

## **Petersfield Society Comments on Planning Applications to be considered by Petersfield Town Council Planning Committee at its video conference meeting on Tuesday 20 July 2021 starting at 18:30hrs.**

**SDNP/20/05682/CND** | Removal or Variation of Conditions - Condition 2 of Planning Approval  
SDNP/15/06484/FUL | Penns Field Heathfield Road Petersfield Hampshire. *Applicant: Kebbell Homes.*  
*Agent: Nova Planning. Case Officer: Rob Ainslie. Ward: Heath. SDNPA.*

**Objection.** This application is for 'Minor Amendments' to the approved application. Despite there being a lot of information submitted it is not easy to see exactly what changes are proposed, and the Planning Statement does nothing to help, it's main thrust being to argue why the applicants should not submit a full new planning application.

Our objection is that the movement of pedestrians and cyclists through the site has not been given priority, a lamentable situation in times of Active Travel. Specifically these points should be addressed and amended.

1. The eastward extension of Heathfield Road spur has been changed; as a result it is no longer possible for cyclists to cross the site between Penns Place Playing Fields and Heathfield Road on the shared footpath/cycleway. This route should be prioritised for pedestrians and cyclists.
2. A 3-car parking bay has been added opposite Plots 2 and 3. This reduces the effective width of the cycleway resulting in pedestrian/cycle conflict.
3. On Heathfield spur an informal crossing with traffic calming (prioritising pedestrian/cycle use) has changed to vehicle priority; the 'link' (ie cycleway/pedestrian) must be reinstated particularly to enable safe use by mobility scooters and pushchairs.
4. Lighting. SSE have amended and downgraded the lighting plan. All lighting columns should be 0.5m clear of riding surfaces, and not adjacent to them. It also seems that part of the cycleway will not be lit; the whole length should be properly illuminated.

The plans should be amended to incorporate these changes to allow safe use of the site by pedestrians and cyclists.

**SDNP/21/01142/HOUS** | Addition of Velux window central to the roof of the rear of the building | 4B Charles Street Petersfield GU32 3EH. *Applicant: William Ringwood. Agent: Veca Architects Ltd. Case Officer: Kate McLoughlin. Ward: St Peter's.*

**No Objection:** This large Velux roof window has a 'fold-out' Juliet balcony, and as the property has no garden of its own, it will overlook the gardens of properties in Swan Street. The Planning Officer must be satisfied that the amenities of neighbours will not be unduly affected before approval can be given.

**SDNP/21/02577/LDP** | Lawful development certificate proposed - single storey rear extension | 81 Moggs Mead Petersfield GU31 4PY. *Applicant: Ms A Tkaczynski. Agent: MDV Interiors. Case Officer: Bernie Beckett. Ward: St Peter's.*

1. This application asks the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to confirm that the extension falls within the parameters of permitted development not requiring a planning application or permission.

**SDNP/21/02585/FUL** | Relocation of AC condenser units | 18-19 The Square Petersfield GU32 3HR.  
*Applicant: Caffe Nero. Agent: Cobalt. Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: St Peter's. GB.*

## RECOMMENDATION

### 1. Refusal.

## REASONS

2. This application is inadequate. In this regard it lacks respect for the planning system, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) Case Officer and Conservation Officer, and those including neighbours who would be affected by the proposal.
3. The application concerns the replacement of 5no condensers mounted presently on the side wall of the host building with what appear to be 5no new, larger and more powerful condensers on the rear wall.
4. Nos 18 and 19 The Square are statutorily listed Grade II C17/18 properties located within Character Area 3 of the Conservation Area covering the core of Petersfield historic town centre. The gabled rear of no 18 to which the new condensers would be affixed is C17.
5. The application confirms that no pre-application advice has been sought from the LPA, that hours of opening are not relevant to this proposal, that the proposal does not involve the carrying out of commercial activities and processes. We question the validity of these assertions. The application also confirms that the site can be seen from public land.
6. No information is provided on the replacement condensers, manufacturers, specification, performance or wall mounting arrangements. No information is provided as to emissions, fumes or sounds. No information is given on the extent to which the proposal meets national, regional or local requirements for the highest standards of design, for increased sustainability and resistance to climate change. No information is provided as to how the proposed development will conserve or enhance the historic buildings or Conservation Area it will affect or the neighbouring properties, mostly residential, the enjoyment and ambience of which it will undoubtedly impact. No reasons are provided as to why the new replacement condensers are required or why they should be relocated. No detailed policies are identified or reasons given as to why they should not be met.
7. Other objections, some in greater detail, focus upon much the same problems with the application and its proposals.
8. All in all, the application fails to meet even the minimum requirements for an acceptable planning application.

