

**Petersfield Society Comments on Planning Applications to be considered by Petersfield Town Council Planning Committee at its video meeting on Tuesday 02 November 2021 starting at 18:30hrs.**

**SDNP/21/00992/FUL** | Change of use of the car showroom to a flexible use as car showroom and/or showroom for the sale and display of bulky goods together with ancillary trade counter use for trade and retail sales (amended description and further information rec. 07.10.21) | 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.*

PREAMBLE

1. The description of this application has been amended twice since it was submitted from 'Change of use of the car showroom to uses within one of Use Class E, Use Class B8 or showroom with ancillary trade counter and storage' (19feb21) to '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' (11aug21 by Bell Cornwell) to 'Change of use of the car showroom to a flexible use as car showroom and/or sale and display of bulky bathroom goods together with ancillary trade counter use for trade and retail sales' (12oct21 by RGP). (All dates are those on which the changed descriptions were uploaded onto the SDNPA Statutory Register). The headline has not changed from the second description.
2. A Technical Note by RGP Transport Planning and Infrastructure Design Consultants, response by HCC Highways Development Planning and a further objection by Mr James Mancz have been added since our last objection on 19aug21.
3. No discussions appear to have been held throughout the planning process by the applicant or agent with either the Local Planning Authority (SDNPA) or its agent (EHDC).

RECOMMENDATION

4. Objection.

REASONS

5. The additional Technical Note by RGP states that the proposal has changed to 'flexible use as car showroom and/or sale and display of bulky bathroom goods together with ancillary trade counter use for trade and retail sales'. It focuses on vehicle use, access, manoeuvrability and parking but does not consider the situation if all three uses are active simultaneously. Access across public vehicular, cycling and pedestrian routes is not expressly considered.
6. The Technical Note considers a use by or similar to that of the Bath Store in other towns in the UK but offers no reasons as to why these other sites are similar to the location and constraints of the application site.
7. Standard bay parking provision is proposed for 12 cars at any one time serving the three proposed uses. No provision is made for deliveries, collections or visits of vehicles larger than standard. No disabled spaces are provided.
8. No consideration is given to the location of the site at an increasingly congested part of Petersfield adjacent to the level crossing at the entrance to the town centre and Conservation Area.
9. Reference is made only to EHDC policy. No reference to or acknowledgement of SDNPA as the LPA is made with whom, as recommended by HCC Highways Authority the applicant and agents should engage if they wish to move this application further forward.
10. Little or no evidence can be found in the amended application indicating compliance with at least the policies listed below.
11. In view of the above, our previous objections on 16apr21 and 19aug21 are reinforced.

## POLICY

12. Policies, guidance and recommendations considered relevant to this application but to which no reference is made in the application include:

- South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19): SD5: Design, SD7: Relative Tranquillity, SD8: Dark Night Skies, SD9: Biodiversity and Geodiversity, SD11: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows, SD12: Historic Environment, SD15: Conservation Areas, SD19: Transport and Accessibility, SD21: Public Realm, SD22: Parking Provision, SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources, SD50: Sustainable Drainage Systems, SD51: Renewable Energy, SD54: Pollution and Air Quality.
- Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15): BEP1: Design, character, setting and quality, BEP7: Sustainability, GAP3: Making Our Streets Safer, NEP7: Biodiversity, Trees and Woodlands.
- Petersfield Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP17): Recommended Action 7: Development in or on the edges of the Conservation Area.
- Petersfield Town Design Guide (PTDS10): Guidance 6.3: Design, 6.4: Sustainability, 8.2: Open Spaces and Trees, 9.1.2: Movement, 10.2: Public Art.
- Petersfield Biodiversity Action Plan (PBAP09).

**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 (as amended by plans received on 20/10/2021). | 10 Rother Close Petersfield GU31 4DN. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs Adrian & Sally Moore. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Matthew Harding. Ward: Froxfield, Sheet & Steep Ward.*

## RECOMMENDATION

1. No objection with reservations.

## REASONS

2. An earlier scheme with a bulky flat-roofed dormer has been amended and does now show two smaller pitched roof dormers.
3. The design put forward is uninspiring but is now seen as just about acceptable subject to conditions relating to the SDLP19 Dark Skies policy and the proposed large roof lantern and windows.

**SDNP/21/04471/FUL** | Moving access for permitted dwelling and changing design of permitted dwelling and permitted garage. (additional details of visibility splays received) | Windward Reservoir Lane Petersfield GU32 2HY. *Applicant: James Allen. Agent: James Allen. Case Officer: Nicky Powis. Ward: St Peter's.*

## PREAMBLE

1. This application needs thorough examination together with the site's planning history.
2. Application SDNP/19/02810/FUL to which the current application refers was approved with conditions on 20mar20. We objected to that application on the basis that the application site is part of the site earmarked as H11 by the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15) for community affordable self-build housing. Our view was - and still is - that the H11 site should be developed as a whole, not in a piecemeal fashion. Independent and separate development, as in this application, prevents the H11 site being developed in a comprehensive and suitable manner and thwarts the wishes of the community and impacts upon the H11 development proposals supported by public grants submitted as an outline application.
3. A further application SDNP/20/01482/FUL revising that previously approved was refused on 11jun20 and dismissed upon appeal on 01mar21.
4. Application SDNP/21/00992/FUL seeks to amend approved application SDNP/19/02810/FUL.

