

Petersfield Society Comments on Planning Applications to be considered by Petersfield Town Council Planning Committee at its video conference meeting on Tuesday 10 August 2021 starting at 18:30hrs.

SDNP/21/00956/FUL | Construction and Part Retention of Farm Track including Culverts and New Access on to The Causeway (additional information received on 10/05/2021 and 28/07/2021). | Horse Chestnut Farm The Causeway Petersfield GU31 4LR. *Applicant: Mrs Nichola Blake. Agent: Graham J Pretty. Case Officer: Matthew Harding. Ward: Causeway.*

PREAMBLE

This representation follows previous comments submitted formal to the LPA on 22mar21 and 25may21. It should be read with our submissions on SDNP/21/01232/CND SDNP/21/01232/CND | Removal of condition 3 of SDNP/15/03090/FUL and removal of condition 2 of SDNP/16/05326/FUL, and on SDNP/21/02984/FUL | External Lighting to Existing Horse Manege (including 6m poles) and to Stables/Yard.

Objection

1. We continue to object to this application notwithstanding the additional information submitted on 10 May 21 and 28 July 21.

REASONS

2. We hold to the view that this application should be refused. The reasons stated in our previous submissions - which should continue to be taken into account - are unaffected by the most recently submitted additional information.

3. We take it that the most recent information submitted is a letter dated 2 July 21 from Bellamy Roberts LLP on behalf of the applicant to the County Highways Authority. The letter asks the Authority to confirm that amendments to the road access arrangements now proposed on drawing 5541/005 satisfy the Authority's previously expressed reservations. The Authority has not yet responded. The letter proposes an alternative approach to that required by the Authority for compliance with the DoT 'Local Transport Note (LTN) LT1/20: Cycle Infrastructure Design' and with Highways England 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges: GG119 Road Safety Audit' Stage 1: Preliminary Design and Stage 2: Detailed Design before the application can be determined. Given the sensitivity of this application we cannot accept the alternative approach.

4. The letter from Bellamy Roberts LLP also responds to the Highway Authority's recognition that the presently proposed access will require the removal of a tree within the highway boundary and that this removal requires reference to HCC 'Road Agreement Policy for the protection of Highway Trees affected by New Development' in which HCC states that trees on highway land are public capital assets and play a key role in the conservation of Hampshire's bio-diversity as well as enhancing the environment for residents. The Authority refers to HCC 'Technical Guidance Note 15 - Landscaping and Trees' and notes that it will require compensation for the loss of the tree assets. It states that the valuation assessment will be made using Capital Asset Value of Amenity Trees (CAVAT) methodology. A short description of CAVAT assessment methodology can be found on p50 of Appendix 1 in the Society's 'Petersfield's Trees: their importance and value'.

5. HCC has offered services of its Arboricultural Team to carry out the CAVAT assessment and has suggested that, as an alternative, the applicant reconsiders the location of the access to minimise impact on highway tree assets. Neither suggestion has been accepted by the applicant who prefers to use the services of their own Tree Specialist. No information is provided as to the name or qualifications of this specialist or that they will adhere to the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.

6. The Arboricultural Association and RSPB recommend that tree or hedging works should not be carried out during the nesting season from March to September so as to avoid disturbing bird and insect life. Care must be taken to avoid infringing the provisions of Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Contractors undertaking tree or hedging works should be members of the Arboricultural Association.

7. The proposed works should comply with South Downs Local Plan policies SD9: Biodiversity and SD11: Trees with HCC Tree Strategy 2020 and HCC Technical Guidance Note TG15 – Trees, Landscape & Ecology.

8. The tree(s) proposed to be removed should be replaced in accordance with the Woodland Trust recommendation at the ratio of 3 to 1. Replacement trees should be planted in suitable tree pits as Regular Standard, that is between 80mm and 120mm girth 1m above ground and of over 2.5m height and properly maintained especially during the two years following planting.

9. Advice on suitable trees is available on p59 of 'Petersfield's Trees - their importance and value', at <www.righttrees4cc.org.uk>, and on p354 to p359 of 'Tree Species Selection for Green Infrastructure' by Dr Andrew Hirons and Dr Henrik Sjöman. Replacement disease resistant Elm trees are available from the South Downs National Park Trust through its Trees for the Downs initiative.

