

## **Petersfield Society Comments on Planning Applications to be considered by Petersfield Town Council Planning Committee at its video conference meeting on Tuesday 27 April 2021 starting at 18:30hrs**

**SDNP/21/00339/FUL** | Detached building to provide restaurant and ancillary bar (Class E) with staff flat above (as amended by plans received 22.03.2021 - basement enlarged and repositioned) | The Old Dairy 6 Station Road Petersfield GU32 3ED. *Applicant: J Bloch. Agent: Hulle Architecture. Case Officer: Katherine Pang. Ward: St Peter's.*

**No Objection subject to conditions:** The latest amendments to the scheme would appear to be limited to enlarging the basement fully below ground which is acceptable as it will provide better circulation space around WC facilities. Our previous formally submitted comments including reservations remain relevant. These were:

1. We do not object to this application in principle but we do have several significant reservations.
2. The scheme now put forward is in essence the same as that which was granted planning approval last autumn apart from a reduction of the basement floor area and a compensatory increase in ground and first floor areas to the rear of the development facing Woodcroft Mews.
3. We found the previous application acceptable subject to reservations.
4. At least the same Conditions as for the approved scheme should apply to this now submitted design.
5. A significant increase in volume above ground has been introduced to the rear where a gable end is now extended about 2m towards the north and Woodcroft Mews facing the existing terrace of 6 dwellings.
6. Overlooking may hence remain a major issue. The direction of view from inside to outside will depend on the detailed design of the vertical slats covering the north gable so should be subject to a planning condition. The slats should be fixed.
7. The design of the north-facing dormer windows remains unconvincing.
8. We acknowledge that the increase of floor area will require the highway authorities to assess whether the parking provision of 7 cars remains sufficient.
9. In addition we assume that the Fire Prevention Officer will issue licenses for the maximum capacity of customers and staff that can be present within the building at any one time.
10. Woodcroft Mews is the means of escape in case of fire for the residents of the existing terrace of 6 dwellings. Great care should be taken to ensure no aspect of the scheme such as materials including glazing, clear and obscured, parking, storage and operation does not restrict the escape route provided by the Woodcroft Mews Estate Common Parts.
11. We note that this application proposes the re-routing of the residents' existing straightforward rear garden access, in place by covenant, and the removal of landscaped planting within the Woodcroft Mews Estate. Parking space no7 is shown 'sticking out' into Woodcroft Mews to accommodate the proposed new access which, if it were approved, would constitute a major restriction on residents' access arrangements.
12. We appreciate that the use of the whole Old Dairy and Woodcroft Mews site and access is complex and regulated by deeds and rights of way agreements that are of a legal nature so are not regulated by planning legislation but that these will impact upon the applicant's ability to implement the proposal and the residents' use of Woodcroft Mews.

**SDNP/21/00401/HOUS** | Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing ground floor wc. Internal alterations and new windows to the rear elevation. New rooflight into ensuite bathroom and flue for log burning stove. New brick upstand to existing basement window to fit safety grill over. (Amended plans received) | 43 Sussex Road Petersfield GU31 4JX. *Applicant: Simon Ockford. Agent: VECA Architects. Case Officer: Susie Ralston. Ward: Heath.*

Please note that our previous recommendation and comments have been reviewed and revised.

## RECOMMENDATION

1. We **object** to the proposed amended design for a rear extension to a property located in South Downs National Park within Character Area 6 of Petersfield Conservation Area. We do not object to the principle.

2. As it stands, the amended application should be amended further, withdrawn or refused in that it fails to comply with the provisions of regional and local policy as identified below. If the proposed extension were to be re-designed with a pitched roof, volume articulation, and materials in sympathy with the original dwelling - as is entirely feasible having been achieved in many other similar situations - then the problems we have with the application could be overcome.

## REASONS

3. We fully endorse the comments of the Conservation Officer with which we are in full agreement including the final paragraph which concludes:

'The result of the scheme gives the property a completely different appearance from its historic origins that can be viewed from the road and indeed the traditional tile hung rear of the building which is a typical feature in the area. The insertion of windows with modern proportions and materials within the existing rear elevation jars with the conservative and traditional material palette.'