## RECOMMENDATION

5. Amendment for the following reasons, comments, policy and guidance.

## REASONS

6. No pre-application advice has been sought from or given by the Local Planning Authority on this application. It is worth noting that the original proposals when pre-application advice was sought were considered by the LPA to be unacceptable. However this view was overturned by the approval granted on 20mar20.

7. Pursuant to the adjacent H11 site outline application SDNP/21/03545/OUT, we understand that discussions are presently taking place between Petersfield Community Land Trust (PCLT) (applicant) and SDNPA (LPA) over the affordability of the proposed self-build dwellings. Very unfortunately, an agreement to include the strip of land forming part of the Windward property and the H11 site identified by Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15) was not accomplished between the previous owner and PCLT.

8. Our view, expressed in our objection to application SDNP/20/01482/FUL, is that the previous proposals appeared not to have fully addressed the self-build development criteria in the PNP15. Housing Objective 2 seeks to provide more affordable housing and more housing for local people, on the basis that 'Petersfield is an expensive place to live and many people who would like to live in the town, often because of family connections, cannot afford to do so.' and that 'Analysis of the number of people waiting for affordable housing has shown that demand is considerably more than is currently available. Housing Policy 6 on affordable housing holds that 'Proposals for new residential development that maximise the delivery of affordable housing and provide for the size, type and tenure of homes to meet local needs as set out in this policy will be permitted, provided they comply with other relevant policies.

9. PNP Policy HP7 states that planning permission for a self-build dwelling (on site H11) will only be granted for applicants who demonstrate that they have a local connection and undertake in a section 106 agreement that the occupancy of the property will be restricted to people with a local connection in perpetuity, that they will live in the property as their main residence once it is complete and that once the development has commenced, they will complete the building of the dwelling within 2 years. The primary driver for self-build housing in the PNP is that it 'typically costs less than buying the market equivalent as the costs do not include the developer's marketing costs and profit - thus these homes will be more affordable', that it will 'be of a higher quality in terms of both architecture and construction than most modern homes' and 'lead to a more diverse and rich mix of architecture, tend to include more sustainable and green technologies, stimulate the local economy by employing local trades people, and create stronger and more cohesive neighbourhoods as self-builders generally become key members of their local communities.' We cannot find how these criteria would be met by applications SDNP/19/02810/FUL or SDNP/21/04471/FUL.

10. The present application should be subject to similar discussions on affordability and design between PCLT and SDNPA - or EHDC on SDNPA's behalf - and any approval conditioned by the same conditions attached to the SDNP/19/02810/FUL approval.

11. The revised design is pretty standard mediocre pattern book style and does not meet PNP15 requirements for 'a higher quality in terms of both architecture and construction than most modern homes' and 'lead to a more diverse and rich mix of architecture' and, as far as we can ascertain, 'include more sustainable and green technologies'.

12. The relocation of the double garage and the proposed new access would result in a reduction of hedging resulting in biodiversity impoverishment which does not appear to have been addressed.

13. We find little information on materials, detailed construction or climate crisis measures including sustainability, landscaping or biodiversity.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. The use of uPVC is contrary to South Downs Local Plan policy SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources.

17. The application simply identifies facing materials as 'Stock multi-rewd brick' for Walls, 'Real Slate' for Roofs, 'uPVC' for Casement Windows and 'uPVC' for Doors. Other information concerning such matters as bargeboards and fascia is missing. In fact the application form states that no additional information is supplied on plans, drawings or a design and access statement. It is unfortunate that no pre-application advice was sought from the LPA. This would have helped the applicant understand the detail required in an application. We would expect the lack of detail to be covered by amendment and, if not, by suitable conditions in any approval.

## POLICY

18. Policies, guidance and recommendations considered particularly relevant to this application but to which no reference is made in the application include:

- South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19): SD1: Sustainable Development, SD5: Design, SD7: Relative Tranquillity, SD8: Dark Night Skies, SD9: Biodiversity and Geodiversity, SD11: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows, SD19: Transport and Accessibility, SD22: Parking Provision, SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources, SD50: Sustainable Drainage Systems, SD51: Renewable Energy, SD54: Pollution and Air Quality.
- South Downs SPD guidance on Sustainable Construction and emerging Design Guide.
- Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15): BEP1: Design, character, setting and quality, BEP7: Sustainability, GAP3: Making Our Streets Safer, NEP7: Biodiversity, Trees and Woodlands.
- Petersfield Town Design Guide (PTDS10): Guidance 6.3: Design, 6.4: Sustainability, 8.2: Open Spaces and Trees, 9.1.2: Movement.
- Petersfield Biodiversity Action Plan (PBAP09).