## POLICY

9. Policies with which this application should comply include the following.
10. South Downs Local Plan policies SD5: Design, SD7: Relative Tranquillity, SD12: Historic Environment, SD13: Listed Buildings, SD14: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation of Historic Buildings, SD15: Conservation Areas, SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources, SD51 Renewable Energy, and SD54: Pollution and Air Quality. Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan policies BEP1: Character, Setting and Quality of the Town's Built Environment, BEP2: Character of the Conservation Area, and BEP7 Sustainable and Adaptable Buildings. Petersfield Town Design Statement Design Guidance 6.3.2 and 6.4.1 and 7.1.5. Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan Recommended Action 6.

**SDNP/21/02702/HOUS** | Two storey rear and single storey side additions | 3 Tilmore Gardens Petersfield GU32 2JQ. *Applicant: Mrs Jennifer Carter. Agent: Drew Planning. Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: St Peter's.*

**No Objection.** This is a well-designed rear extension with a 'catslide' roof. The site is lower than the adjoining plot to the east, which will help minimise the impact on that property.

**SDNP/21/02937/FUL** | Detached dwelling and new vehicular access (amended description) | 61 Heath Road East Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4HN. *Applicant: Mr Keys. Agent: 6a Vision Homes Ltd. Case Officer: Katherine Pang. Ward: Heath.*

## RECOMMENDATION

### 1. **Withdrawal, Re-design or Refusal.**

#### REASONS

2. This application is for an alternative design to that which was unfortunately permitted under application SDNP/18/05932/FUL. We objected to the previous proposal on the basis that it was of an exceedingly poor design and was backlands development, all contrary to Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15) Policy BEP1 and Town Design Statement (PTDS10) 6.1.2 Design Guidance which states that new developments in existing residential areas should be designed to minimise adverse effects on surrounding properties and their neighbourhood, ensuring that densities are compatible with local character and scale. PTDS 6.1.2 states further that applications should demonstrate how proposals will relate satisfactorily to the site and its surroundings and incorporate a landscape scheme and open space as appropriate and that backland development and infilling will only be permitted if the character and scale of the proposal is compatible with the neighbourhood and there is satisfactory supporting infrastructure and safe access. The previous design was described in the application as a contemporary style. Our view was that as such it needed greater design flair and a visual concept including quality of finishes and detailing to ensure that the end product would not end up looking, as it did, like a glorified shed. We agreed with a neighbour who described the scheme as a collection of boxes and of a rudimentary nature and commented that the design fell significantly short of the character of the National Park and its immediate neighbourhood with which it is required to be in keeping. We thought that the proposed dwelling utterly failed to achieve the highest standard of design required by national, regional and local legislation and guidance.

3. Although the present proposal is stated as having a smaller footprint than that approved previously, the size, scale and bulk of the design is much larger and contrary to the provisions of PNP15 and PTDS10. It is for a large 2-storey 5-bedroom house with double garage occupying, according to the Sketch View drawing submitted, the full width of the building plot. A smaller 3-bedroom house could be acceptable subject to design, site occupancy and policy adherence.