10. Our objections to the application are reinforced by application SDNP/21/01232/CND which seeks to establish a commercial use for the site by the removal of condition 3 of SDNP/15/03090/FUL and condition 2 of SDNP/16/05326/FUL both of which conditions have, by the applicant's own admission been breached, and by retrospective application SDNP/21/02984/FUL.

11. We submit that applications SDNP/21/01232/CND, SDNP/21/00956/FUL and SDNP/21/02984/FUL should be considered together. Approval of the first would establish permission for commercial use, of the second would enable it and of the third would illuminate it.

12. Information and comment in the application appears deliberately to misunderstand the argument by the Society in paragraphs 2 and 3 of its previous objection. The point is that the National Park Purposes to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the national park by the public would be damaged by the construction and location of the proposed new access road centrally across the site and new access onto the B2070. The Society holds that the impact of the present proposal would be significant and unacceptable in policy terms notwithstanding any agreement with the Highway Authority.

13. Criticism has been levelled at the Society's citation of application EHDC 34636/001 which was refused and disallowed upon appeal. This application is relevant because it concerned the site of the present application and, as does the present application when taken with applications SDNP/21/01232/CND and SDNP/21/02984/FUL it concerns commercial use. In dismissing the appeal the HM Inspector stated that The Causeway is one of the most attractive and prominent gateways into Petersfield and that this open land demands the strongest possible protection.

14. We do not accept the assertion by the letter dated 25 March 21 that breaches are of a minor nature. The breaches of condition 3 of SDNP/15/03090/FUL and condition 2 of SDNP/16/05326/FUL are not insignificant. Far from it; the applicant has been operating a commercial business in contravention of the LPAs decision that it should not do so. As the Society stated in its objection to SDNP/21/01232/CND, the conditions are exactly the same that 'The development hereby permitted shall be used only for private, non-commercial, stabling and equestrian use and shall at no time be used for any trade or business including livery stabling' in order 'To prevent the stables and land from being used for commercial purposes since the increased use of the premises and generation of additional traffic would be detrimental to the amenities of the area.' Our view is that planning policy has not changed since both conditions were imposed nor has the reasons in that, if the conditions were not to be imposed, the increased use of the premises and generation of additional traffic would be detrimental to the amenities of the area and the residents nearby.

15. We continue fully to endorse the objections of others. The Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan establishes the Settlement Boundary for the Parish and provides in Policy BEP6 that 'Development will not normally be permitted on land which is within the parish of Petersfield but outside the Settlement Boundary'. The LPA should clarify which parish the proposal, or part of it, is sited. In any event, the South Downs Local Plan will apply.

POLICY

16. The application should comply with all relevant national, regional and local planning policies and guidance. Of particular importance are the following:

17. In our view, the proposals in this application are contrary to South Downs Local Plan policies SD1, SD2, SD3, SD4, SD5, SD6, SD7, SD9, SD11, SD19, SD20 and SD21 and to Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan policies GAP1, GAP3, BEP6, BEP7, BEP1, NEP7 and NEP8. The application should therefore be refused.

SDNP/21/00992/FUL | Change of use of the car showroom to a flexible Class B8 (storage and distribution) with ancillary trade counter use for trade and retail sale, and/or showroom for the sale/display of bulky goods (amended description 03.08.21) | White Rose (Petersfield) Ltd Station Road Petersfield GU32 3DJ. *Applicant: White Rose Petersfield Ltd. Agent: Bell Cornwell LLP. Case Officer: Rosie Virgo. Ward: Bell Hill.*

Objection

1. We continue to object to this application and await the inclusion of the amended description on the SDNPA Statutory Register of Planning Applications when we shall consider submitting a further formal representation.

REASONS

2. Our primary concerns as before are about the use of the forecourt by new users, as yet unidentified or undefined, and the impact the proposed uses would have upon the increasingly congested Station Road at the entrance to Petersfield town centre and Conservation Area.

3. The application dismisses the proximity of the Conservation Area since the property concerned is not within it. South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19) policy SD15 refers to the Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP17) which recommends that the local planning authority (LPA) will ensure that all new development in or on the edges of the Conservation Area is of the highest possible quality and will ensure that all new development in or on the edges of the Conservation Area protects or enhances existing views into and out of the Conservation Area. Although, as the application asserts, the building would not be changed, vehicular activity would increase and unacceptably damage the views into and out of the Conservation Area.

4. Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15) policies BP5 and BP6 indicate that the Frenchmans Road area would be particularly suitable for a Business Enterprise Centre providing small units to support affordable workshop space for small businesses (trades/crafts/social enterprises etc). PNP15 Policy BP6, however, states that any such uses should be appropriate to their immediate context. The application uses these policies to justify a change of use without specifying how the property would be used. Indeed, the application allows for bulk warehousing and the sale of bulky goods. This is unacceptable.

5. The application states both that end users of the property cannot be identified at present but that, nevertheless, the uses proposed are acceptable in the residential location. This is extraordinary and unacceptable.

6. Insufficient information is submitted to be able to support the general change of use proposed. No users are specified and no assessment of vehicle movements is provided.

7. PNP15 policy RP1 sets out the boundary of the town centre retail area. The application site is outside the area. RP1 provides that outside the defined town centre, new provision will be limited to small scale convenience shops (A1) with a maximum floor space of 280m² in appropriate locations to meet the daily shopping needs of the local community. We contend that the present proposal fails to meet these requirements and those of SDLP19 policy SD38: Shops Outside Centres.

8. The garage to the west of the application site is not included in the proposals and we expect it to continue to operate as at present. This should be taken into account in determining the application.

9. The 9 car spaces which serve the application site, while adequate for the display of cars for sale, would be unacceptable for employee/ visitor parking because of the narrow width of the site and inadequate space for vehicle turning/manouvering.

10. Access is already from and onto Station Road which is frequently congested with pedestrian, cycling and vehicular traffic waiting at the rail level crossing, seeking access to the Lidl and Majestic Wine Stores, entering and exiting from Penns Road and using Winchester and Station Roads as a through route from the A3 dual carriageway to and from the A272 east of the level crossing. The location is already dangerous. Car delivery lorries have no option, even at present, to park on Station Road and private cars are often driven on the right-hand side of the road to navigate congestion. Traffic will only get worse given the industrial and residential developments to the north of Winchester Road especially if, contrary to PNP15 policies BP5 and BP6, the Frenchmans Road Aldi application SDNP/20/05058/FUL for a Class E retail unit is approved. Additional pedestrian, cycling and vehicular traffic including delivery lorries will exacerbate congestion and danger given the narrowness of Station Road and Winchester Road with their inadequate and dangerously narrow pavements. Winchester Road and Station Road are already dangerously overloaded with traffic. This application would increase the overload. For this reason alone it is unacceptable. Hampshire County Highways raise similar concerns.

POLICY

11. We submit the proposal fails to meet the provisions of PNP15 Making Our Streets Safer Policy GAP3, PTDS10 Movement s9 para 9.1.2, SDLP19 Transport Policy SD19 and Public Realm Policy SD21.

SDNP/21/01366/HOUS | Raise roof height to front extension to create accommodation at first floor level, including two dormer windows. | Annexe 28 Dragon Street Petersfield GU31 4JJ. *Applicant: Mr Osborn. Agent: Critchley Architecture and Design Ltd. Case Officer: Matthew Harding. Ward: St Peter's.*

No Objection: This is a resubmission of a in 2016 approved planning application that never was implemented. The submitted plans are identical to those approved so no objection provided the suggested conditions listed by the Conservation Officer are adhered to.

SDNP/21/01367/LIS | Listed Building Consent - raise roof height to front extension to create accommodation at first floor level, including two dormer windows. | Annexe 28 Dragon Street Petersfield GU31 4JJ. *Applicant: Mr Osborn. Agent: Critchley Architecture and Design Ltd. Case Officer: Matthew Harding. Ward: St Peter's.*

See above.

SDNP/21/03109/HOUS | Two storey side extension to existing outbuilding. | Flint Barn Harrow Lane Petersfield GU32 2HT. *Applicant: Jacqueline Fraser-Pye. Agent: Brookwood Barn Company. Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: Bell Hill.*

Objection. This site lies outside the Settlement Policy Boundary where limitations on extensions apply. The site already has a large outbuilding and we therefore question the justification for a building extension of over 150 square metres (circa 1500sq ft) on two floors. It appears to be a significant overdevelopment.