4. The amended design bears little or no relation to the existing historic building or to its context in shape, volume or materials. It appears as a large white rendered flat-topped box closely juxtaposed against the existing house replacing a small dark-coloured pitched-roof extension. The proposal neither respects nor makes reference to the character of the existing property nor does it comprise an imaginative creative modern statement as provided for by Conservations Area legislation and Historic England. It contrasts starkly with the existing house. Render suffers from staining in Petersfield. The material, particularly when coloured white and unprotected by a roof overhang, is inappropriate given the town's present and future local climate. Visually it would stand out starkly against the original building and the area when viewed from closeup and from a distance to the south. The application states that the use of a flat roof with parapet upstand is well established and widely utilised throughout conservation areas. This does not mean that it is acceptable if it does not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area or meet the statutory requirement for the highest standards of design.

5. The application asserts that the proposed parapet would generally only be visible from a distant view across the fields. This may not be correct, given the elevated position of the proposal. The amendment includes for a number of brickwork dental courses. This feature does nothing to improve the appearance of the proposal and may even increase the overall height of the extension making it more visible. A pitched roof would be more acceptable and promote the view that the extension was built in accordance with the character of the original building. In any event the extension and parapet as now proposed would be in full plain view from the Conservation Area and National Park to the south in particular from the well-used public footpath from Petersfield to Buriton. Conservation Areas are established to preserve or enhance the area. The amended proposal would do neither.

6. The aluminium flue, even if painted black, is inappropriate within the Conservation Area. See application SDNP/15/00793/HOUS and the Conservation Officer comments. This application concerned a similar but retrospective application in the Conservation Area. It was refused and a subsequent appeal dismissed. The Conservation Officer commented at the time that the key test for development in the Conservation Area is to 'preserve or enhance ... the character and appearance .... of the area' and held that the flue, even if it were to be coloured black, was out of character with the existing building and formed a discordant feature within the Conservation Area and the broader historic context within which it was set. The Conservation Officer considered that one solution would be to encapsulate the metal flue within a well detailed brick stack and chimney.

7. The application asserts further that because adjacent properties are screened by high or 2m high fencing - which latter we presume is covered by planning approval - the proposal would not impact upon their amenity. We disagree. Moreover, the argument accepts that if any fencing were to be removed the amenity of adjacent properties would be affected.

8. We cannot see evidence that light emission from the large areas of glazing proposed would be mitigated by blackout blinds in compliance with the South Downs Local Plan Dark Night Skies Policy SD8 and Dark Skies Technical Advice Note. Blind operation should be automatic rather than manual.

9. We appreciate that the rear elevation window and door framing has unfortunately been replaced with wholly unsustainable uPVC framing. We welcome the removal of uPVC but are surprised the replacement and new windows and doors are proposed to be framed with grey colour-coated aluminium. Framing should match the materials of the original which, as in the street elevation, was undoubtedly timber. We are concerned that the articulation of the proposed new and replacement glazing is not articulated either as originally constructed or in scale with the existing building.

#### POLICY

10. The amended proposal is contrary to Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan 2015 Design Policy BEP1 for all development to be of the highest standard of design, to Petersfield Town Design Statement 2010 Design Section s6, to Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan 2017 Part 2 Section s2.7 and Recommended Action 7, to South Downs Local Plan 2019 Design Policy SD5 and Extension Policy SD31, and to SDNPA Extensions Technical Advice Note.

NOTE: One of our Trustees has a pecuniary interest in this application and, in accordance with our procedures, has therefore played no part in the preparation of these comments.

**SDNP/21/01355/FUL** | Change of use from first floor hair salon to 1 bedroom flat | Butterfly Lingerie 1  
Crawters Lane Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4DS. *Applicant: Mr Rolfe. Agent: MT Planning. Case Officer:  
Matthew Harding. Ward: St Peter's.*

**No Objection.** The application states that the first floor of the building is currently used for storage, above the hair-dressing salon. There will be no reduction in floorspace of the salon, and no loss of employment. The site is well located for a small dwelling unit. There appears to be no car parking but public car parking is close by.

**SDNP/21/01463/FUL** | Alteration to fencing to provide pedestrian gate, new access footpath along the side of the access road to extend the existing path, a dropped kerb to provide wheelchair access onto the existing short section of footpath, alterations to existing fencing to create a bin store and to enclose a smoking shelter (relocated cycle store), new cycle storage and hardstanding, markings to car park surface to provide for the pedestrian access across the car park, pedestrian access to the smoking area and a hatched area outside the bin store gates. | Athena House Bedford Road Petersfield GU32 3LJ. *Applicant: Moneybarn Ltd. Agent: DSA Surveyors. Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: Bell Hill.*

## RECOMMENDATION

1. We **support** his application to improve pedestrian and cycle access to and on the application site. We do have some comments, however, on matters with which any approval should be conditioned.