4. The main impact identified on 09apr21 by the LPA in pre-application oral advice would be upon neighbouring properties given overbearing issues given its scale, bulk and width. The LPA was also concerned about overlooking from the first floor windows of bedrooms 1, 4 and 5 and proximity of the development to existing trees and stated that the application would need to be accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA). We cannot find that an AIA has been submitted.

5. The application form confirms that trees and hedges on the development site could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character. We are surprised therefore that the LPA appears not to have required the application to be supported by a full tree survey including how the proposal will meet the recommendations of BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. None is submitted.

6. Previous LPA advice included in detail in their objection by David and Emma Barham, was that the LPA found the scale, bulk and massing of previous proposals to be unacceptable, the dwelling appeared too wide and cramped for its plot, the roof was too high and that the dwelling as proposed would have an unacceptably overbearing impact upon terraced housing to the south. The LPA advised that a roof ridge height of more than 6.5m would be unacceptable. The present application drawings show the main roof ridge of the proposal to be at some 9m above ground level.

7. Setting aside the scale, bulk and massing, width and height of the present proposal, the alternative design is better than that previously approved. However, the design detail including its articulation and integrity could still be much improved. The roof ridges could be better defined and roof edges and eaves would benefit from dentil and other types of brickwork corbelling supporting larger overhangs.

8. We are concerned that no information is provided regarding sustainability and climate resistant measures. And casement window frames, doors and door frames are specified as uPVC, a highly unsustainable material. Energy used in the manufacture of uPVC (embodied energy) has been shown to be as high as 2224 kWh/tonne. In comparison indigenous softwood is as low as 158 kWh/tonne (CIRIA). uPVC may contain phthalates, a group of endocrine-disrupting chemicals readily absorbed through the skin or through inhalation. We see no reason why uPVC should not be substituted with treated softwood or hardwood or even with colour coated aluminium.

## POLICY

9. Policies with which this application should comply include the following.

10. South Downs Local Plan policies SD5: Design, SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources, and SD51 Renewable Energy. Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan policies BEP1: Character, Setting and Quality of the Town's Built Environment, and BEP7 Sustainable and Adaptable Buildings. Petersfield Town Design Statement Design Guidance 6.3.2 and 6.4.1.

Note: One of our trustees has a non-pecuniary interest in this application and, in accordance with our procedures, has therefore taken no part in the preparation of these comments.

**SDNP/21/02984/FUL** | External Lighting to Existing Horse Manege (including 6m poles) and to Stables/Yard | Horse Chestnut Farm The Causeway Petersfield GU31 4LR. *Applicant: Mrs Nichola Blake. Agent: Graham J Pretty. Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: Causeway.*

## RECOMMENDATION

1. **Refusal** of the retrospective application as it stands for permanent exterior lighting.

## REASONS

2. No pre-application advice has been sought from the Local Planning Authority (LPA).

3. The application is retrospective in that lighting has already been installed at the manege (ménagement) contrary to its planning permission granted on 01feb17 conditioned by 'No external lighting of any kind shall be installed within the site without having first been agreed in advance with the Local Planning Authority.' (A manege or ménage is an all-weather riding arena.)

4. The Planning Design & Access Statement submitted in support of the application states that as part of the regularisation of a number of planning matters at the site, lighting consultants have carried out a thorough survey of the relevant parts of the site and made recommendations covering both manege and yard. Their report is included in the application and referenced in the Statement.

5. The proposal is to replace the present unauthorised lighting with permanent luminaires mounted at 6m height on metal poles at the manege to permit the exercise and training of horses and at the yard to illuminate stabling.

6. Planning history:

SDNP/15/03090/FUL: Retrospective application for a change of use of land from agriculture to a mixed agriculture and equestrian use and retention of internal works to form loose boxes. Permitted on 28aug15.

SDNP/16/05326/FUL: All Weather Manege. Permitted on 01feb17.

SDNP/21/00956/FUL. Construction and Part Retention of Farm Track including Culverts and New Access on to The Causeway. Not yet determined.