SDNP/21/03209/HOUS | Conversion of the Longbarn garage at Mallards Mere into an artist studio and home office. | The Longbarn Russell Way Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4LD. *Applicant: Russell Oppenheimer. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Danielle Hall. Ward: Heath.*

No Objection: The proposal is for converting an existing garage that is fronted by contemporary garage doors into a studio space. The external appearance would appear to be enhanced this way by introducing matching brickwork and timber door and window openings. The historic fabric of the building is unlikely to be harmed. Any observations and findings to be issued by the conservation officer are to be adhered to when submitted but are presently not available for consideration.

SDNP/21/03210/LIS | Listed building consent - Conversion of the Longbarn garage at Mallards Mere into an artist studio and home office. | The Longbarn Russell Way Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4LD. *Applicant: Russell Oppenheimer. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Danielle Hall. Ward: Heath.*

See above.

SDNP/21/03250/TPO | T1 - Oak trees x 2 that have grown together as one. Reduce crown height by 3 metres from 16 metres, leaving a finished height of 13 metres. Reduce crown width by 3 metres from 13 metres, leaving a finish of 10 metres. Crown lift to 5 metres from the ground, removing the lowest limb growing over the conservatory. T2 - Robinia. Reduce crown height to 8 metres, just below the lowest wound on the main stem. T3 - Robinia. Fell | 47 Lower Mead Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4NR. *Applicant: Mrs Jane Taylor. Agent: Blendworth Tree Surgeons. Case Officer: Adele Poulton. Ward: Heath.*

We have no comments at this time on this TPO application.

SDNP/21/03454/TPO | T4 - Oak. Crown reduction. Current height 15 metres. Remove 2.5 metres from height retaining 12.5 metres. Crown spread of 10 metres, remove 1.8 metres from each aspect of the crown to retain a spread of 6.5 metres. T5 - Oak. Crown reduction. Current height 10 metres. Reduce height by 1 metre retaining 9 metres. Current crown spread of 9 metres, remove 1.5 metres on each aspect leaving crown spread of 6 metres. | 18 Kennet Road Petersfield GU31 4LS. *Applicant: Mr C Blumlein. Agent: Sequoia Tree Services Ltd. Case Officer: Adele Poulton. Ward: Causeway.*

We have no comments at this time on this TPO application.

SDNP/21/03458/TPO | Oak (T1) - Lowest branch on North side (over garage of 29 Grenehurst Way) reduce by 3m to reduce end weight. Lowest branch on south side reduce by 3m to reduce end weight. Remove major deadwood greater than 70mm diameter over footpath / grass area. To give clearance and increase light to neighbour as encroaching and becoming suppressive. Holly (T2) - Overall crown reduction of approx. 1.5m. To maintain size of tree as beginning to outgrow location and to increase light. | 31 Grenehurst Way Petersfield GU31 4AZ. *Applicant: Mr Borland. Agent: Arbor Venture Tree Care. Case Officer: Adele Poulton. Ward: St Peter's.*

We have no comments at this time on this TPO application.

SDNP/21/03498/HOUS | Partial demolition of existing 1970's single-storey rear extension; new roof glazing and fenestration to other existing single-storey rear extension; internal and external alterations including reinstating additional off-road parking space. | 24 Sussex Road Petersfield GU31 4JX. *Applicant: Ms Caroline Runham. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Danielle Hall. Ward: St Peter's.*

No Objection: Internal alterations would appear sensible and cause little harm to genuinely historic fabric. A better arranged staircase will benefit the long term useful life of the building. The existing rear extension is of little architectural or heritage interest. Detailing of the perimeter to the new flat roof is of some concern and it is recommended that detailing should be discussed with the Heritage Team to ensure an acceptable look including avoiding simple felt roof turned down finishes. The new roof lantern should be supplied reflecting the age of the property so powder coated slimline metal would be acceptable. The conservation team has not as yet issued their comments but are likely to provide more detailed guidance that should be adhered to.

SDNP/21/03499/LIS | Listed building consent - Partial demolition of existing 1970's single-storey rear extension; new roof glazing and fenestration to other existing single-storey rear extension; internal and external alterations including reinstating additional off-road parking space. Removal of small Laburnum tree. | 24 Sussex Road Petersfield GU31 4JX. *Applicant: Ms Caroline Runham. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Danielle Hall. Ward: St Peter's.*

See above.

