement given that measures will be required from the outset.
61. Condition (13) secures provision of a sustainable construction report in order to secure a number of sustainability objectives set out within the development plan.
62. Condition (14) secures measures to safeguard occupants of the proposed buildings from external noise in the interests of their amenity.
63. Condition (15) secures the provision of a LEMP in the interests of helping to safeguard both on-site and off-site ecology, and as a means of implementing long term enhancement and management.
64. Condition (16) secures the provision of a Travel Plan in the interests of further promoting sustainable travel. Some overlap with the obligation within the UU which secures a Travel Plan is unavoidable given the UU's reference to details agreed via the discharge of conditions. The condition and UU would therefore operate alongside each other.
65. Condition (17) clarifies and restricts the scope of the cycle centre's use in the interests of certainty as discussed in the preliminary matters. There is no demonstrable need for a similar condition in relation to the hotel.
66. There is also no need for a condition requiring provision of specific footpath/cycle connections within the site as these can be more appropriately agreed through the reserved matters. I have also not imposed a condition requiring an operational management plan whose principal purpose would be to

limit the number and type of cycle hires and HGV movements. Whilst the development appears unlikely to generate large numbers of HGV movements, my findings above indicate that control over hires would be unreasonable.

67. A further condition concerning 'delivery' and operation of the cycle centre was agreed by the parties at the Hearing. However, as it appears doubtful whether this would secure much more than a phasing plan, and no such plan is necessary, I have not imposed the condition.

Conclusion

68. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Benjamin Webb

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) Details of appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) Insofar as it details the site access, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan:
207.0005-0001 Rev.P10.
- 5) Applications for clearance of the reserved matters shall be within the general parameters set by the following plans: 01809A_PP01 Rev.P3;
01809A_PP02 Rev.P3; 01809A_PP03 Rev.P3
- 6) Concurrent with the first reserved matters application a revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) produced in accordance with BS 5837:2012 ('Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction'), or any superseding British Standard, including a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved AIA, TPP and AMS.
- 7) Concurrent with the first reserved matters application a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:
 - a) A technical summary highlighting any changes to the design from that within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, and information to demonstrate all development shall be made safe from flood risk from any source.
 - b) Infiltration test results undertaken in accordance with BRE365 and providing a representative assessment of those locations where infiltration features are proposed and demonstrating the unsaturated zone.

- c) Groundwater monitoring data for the site recorded between October and March.
 - d) Drainage plans to include type, layout and dimensions of drainage features including references to link to the drainage calculations.
 - e) Drainage calculations to demonstrate existing runoff rates are not exceeded and there is sufficient attenuation for storm events up to and including 1:100 + climate change.
 - f) Evidence that urban creep has been included within the calculations.
 - g) Confirmation that sufficient water quality measures have been included to satisfy the methodology in the Ciria SuDS Manual C753.
 - h) Exceedance plans demonstrating the flow paths and areas of ponding in the event of blockages or storms exceeding design criteria.
 - i) Details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system, including maintenance schedules for each drainage feature type and ownership, and details of protection measures.
 - j) A timetable for implementation.
- The drainage scheme shall then be implemented and thereafter managed as approved.
- 8) Details to be submitted in relation to the reserved matter of appearance shall include an external lighting strategy designed to avoid and minimise light spill and adverse effects on bats and other wildlife. The strategy shall include:
 - a) use of adaptive illuminances to change light levels on activity;
 - b) use of CCT temperatures 2200K - 2700K;
 - c) omission of architectural accent lighting;
 - d) use of automated black out blinds on any rooflight;
 - e) use of passive design to developed shared spaces that reduces the need for lighting;
 - f) use of zero upward light bulkheads without the luminous half eye cover, rather than half-moon emergency lighting; and
 - g) a night-time visual impact assessment including the calculation of obtrusive light using lighting software.
 - 9) Details submitted in relation to the reserved matters of layout, scale and landscaping shall include site levels and longitudinal and latitudinal sections showing the way in which buildings and the public realm will be set into the topography of the site.
 - 10) Details submitted in relation to the reserved matter of landscaping shall include a scheme which demonstrates how a net gain in biodiversity will be delivered on site.
 - 11) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. This shall be consistent with relevant parts of the Dormouse Survey and Badger Report dated September 2023, and shall include:
 - a) mitigation measures required to protect legally protected species and their retained habitats from injury or damage, including in relation to lighting;
 - b) information for the construction workforce;
 - c) timings of site clearance;

- d) details of appropriate fencing for buffer areas to protect retained on site habitats from encroachment by machinery, construction activity and unauthorized operatives;
- e) overnight ramps placed within open trenches and daily checks of excavations for trapped wildlife;
- f) pre-commencement surveys for species that are dynamic in distribution, and where updates are otherwise required; and
- g) provision for ecological tool box instruction for operatives, a walk over check by an ecologist immediately prior to vegetation and other site clearance activities.

