

The Petersfield Society

Planning Application Comments

Petersfield Town Council. Planning Committee Meeting at 18:30 on Tuesday 21 September 2021

SDNP/21/03578/ADV | Retrospective application - Shop name "Refill and Replenish" displayed on a sign above the main front door of The Old Bank on Petersfield High Street. 2 smaller signs showing the business logo and purpose either side of the entrance door. | The Old Bank 15 High Street Petersfield Hampshire GU32 3JT

RECOMMENDATION:

1. We do not object to this retrospective application.

REASONS:

2. The proposals appear to comply with policy and recommendations.

POLICY:

3. Relevant policies and recommendations with which the proposals are to comply:

- South Downs Local Plan policies SD1: Sustainable Development, SD5: Design, SD12: Historic Environment, SD13: Listed Buildings, SD14: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation of Historic Buildings, SD15: Conservation Areas, Development in Town and Village Centres, SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources, SD52: Shop Fronts and SD53: Advertisements.
- Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan policies BEP1: Design, character, setting and quality, BEP2: Conservation area, and BEP4: Conservation Area Shopfronts;
- Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan Recommendation 6: Conservation Area Shopfronts and Advertising.
- Petersfield Town Design Statement guidance 6.1: Design, 6.3: Local Design, 6.4 Sustainability, and 7.1 Town Centre.

SDNP/21/04107/HOUS | Two storey and single storey extension to the rear | 94 The Causeway Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4JS

No Objection with Reservations: The design of the first floor extension would appear to be acceptable. However, it is not completely clear from the submitted plans whether the enjoyment of the garden to the adjacent property is adversely affected or not. It is assumed that the case officer will check this matter using the guidelines set out in the SDNP design guide for extensions.

SDNP/21/04115/FUL | Demolition of existing store and erection of dwelling with associated landscaping, parking and cycle shed. | Land North of 10 - 12 Grenehurst Way Petersfield Hampshire

No Object Subject to Reservation: Concerns raised about the original scheme would appear to have been addressed. The overall floor area and volume of the building has been reduced to better fit the site. The close proximity to the public highway is perhaps not characteristic of this part of Grenehurst Way.

SDNP/21/04196/FUL | Change of Use from Beauty Salon (Sui Generis) to Office (Class E) | Park House Park Road Petersfield GU32 3DL

RECOMMENDATION:

1. We do not object to this application but we do have a reservation consequent upon an approval of Office (Class E) use.

REASONS:

2. The property is located within Character Area 1 of the Conservation Area adjacent to positive unlisted buildings recommended by the Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan for statutory or local listing.

3. We understand that from 01aug21 it is possible under planning policy for a property of Use Class E to be converted to residential as permitted development that is to say without a formal planning application or permission.

4. This means that if this application is permitted the applicant will be able to convert the property to residential.

5. The question arises therefore as to whether the property is suitable for residential as well as office use.

6. The property as it stands has been very poorly maintained. Any physical changes to the property following a change to office or residential should be covered by a planning application. We would expect the LPA to condition any approval to this effect.

POLICY

7. Relevant policy and recommendations affecting the fabric of the property:

- South Downs Local Plan policies SD1: Sustainable Development, SD5: Design, SD12: Historic Environment, SD14: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation of Historic Buildings, SD15: Conservation Areas, Development in Town and Village Centres, and SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources.
- Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan policies BEP1: Design, character, setting and quality, and BEP2: Conservation area.
- Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan Recommendation 2: Positive Unlisted Buildings, 5: Public Realm Enhancement, 7: Conservation Area Enhancement, and 8 Conservation Area View Enhancement.
- Petersfield Town Design Statement guidance 6.1: Design, 6.3: Local Design, 6.4 Sustainability, and 7.1 Town Centre.

SDNP/21/04205/HOUS | First floor extension for the addition of a single bedroom and study area. | 17 Torberry Drive Petersfield GU31 4HW. Applicant: Hugh Maddison. Agent: Hazel Butler Architects. EHDC Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers. Ward: Heath.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Amendment before approval.

REASONS:

2. The design proposals appear to meet the policy requirements of the South Downs Local Plan, Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan, and Petersfield Town Design Statement except for those concerning sustainability.