SDNP/21/03501/HOUS | Single storey rear extension to enlarge kitchen and dining room. First floor rear extension to form larger bedroom | 102 The Causeway Petersfield GU31 4JS. *Applicant: Mr G Beaty. Agent: Clive Milburn Designs. Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers. Ward: Causeway.*

No Objection. The two-storey element is well-designed and although the single storey extension is largely flat-roofed it should fit in quite well on this prominent site.

SDNP/21/03701/FUL | Retrospective application for a Continued Use of Terrace (Ex. Residential Garden) as External Dining Area (Including Extended Hours of Use) | Pages Court, Stables Wine Bar and Restaurant St Peters Road Petersfield GU32 3HX. *Applicant: Mr D Graver. Agent: Graham J Pretty. Case Officer: Katherine Pang. Ward: St Peter's.*

Objection

1. We support in their entirety the detailed objections to this retrospective application by Joanna Crane and David Crane, residents of adjacent property.
2. The application site is located within a primarily residential area in the Conservation Area of Petersfield town centre. Our view focuses upon the damaging impact the unlawful continued use and extended hours of use of a small first floor terrace are having and will continue to have, upon residents in the locality and their enjoyment of their homes.
3. We are more than very disappointed that, once again, the applicant has submitted an application after implementing that which is proposed, in this case the continued use of the terrace at Stables Wine Bar and Restaurant beyond that previously approved by the LPA contrary to the wishes of the neighbours and other members of the community.
4. We find it difficult to express our strong objection more clearly than we have already in our submissions on applications SDNP/16/01177/FUL, SDNP/19/03597/FUL and SDNP/20/03072/CND. Our comments on those applications are set out below, and we ask that the LPA takes them fully into account in determining the present retrospective application.

SDNP/16/01177/FUL:

1. We Strongly Object to this amended application.
2. Pages Court is accessed between, and sits behind, the Grade II listed properties at 15 and 19 High Street. In the 17th century no15 was part of the Crowne Inn, a large building with stables and outbuildings to the rear. The Crowne Inn was replaced in the 18th century with the present three- storey building and the stables converted to other uses. Pages Court is now a quiet and peaceful area surrounded by residential properties.
3. The proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policy CP27 Pollution and to Neighbourhood Plan Policy BEP1. In addition, the facts and history as presented in the application, upon which the proposed use is argued, are inaccurate. In short, they do not represent the truth. We are seriously concerned that both the application form and the Design, Access and Heritage Statement are misleading and contrary to our understanding and that of local residents.

Application Form

4. The answer to question 3 gives the date the proposed use started as 01 June 2008. No evidence is provided to support this statement and both the previous owner and the former and present residents of 15 High Street clearly state that this was not the case.
5. The answer to question 14 about the External Dining Area states that it is not vacant. Yet there is evidence to the contrary in that it was not used by the previous owner of Monoloco for outside catering purposes.

6. No times were originally given about the hours of opening in answer to question 20. This is very important since they seem to have changed since the original permission for a café was given. Amended hours are now proposed, but we do not consider them sufficient to prevent nuisance to the neighbours.

7. For the above reasons the application form is therefore incomplete and misleading.

Design and Access Statement

8. The submitted Design and Access Statement claims that "Up to 2008 the terrace formed part of the adjoining garden but since that time (ie 7-8 years) it has formed an integral part of the curtilage of the restaurant and has been used for outside dining in association with the restaurant use." and "The terrace has been in use now for many years without complaint. All of this time it has been adjacent to the residential garden to the west - with no complaint from the residents. The period of time the terrace has been in use has demonstrated that this does not cause harm to either the character of the Conservation Area or, more particularly, to the amenities of the adjacent residents." This statement is incorrect. The application contains no evidence that it is otherwise.

9. The Statement also claims in para 5.8 in respect of noise that "the site is in a town centre location and the proposed use will have little or no impact upon overall noise levels in the area. Indeed the use has been carried out now for several years without detriment." As the local residents point out, they certainly would be affected by noise and light pollution from the external dining area, since there are many residential properties immediately adjacent to the site.