## REASONS

2. We agree with the comments of Hampshire Highways and refer the department to Recommendation 7.6.5 in Petersfield Town Design Statement. We understand that the management plan recommended in 2010 has yet to be prepared by Hampshire County Council and East Hampshire District Council.

3. We cannot find reference to the width of the proposed new pavement access. This should be a minimum of 2400mm to allow two wheelchairs to pass and for pedestrians to maintain a 2000mm social distance when passing without the need to step into the adjacent roadway. We understand that social distancing is likely to continue to be required for some time in the future.

## POLICY

4. Subject to amendment or condition, the proposal appears to comply with Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan 2015 Pedestrian and Cycle Access Policy GAP1, Petersfield Town Design Guide 2010 Section 7 Recommendations 7.6.5 and South Downs Local Plan 2019 Transport and Accessibility Strategic Policy SD19.

**SDNP/21/01575/FUL** | Conservatory following demolition of existing conservatory | Downs House Reservoir Lane Petersfield Hampshire GU32 2HX. *Applicant: Mr P Rogers. Agent: M2 Architecture. Case Officer: Bernie Beckett. Ward: St Peter's.*

**No Objection.** The proposal is for a flat-roofed conservatory with lantern rooflights at the rear of the property. The structure will fit quite well with Downs House and it will replace an existing conservatory.

**SDNP/21/01606/HOUS** | Single storey extension to side incorporating garage/home office, access and driveway, enclosed porch, conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation and single storey extension to rear. | 36 Monks Orchard Petersfield GU32 2JD. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs Sherley-Price. Agent: Bespoke Architects. Case Officer: Lisa Gill. Ward: St Peter's.*

**No Objection:** New garage to the side and at a lower elevation than the main house. It is positioned close to the boundary line but as the property next door does not have windows on their side elevation so acceptable. The garage roof is a mono pitch towards the boundary ensuring the gutter line is as low as possible. Straight forward single storey rear extension. The front elevation will improve visually by moving the unattractive existing garage door away from the front entrance of the house.

**SDNP/21/01732/REM** | Reserved matters for approval: Landscaping on proposal - The construction of a C2 assisted living community for older people consisting of apartments, cottages and a community hub | Land East Of Harrier Way Petersfield GU31 4EZ. *Applicant: Harrier Way Property Ltd. Agent: Dowsett Mayhew Planning Ptnrp Ltd. Case Officer: Heather Lealan. Ward: Heath.*

#### RECOMMENDATION

1. We have **no objection** to this application subject to the comments of SDNPA Planning and Landscape Officers.

#### REASONS

2. The Planning Statement confirms the application to be the same as SDNP/18/06215/REM which was granted planning approval on 31jul19 revised to accommodate the relocation of the main hub building approved on 12feb20 under SDNP/18/06229/CND.

3. We supported the outline landscape proposals developed by Terra Firma included in SDNP/03513/OUT approved on 20jun18.

#### POLICY

4. Policy is unchanged since the approval of SDNP/18/06229/CND. Approval of SDNP/21/01732/REM is sought to regularise the planning position.

**SDNP/21/01869/LDP** | Lawful development certificate proposed - loft conversion to include 3 rooflights to the front elevation and 3 rooflights to the rear elevation | 38 Hanger Way Petersfield GU31 4QE. *Applicant: Benjamin Potts. Agent: Skylofts Ltd. Case Officer: Kate McLoughlin. Ward: Heath.*

**No Comment.** This is an application asking the Planning Authority to confirm that the installation of rooflights will be 'Permitted Development' not requiring planning permission.

**SDNP/21/01900/NMA** | New brickwork to be left not-painted to match existing. | 15 Sheep Street Petersfield Hampshire GU32 3JX. *Applicant: Nicolas Koussertari. Agent: Anthony Hutchings Architect. Case Officer: Nicky Poweis. Ward: St Peter's.*

**No Objection:** Leaving the new brick frontage not painted is acceptable and also supported by the Conservation Officer. The facing brick used is of good quality.

<END>