3. The proposal includes for the use of uPVC, a highly unsustainable material. This is unacceptable in the face of the climate crisis. The Building Services Research and Information Association (BSRIA) defines sustainable construction as “the creation and responsible management of a healthy built environment based on resource efficient and ecological principles”. The principles include minimising non-renewable resource consumption, enhancing the natural environment and eliminating or minimising the use of toxins thus combining energy efficiency with the impact of materials on occupants.

4. Energy used in the manufacture of uPVC (embodied energy) has been shown to be as high as 2,224 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. According to the Breast Cancer Fund, a 2012 study found that women exposed to phthalates have nearly a fivefold increase in risk for premenopausal breast cancer. Phthalates have also been linked to other medical conditions.

5. The application drawings simply identify facing materials as matching existing. The application is more precise, identifying uPVC for Windows and Doors. Other information concerning such matters as bargeboards and fascia is missing.

6. Pre-application advice was sought from the LPA but, unfortunately, according to the application, did not raise the need for sustainability in the face of climate change.

8. In all respects it is essential that the proposals are of the highest standard of design to meet policy requirements and as befitting a historic town within the South Downs National Park.

POLICY:

7. The use of uPVC is contrary to:

- South Downs Local Plan policies SD1: Sustainability, SD5: Design, and SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources.
- South Downs SPD guidance on Sustainable Construction and emerging Design Guide;
- Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan policy BEP7: Sustainability; and
- Petersfield Town Design Statement guidance 6.4.1: Sustainable Building Design.

SDNP/21/04254/HOUS | Single storey rear extension and minor internal works (amended plan received 20.09.2021) | 20 Holt Down Petersfield GU31 4PQ

No Objection. Refreshingly clear plans showing a nicely designed rear extension, which meets the Design requirements of the South Downs LP and the PNP.

SDNP/21/04257/FUL | Repositioning of agricultural access | 158 The Causeway Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4LW

Objection for two reasons. (1) This proposed large, industrial scale access, which involves the loss of a significant length of hedgerow, will create an unattractive feature in the street scene and local landscape on a prime approach to the town. The 6 x 10 metre tarmac entrance will be similar in scale to the recent access to Employment land at Winchester Road and will cause a scar in the landscape.

(2) There is no need for this access. Permission for a new 3.6 m wide access was granted in 2008 and if properly maintained is perfectly adequate. The land holding is only a few hectares, and there are no agricultural buildings or yards on it. The Planning Statement says '*movement of traffic is not envisaged to be much different to that envisaged when the 2008 access was proposed*', and that the large access will allow two large vehicles to pass! Why is this necessary when cultivation or use of the land will require only a handful of traffic movements per month? There is simply no need for such a large access to serve this land. An access of the size proposed would normally only be necessary for an Industrial estate or a large housing development.

SDNP/21/04266/HOUS | Single storey extension to rear following demolition of conservatory | 14 Selborne Close Petersfield Hampshire GU32 2JB

No Objection subject to Comment: The proposed single storey extension has a flat roof. A pitched roof solution would be preferable but that would be difficult to achieve in this case. There would be no unacceptable adverse effect on the adjoining property. It is regrettable that the submitted plans show a flat felt covered roof and upvc window frames. The inclusion of both these materials tend to lessen the visual quality of building work. However, the extension is to the rear facing the railway line so hence in this case acceptable.

SDNP/21/04347/FUL | Demolition of existing building and construction of 22 residential (Class C3) dwellings, comprising 15 flats and seven houses, and a commercial unit (Class E), provision of parking, waste storage and external landscaping. | Trademark House Ramshill Petersfield GU31 4AT

Objection: The existing business building does not possess any visual architectural qualities worth restoring suggesting a new build structure would be appropriate. The land is furthermore a brownfield site so in that respect suitable for development. The replacement scheme does unfortunately have an overpowering dense town centre feel inappropriate for the site and not reflecting a natural transition towards the countryside within the SDNP. This sentiment is supported by the Highway Engineers who believe the provided parking standards are inadequate. The inclusion of smaller dwellings is welcome and needed in Petersfield. This is nevertheless no reason for proposing overdevelopment. The scant provision of private amenity space and generally greenery is telling where access to positive outdoor space is impossible without venturing along a busy public highway for some considerable distance. The design needs to be revisited in this light.