10. The Environmental Health Officer agrees with the residents and objects "to this change of use on the grounds that the proposed use is likely to give rise to both noise and light pollution to the many adjoining residents. There would be no means of controlling patron noise arising from extended use of this outdoor area, to protect the nearby residents."

Conclusions

11. EHDC Local Plan Policy CP27 Pollution states that: "Development must not result in pollution which prejudices the health and safety of communities and their environments....Development will not be permitted if it would have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties...". We consider that the proposal would severely impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of noise and light pollution.

12. Neighbourhood Plan Policy BEP1 requires development to meet the highest standards of design and make a positive contribution to the character of Petersfield. It sets out criteria which need to be met including the Petersfield Town Design Guidance 7.1.5 Petersfield Town Centre. This includes the need for developments to respect and be compatible with adjacent buildings and uses.

13. The residents have expressed serious concerns about this application. They point out that the original permission for use as a tea shop (F.27058/027) was specifically restricted "in the interests of amenity" to exclude general A3 purposes. As they state, there is no subsequent policy change that justifies a different view being taken now.

14. The further development of Pages Court and near environs since that date have introduced a greater number of residential dwellings into the area, and the adverse impact of any change of use of this residential garden area is disproportionately greater today than when the premises' original restriction was imposed. This proposed change of use is significantly and demonstrably harmful to residential amenity in many ways, not least in respect of increased noise, pervasive cooking smells, smoke from barbecues, visual impact of awnings and other al-fresco dining accoutrements, along with general disturbance.

15. We conclude that the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Local Plan Policy CP27 and Neighbourhood Plan Policy BEP 1 and that the information provided in support of the proposal is incomplete, incorrect and misleading. It misrepresents the facts upon which the application is based. We agree with the residents' objections.

16. We have a general concern that this restaurant use is taking over the rest of Pages Court. We understand that tables and chairs, together with umbrellas are now located within the area. This needs to be resolved with the applicant.

17. In view of the above, this application should be refused.

SDNP/19/03597/FUL:

1. We strongly object to this application for the continued use of the elevated external terrace as a dining area at The Old Stables restaurant in Pages Court. Our reasons are as our objection to application SDNP/16/01177/FUL for which a 12 month temporary permission was granted on 20jun16 on which date legitimate use first started. Our previous objection is included at the foot of these comments and should be taken into account by the Case Officer.

2. The SDNP/16/01177/FUL decision notice stated that 'Failure to comply with any conditions may invalidate the permission and may result in enforcement action'. It is clear from the present application (see DA&H Statement 5.2 'Unfortunately, as is often the case in such matters the renewal of the permission was overlooked although the use continued'.) that the use has continued since 20jun16, a period in excess of the permitted 12 months of over 25 months contrary to Condition 3 of the SDNP/16/01177/FUL approval. We are surprised and disappointed that the LPA has not taken enforcement action in the matter.

3. The DA&H Statement recognises that complaints over the use have been expressed and admits that at least one party has been held on the terrace. Further it argues in 5.4 that 'Although it is understood that there is a sensitive balance between the needs of the business use and the amenities of residents it must be said that if residents seek a town centre home then they must give due account of the needs of local businesses'. We find this statement inflammatory and most unfortunate. In 5.3 the Statement pursues the point that 'Uses such as this are vital to the vitality of the town centre of Petersfield and it is the Policy of the Local Authority to foster local business'. It can equally be argued that as businesses are converted to residential (see the same applicant's application SDNP/19/03752/PA30 for Prior approval for a Change of Use from existing B1 Light Industrial Premises to a Dwelling House (C3)), the 'sensitive balance' balance must take full account of the increasing residential character of the town centre.

4. We are disturbed to read the analyses and comments of local residents and neighbours. It seems it is thought that statements in the application are erroneous leading to obfuscation, distortion and inaccuracy. If this is found to be correct then the whole application could be brought into question.

5. The South Downs Local Plan Development Management Policy SD54: Pollution and Air Quality states that 'Development proposals will be permitted provided that levels of air, noise, vibration, light, water, odour or other pollutants do not have a significant negative affect on people and the natural environment now or in the foreseeable future, taking into account cumulative impacts and any mitigation'.

6. EHDC Local Plan Policy CP27 Pollution states that: "Development must not result in pollution which prejudices the health and safety of communities and their environments....Development will not be permitted if it would have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties...".