## NOTE

19. One of our trustees has an interest in this application and has therefore played no part in preparing our comments or making our recommendation.

**SDNP/21/04486/HOUS** | Conservatory to rear of property | 3 Reed Way Petersfield GU32 3FL. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs David Wright. Agent: Executive Windows & Construction. Case Officer: Bernie Beckett. Ward: Causeway.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. No Objection.

REASONS

2. This is a traditionally designed conservatory. The design is acceptable and the proposal will have no unacceptable impact on neighbouring property.

**SDNP/21/04640/FUL** | New dwelling with associated off street parking. | 3 Charles Street Petersfield GU32 3EH. *Applicant: New Bronze Ltd. Agent: James Allen. Case Officer: Rosie Virgo. Ward: St Peter's.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. No Objection with reservations.

REASONS

2. The use of brownfield sites for new dwellings is encouraged.
3. The design of the proposed house is traditional, considered and appropriate.
4. However, the large areas of hard surfaces to the front and side while green amenity space is limited is a concern. Existing street corner vegetation will be considerably reduced. The applicant should be asked to consider the inclusion of some green landscaping and at least one substantial tree. It is unclear to what use the hard surface area to the north would be put.

**SDNP/21/04809/HOUS** | Installation of air source heat pump (Mitsubishi Ecodan 8.5) on east facing wall of property boundary, approximately 1.7m above ground level. | 10 Selborne Close Petersfield GU32 2JB. *Applicant: Jesse Foyle. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: St Peter's.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. No Objection.

REASONS

2. The introduction of the use of ASHPs should in general be encouraged.
3. The location selected for the wall-hung unit is acceptable. It is positioned to the rear of a side elevation and shielded from view by the neighbouring garage.

**SDNP/21/04966/HOUS** | Single storey side extension | 4 Herne Court Heath Road Petersfield GU31 4EQ. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs G Svarovsky. Agent: Vincent Edberg Architects. Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers. Ward: St Peter's.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. No objection.

NOTE

2. Two of our trustees have an interest in this application and have therefore played no part in making our recommendation.

**SDNP/21/05014/HOUS** | First floor extension above existing ground floor area | 1 Copse Close Petersfield GU31 4DL. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs Kidd. Agent: Birch Wood Design. Case Officer: Bernie Beckett. Ward: Heath.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. No Objection.

REASONS

2. This is an appropriately designed extension, and is in keeping with other family homes nearby.

**SDNP/21/05027/HOUS** | Single storey rear extension, relocate door to front of property following demolition of existing garage | 9 Lower Mead Petersfield GU31 4NR. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs Neal. Agent: Birch Wood Design. Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: Heath.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. No Objection.

REASONS

2. The proposal is for a straightforward rear extension appropriately designed.

3. Roof lights are subject to restrictions in the Local Plan relating the the SDLP19 Dark Skies Policy.

**SDNP/21/05028/TCA** | Cypress tree - Felled. Ace planted as replacement in different location. | 40 Heath Road Petersfield GU31 4EH. *Applicant: Richard Warton. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Adele Poulton. Ward: St Peter's.*

We have no comments on this application at this time.

**SDNP/21/05062/TPO** | T1 Oak - Crown reduce by 4 metres on height and any over extended limbs on higher canopy to be reduced by 2 metres. Lower canopy to be retained. The finishing height will be 10 metres and spread 8 metres. | 21 Lower Mead Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4NR. *Applicant: Mr Colin Slaughter. Agent: Alpine Tree Surgeons Ltd. Case Officer: Adele Poulton. Ward: Heath.*

We have no comments on this application at this time.

**SDNP/21/05080/PNTEL** | Regulation 5 Fixed Line Broadband Electronic Communications - Installation of 9m light wooden Pole | Outside White Rose Station Road Petersfield Hampshire. *Applicant: Openreach. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Rosie Virgo. Ward: Bell Hill.*

and

**SDNP/21/05369/PNTEL** | Prior Notification - Installation of 1 wooden pole for fixed line broadband electronic communications apparatus outside 9 Buckmore Avenue, Petersfield, GU32 2EF. | Land at Buckmore Avenue Petersfield Hampshire. *Applicant: Openreach. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: Bell Hill.*

1. These are not planning applications, but 'Notifications' under Regulation 5 of the Electronic Code advising the Local Planning Authority that work will commence within one month.

#### RECOMMENDATION

2. Objection.

#### REASONS

3. HCC Highways Authority has objected because the new pole will obstruct visibility from nearby accesses. We support this objection.

4. The Pole is not the end of the matter. It will be used to link wires from it to nearby premises, and this will result in an overhead 'wirescape', creating an unfortunate impact on the street scene.

5. We worked hard with others in the past to achieve the removal of overhead wires in Petersfield. Street 'clutter' including that notified can ruin the streetscape, negate previous efforts to enhance the quality and character of the town.

<END>