SDNP/21/01232/CND. Removal of condition 3 of SDNP/15/03090/FUL and removal of condition 2 of SDNP/16/05326/FUL. Not yet determined.

Both SDNP/15/03090/FUL and SDNP/16/05326/FUL permissions are subject to the condition that no external lighting of any kind shall be installed within the site without having first been agreed in advance with the Local Planning Authority.

7. The Planning Design & Access Statement is thorough and detailed. It lists most relevant national, regional and local policy but then, extraordinarily, argues that the proposed lighting meets requirements and guidance. We disagree.

8. Our objections arise from the impact the proposed lighting would have upon the occupants of the adjacent residential area and on wildlife and biodiversity. See similar but refused application SDNP/18/06574/FUL for floodlighting columns for the Rugby Football Club at Penns Place Petersfield. The application is not accompanied by any detailed ecological information. No information is provided on the hours the proposed lighting would be used apart from a general note that it would be switched on when ambient light levels were insufficient for horse exercise, training or stabling.

9. We are astonished by HCC Ecology Group comment that a non-exhaustive desk-based assessment has been carried out but that the predicted lightspillage onto habitat likely to support foraging/commuting bats is unlikely to result in significant ecological impact. This conclusion is based solely on lightspillage. As an objection highlights, bats forage through the whole site including over the manege and stable yard which would be well lit. 10. No reference is made to the Bat Conservation Trust 'Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK' which includes that artificial lighting should be avoided in all cases close to wildlife habitat. The impact on other nocturnal creatures such as barn owls is also unaddressed.

11. The application does confirm that there would be a reasonable likelihood of protected and priority wildlife species and biodiversity being affected adversely within the site or on land adjacent to or near the site.

12. Although the site is described as rural, the application does admit it is adjacent to the residential area and within the South Downs National Park and Petersfield Parish covered by Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan and by the South Downs Local Plan policy on Dark Night Skies. It argues strangely, that, because the site is on the boundary of the Parish and outside (just) of the residential area, the Dark Night Skies policy is of less importance. We disagree.

13. Design is dismissed by the application as irrelevant. We disagree. Design includes specification, performance, layout and location.

## POLICY

14. Policies with which this application should comply include the following.

15. South Downs Local Plan policies SD4: Landscape Character, SD5: Design, SD6: Safeguarding Views, SD7: Relative Tranquillity, SD8: Dark Night Skies, SD9: Biodiversity, SD11: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows, SD24: Equestrian Uses, SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources, and SD51: Renewable Energy. South Downs Dark Skies and EcoSystems Technical Advice Notes and Sustainable Construction SPD. Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan policies BEP1: Character, Setting and Quality of the Town's Built Environment, BEP7 Sustainable and Adaptable Buildings, NEP5: Positive Development, NEP7: Biodiversity, Trees and Woodland, Petersfield Town Design Statement Design Guidance 5.1.2 and 6.4.1.

**SDNP/21/02992/HOUS** | Single storey rear extension, hip to gable extensions and rear dormer to provide additional first floor accommodation. Alterations to porch roof. | 10 Rother Close Petersfield GU31 4DN. *Applicant: Adrian & Sally Moore. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Matthew Harding. Ward: Froxfield, Sheet & Steep.*

**Objection.** While there is no objection to the principle of an enlargement, the extension proposes a large 'shoe-box' on the existing roof which completely overwhelms the building. The hipped roof would be changed to a much wider gabled roof; it is a poor design and does not meet the Design standards of the SDLP and the PNP, or House Extension guidelines. The house lies in a generous plot where there is ample room for a large ground floor extension, which could result in a better design solution.

**SDNP/21/03043/HOUS** | Single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable accommodation with dormer to rear. | 9 Sandringham Road Petersfield Hampshire GU32 2AA. *Applicant: Mrs R Davidson. Agent: Mr Cenarth. Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers. Ward: St Peter's.*

**Objection:** The rear loft dormer is of a poor box shaped design with a flat roof finished with roofing felt not compliant with local authority design standards for dormer windows and the design guidance set out in the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan. It would in addition appear as if the rear window to the proposed loft bedroom is overlooking adjacent gardens in an unacceptable way. The ground floor rear extension is seen as acceptable.