7. The EHO has previously agreed with residents and objected to application SDNP/16/01177/FUL on the grounds that 'the proposed use is likely to give rise to both noise and light pollution to the many adjoining residents' and that 'There would be no means of controlling patron noise arising from extended use of this outdoor area, to protect the nearby residents'. Local residents have explained that the use of the terrace as a dining area has caused an unacceptable interference with their right to the full use and enjoyment of their properties constituting nuisance. This interference is exacerbated by the overlooking of the neighbouring property's rear windows and garden.

8. Pages Court is, to a large extent, occupied by chairs, tables and customers of The Old Stables restaurant. We question whether this takeover by the restaurant of what is in essence a public space surrounded by and giving access to shops, businesses, and residences is licensed or has approval. Given what can be described as an excessive single purpose use of Pages Court we fail to understand why the applicant wishes, without any substantive justification or reason for the proposal, to use the small terrace as additional dining facilities.

9. The proposal is contrary to the requirements of SDLP Policy SD54, Local Plan Policy CP27, Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan Policy BEP1 in that the information provided in support of the proposal is incomplete, incorrect and misleading.

10. Given the above reasons for our objection we submit this application should be refused.

SDNP/20/03072/CND:

Objection.

1. Condition 3 of permission SDNP/19/03597/FUL permitted use of the terrace between the hours of 0900 and 1700. The reason for the Condition was to protect the amenities of nearby residencies. The terrace is quite small, but next door to gardens, and it is reasonable to impose that restriction.

2. The restaurant already has a number of outside tables in Pages Court as well as space inside the restaurant.

3. One of the problems with allowing a later operating time (9 o'clock) is that any use of the space would have to cease by that time, and it would be difficult to enforce. Also, if someone was in the middle of a meal at 9 o'clock it would be unreasonable for the proprietor to ask the client to leave. It may, however, be reasonable to extend the hours of use to early evening to, say, 1900 hours.

SDNP/21/03715/CND | Variation of condition 2 of SDNP/20/02936/CND to allow the operating hours to be made permanent | Churchers College Ramshill Petersfield GU31 4AS. *Applicant: Churchers College. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Nicky Powis. Ward: St Peter's.*

Objection. Temporary permission (for one year) to allow a variation of the Condition was granted in 2020, partly because Covid restrictions were limiting the numbers that could use the playing pitches. 14 local residents, mostly from addresses adjoining the site objected to that application, on grounds of noise, powerful floodlighting, and because the lights and pitches have been used 'outside the permitted hours'. These arguments seem valid; we therefore object to the use of the site later than the 'original' hours in the evenings. We have no objection to an earlier start in the mornings.

SDNP/21/03720/HOUS | Two storey rear extension, single storey side extension and hardstanding to front garden | 18 King George Avenue Petersfield Hampshire GU32 3EU. *Applicant: Mr Keith Benstead. Agent: Architectural Planning Ltd. Case Officer: Ms Sabah Halli. Ward: St Peter's.*

No Objection. This is a nicely designed extension, which therefore accords with the design policies of the SDLP and the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan. It also meets the requirements of the Draft South Downs Design Guide which contains detailed advice on house extensions.

SDNP/21/03832/TPO | T1 Maple - Reduce overhanging branches to property by approx 4 metres (starting spread 10 metres, reduce by 4 metres leaving finishing spread of 6 metres). T2 Sycamore - Re-pollard tree to original pollard points. Approximate reduction of 3 - 4 metres. | 20 Gammon Close Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4SU. *Applicant: Ms Phillipa Laughton. Agent: Bailey Bros (Southern) Ltd. Case Officer: Adele Poulton. Ward: St Peter's.*

We have no comments at this time on this TPO application.

SDNP/21/03858/FTP | Relocation of Petersfield Public Footpath 12 located at Buckmore Farm. | Land North of Buckmore Farm Beckham Lane Petersfield Hampshire. *Applicant: Gentian Developments (Petersfield) Ltd. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Heather Lealan. Ward: Bell Hill.*

No Objection. The proposed diversion will make the route slightly longer, but will pass through 'green areas' in the forthcoming development. The Ramblers object, mainly it seems to procedural matters, but appear to support the principle of the Diversion.

<END>