The approved CEMP shall be implemented during the clearance and construction phases of the development hereby permitted.

- 12) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMP shall be fully compatible with the CEMP approved in relation to Condition (11) and the TPP approved in relation to Condition (6) and shall include:

- a) hours of work;
- b) measures to minimise noise and vibration;
- c) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction, to include the mitigation measures detailed in tables 7-1 and 7-2 of the submitted Air Quality Assessment dated September 2023;
- d) details of any floodlighting, including location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination;
- e) identification of locations for parking by site operatives and visitors;
- f) arrangements for deliveries, including vehicle tracking details covering access and egress;
- a) identification of locations within the site for loading/unloading, the storage of waste, plant and materials, the site office, welfare facilities and any hoardings;
- g) protection of pedestrian routes including the PROW crossing the site;
- h) details of measures to ensure dirt is not transferred onto the highway; and
- i) a list of key contacts and responsibilities.

The approved CMP shall be implemented during the clearance and construction phases of the development hereby permitted.

- 13) Construction of the buildings hereby permitted shall not commence until a Sustainable Construction Report (SCR) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The SCR shall include:

- a) a BREEAM pre-assessment and score showing the development will achieve a BREEAM 'excellent' rating and the specific credits targeting in the Authority's Adopted Sustainable Construction SPD;
- b) an SBEM assessment showing at least a 20% reduction in BER or TER for both buildings;
- c) water calculations showing how a 25% reduction in internal potable water use will be achieved;
- d) details of EV charging points;
- e) details of green roofs (10% of area); and

- f) arrangements for the submission of a post-construction validation report including BREEAM certification and SBEM calculations to the Local Planning Authority within 3 months of first occupation.

Construction of the development and its subsequent validation shall then proceed in accordance with the approved SCR.

- 14) The development hereby permitted shall not commence above slab level until a scheme to demonstrate that internal noise levels will:
 - a) conform to the 'Indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings' guideline values specified within Table 4 under section 7.7.2 of BS 8233:2014; and
 - b) that L_{Amax,F} noise levels shall not exceed 45 dBA more than 10 times between 23.00 – 07.00 hours inside bedrooms, as detailed in WHO Guidelines for Community Noise, 1999;

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be compiled by a competent acoustician on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings, and shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of the development.

- 15) Prior to the first use of the buildings hereby permitted, a site-wide Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP shall be informed by measures set out within the submitted Dormouse Survey, Badger Report and Bat Activity Report dated September 2023, and the BNG scheme secured in relation to Condition (10), shall set out long term objectives and management responsibilities for the site, and include:
 - a) a description and evaluation of features to be managed;
 - b) identification of ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
 - c) aims and objectives of management;
 - d) appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
 - e) prescriptions for management actions, together with a plan of management compartments;
 - f) preparation of a work schedule including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period;
 - g) details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan; and
 - h) ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The approved LEMP shall then be implemented over the operational phase of the development.

- 16) Prior to the first use of the buildings hereby permitted a finalised Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall therefore be managed in accordance with the approved Travel Plan.
- 17) The cycle centre hereby permitted shall be used for the purposes of cycle hire, repair, and retail with ancillary food and drink provision on the premises and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

APPEARANCES

For the Appellant

John Bell	(Appellant) Amberleigh Projects Ltd
Andy Cook	(Landscape) Pegasus Group
Nick Darling-Drewitt	(Drainage) Aegaea
Tom Fisher	(Highways) PBA
Jeremy Gardiner	(Planning) Pegasus Group
Douglas Grant	(Hotel need) Arc Consulting
Thea Osmund Smith	(Counsel for the appellant) No5 Chambers

For the Local Planning Authority

Ruth Childs	(Landscape) SDNPA
Richard Ferguson	(Planning) SDNPA
Charlotte Smith	(Landscape) Hampshire County Council
Philippa Smyth	(Planning) SDNPA

Interested parties

Greg Ford	Petersfield Climate Action Network
Christopher Napier	CPRE
Anthony Allen	Petersfield Society
Carter Clothier	Local resident

Documents presented at the Hearing

Amended condition list (appellant).
Annotated viewpoint location plan.
Extract from SDNPA Monitoring Report April 2025.
Landscape masterplan overlaid with contour plan.
List of appellant appearances.
Text of cycle centre delivery condition.
Text of cycle centre use class condition.
Transcript of contribution by Anthony Allen.
Transcript of contribution by Carter Clothier.
Transcript of contribution by Christopher Napier.