**SDNP/21/03052/HOUS** | Detached garden store, alterations to windows and doors and demolition of existing car port | Beechlands 52 Ramshill Petersfield GU31 4AT. *Applicant: Peter Allchurch. Agent: Charlie Allchurch. Case Officer: Kate McLoughlin. Ward: St Peter's.*

**No Objection:** The removal of the car port is likely to improve the external appearance and the alterations to windows are also positive.

**SDNP/21/03075/TPO** | Pine - Reduce the lowest large limb by 4.5 metres to the height of smaller limb growing towards the road. Remove split limb that grows 8 metres over the garden. There also appears to be another split limb at the top of tree that may need reducing depending on the condition. | 137 Sussex Road Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4LB. *Applicant: Mr John Richards. Agent: Blendworth Tree Surgeons. Case Officer: Adele Poulton. Ward: Heath.*

1. We have no comments on this TPO application.

**SDNP/21/03104/HOUS** | Conversion of garage into habitable space with addition of bay window to front and pitched roof to replace flat. | 5 Pulens Crescent Petersfield GU31 4DW. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs White. Agent: Birch Wood Design. Case Officer: Danielle Hall. Ward: Heath.*

**No Objection:** Removal of existing garage flat roof and garage doors which are to be replaced with pitched roof and matching bay window. There is furthermore sufficient space on site for external parking.

**SDNP/21/03193/HOUS** | Single storey rear extension and new boundary wall to replace leaning fence with access gate. | 11 Hanbury Square Petersfield GU31 4QT. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs Cox. Agent: Birch Wood Design. Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers. Ward: Not listed.*

**No Objection:** Small scale rear extension with minimal impact on adjacent dwellings. There is a question mark over the proximity of the extension to the boundary wall making maintenance access virtually impossible but is not relevant to planning.

**SDNP/21/03233/HOUS** | Two storey side extension, single storey front extension and new pitched roof on existing flat roof side element. | 9 Love Lane Petersfield GU31 4BU. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs Goves. Agent: Birch Wood Design. Case Officer: Ms Sabah Halli. Ward: Froxfield, Sheet & Steep.*

No Comment as this property is located within Sheet Parish.

**SDNP/21/03545/OUT** | Outline planning application for upto 12 dwellings for self build, including approval of access and layout, with all other matters reserved | Land West and North of Windward Reservoir Lane Petersfield Hampshire. *Applicant: Petersfield Community Land Trust Ltd. Agent: Re-Format LLP. Case Officer: Rafa Grosso Macpherson. Ward: Not listed. SDNPA.*

**Design Comments:** All the members of the team viewing the planning applications do have a pecuniary interest in this H11 site. We have hence selected to limit our input to a few comments at this time.

1. We are concerned that the site plan layout looks fairly ordinary arguing that it reflects aspects of existing local housing layouts. There is hence nothing to distinguish this design from an ordinary developers layout apart from that the plot sizes appear bigger. There is still hope that a special visual character can be achieved.
2. There has been some discussion and concern of what the impact of two access/exit points will have on Reservoir Lane. However, it is appreciated that traffic circulation within the H11 site may benefit.
3. Earlier site layouts had a distinct aim to be suitable for energy efficient individual house designs such as Passive House construction. This ambition would appear to have been lost.
4. The design statement refers to a suggested pallet of permitted facing materials. It would be preferable if these constraints were strengthened to support and ensure a quality visual character of the site.
5. There is little reference to how pedestrians and cyclist will move about within the site apart from actually walking or cycling on the vehicle drive surface. Safe and separated access to Reservoir Lane would be to prefer.

Please note that Petersfield Society will aim to expand on the comments made above and potentially add others before submitting a fully considered submission to SDNP planning.

<END>