

Petersfield Society Comments
Petersfield Town Council. Planning Committee Meeting:
18:30 on 23 November 2021.

Applications to be considered:

Meeting to be held via Zoom video conference.

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). (additional Ecology Survey received on 29/10/2021) | Horse Chestnut Farm The Causeway Petersfield GU31 4LR. *Applicant: Mrs Nichola Blake. Agent: Graham J Pretty. Case Officer: Matthew Harding. Ward: Causeway.*

PREAMBLE

1. Our previous objection was submitted to the LPA on 19 Aug 21. Six further documents have been added to the SDNPA Statutory Planning Register since then viz further objection by Buriton Parish Council and Gethin Morgan, comments by Hampshire Highways, updated Ecological Assessment by Ecosupport Ltd, and a drawing of culvert construction details and installation method statement by Bellamy Roberts. Our present recommendation takes account of these further documents.

2. This submission follows our previous comments submitted formally to the LPA on 22mar21, 25may21 and 19aug21. It should be read with our submissions on 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.

RECOMMENDATION

3. **Objection.** We maintain our view that this application should be refused. The reasons stated in our previous submissions that are still valid and are reinforced by the most recently submitted additional information.

REASONS

4. The updated Ecological Assessment is an excellent piece of work. There are several important points stated in paragraph 3.4 Limitations that much of the work subject to this planning application has already been completed making a baseline ecological assessment difficult to formulate, that some of the trees that require removal for the installation of a culvert across the southern boundary stream have been removed, and that works to existing buildings are already being re-roofed and clad. These works have been carried out without planning permission and appear directed to developing the existing permitted use into a commercial activity contrary to SDNP/15/03090/FUL condition 3 and SDNP/16/05326/FUL condition 2.

5. The Assessment does unfortunately not make any reference to the new Environment Act 2021. This requires that environmental damage caused by new development to be made good. This requirement is reinforced by government recommendations on Biodiversity net gain (BNG). As promoted by the Local Government Association, BNG is an approach to development, and/or land management, that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was beforehand. It is clear from the application that very little or indeed no effort has been made to ensure the protection of the natural environment or to achieve a net gain in

biodiversity. The revers would appear to apply as it appears that past and present works on the application site and under the current planning application have damaged or will damage the natural environment and reduce biodiversity.

6. We fully support the objection by Gethin Morgan. This focuses on the proposed new ramped access to the B2070 and emphasises the major works necessary to achieve a connection safe for pedestrians and cyclists of all ages and vehicles alike. The objection states that neither the original plans for the access road, or the revised plans, show the design of this ramped embankment, its cross section, profile, carriageway gradient (average and maximum), materials (type and volume), or its construction method. and argues that the application should include this information so that a full assessment can be made of the impact of the new junction on the landscape, the ecology of the site and the shared footway/cycleway. It is clear from the objection that the DfT's Local Transport Note LTN 1/20 has not fully been fully considered notwithstanding the comments by HCC Highways.

7. Our sympathy lies with Buriton Parish Council the further objection of which we fully endorse.

8. The further information submitted by Bellamy Roberts on the proposed culvert design and construction, taken together with the major works necessary to introduce a new access onto the B2070 reinforce our fears that, if carried out, the works would mirror those at the new entrance to the industrial park along Winchester Road. They would not only cause a major safety hazard but would permanently blight the countryside character of the B2070 as it enters Petersfield.

9. Taken together, the works themselves, the opening introduction of a commercial activity, the damage to the landscape, the natural environment and the reduction of biodiversity caused by developments on this site are completely unacceptable. Such works as have yet to be carried out should be refused and those works which have already been carried out without planning permission or in contravention of previous permissions should be reversed by planning enforcement.

POLICY

10. In our view, the proposals in this application are contrary to:

- South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19) policies SD1: Sustainable Development; SD2: Ecosystem Services; SD3: Major Development; SD4: Landscape Character; SD5: Design; SD7: Relative Tranquillity; SD9: Biodiversity and Geodiversity; SD11: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows; SD19: Transport and Accessibility; SD20: Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Routes;
- Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15) policies BEP1: Design, character, setting and quality; GAP1: Access for Pedestrians, Cyclists, Mobility Scooter Users; GAP3: Vehicular Traffic; BEP6: Settlement Boundary; BEP7: Sustainability; NEP5: Environmental Setting; NEP7: Biodiversity, Trees and Woodlands; NEP8: Flooding.
- Petersfield Town Design Guide (PTDS10): Guidance 6.3: Design; 6.4: Sustainability; 8.2: Open Spaces and Trees.
- Petersfield Biodiversity Action Plan (PBAP09).

SDNP/21/04757/HOUS | Rear Conservatory. | 7 Dukes Close Petersfield GU32 3QZ.
Applicant: Mrs Brenda Pugh. Agent: Harnam Contract Management. Case Officer: Danielle Willis. Ward: Bell Hill.

No Objection

SDNP/21/05061/HOUS | Retrospective application for outbuilding following demolition of existing shed. | 101 The Causeway Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4LJ. *Applicant: Mrs Sarah Abery. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Bernie Beckett. Ward: Causeway.*

No Objection: The new shed at the bottom of the garden is acceptable. There should be a planning condition that the old shed is to be demolished.

SDNP/21/05067/HOUS | Single storey extension to rear of existing dwelling. | 46 Woodbury Avenue Petersfield GU32 2EB. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs G Duddridge. Agent: Aves Architectural. Case Officer: Bernie Beckett. Ward: Bell Hill.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. Objection.

REASONS

2. The application is for a flat-roofed extension to a fine pitched-roof five-bedroomed two-story detached dwelling located in an area of Petersfield full of character, style and history.
3. The development proposed is shocking. It is certainly not an extension. If it were, it would extend the character and integrity of the existing dwelling. It is an addition which pays no regard to the design and character of the existing well-articulated house or of the area. The design, if one can call it such, is worse than mediocre. It is bland and ugly, devoid of imagination and lacks creativity. It is entirely contrary to national, regional and local policy recommendations or guidance as listed below. There is no reason for policy if it is not adhered to and then particularly in this case when the requirement for the highest standard of design is not reached. The proposed window and door sizes, proportion and scale are out of kilter with the existing.
4. No reference is made to applicable national, regional or local policy, recommendations or guidance as listed below not does it appear any attempt has been made to ensure compliance.
5. No attempt appears to have been made to meet particularly the recommendations of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission (BBBB20) and the requirements of South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19) policy SD31: Extensions to Existing Dwellings, South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Technical Advice Note (TAN): Extensions, SDNPA TAN: Ecosystem Services for Householders, and the SDLP19 Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2.1: Enhancing Local Character and 4.2: Front, Side, and Rear Extensions to Existing Residential Buildings.
6. There are many design options available which would provide the accommodation in accordance with planning requirements but unfortunately this proposal is not one of them. Better-articulated plans and elevations including a good proportioned pitched roof with clay tiling and deep overhangs might be acceptable subject to other requirements being met.

7. No pre-application advice has been sought from the Local Planning Authority (LPA). If it had, the applicant would have been directed to national, regional and local policy, recommendations and guidance with which compliance is required for planning permission to be granted.

8. No information is supplied regarding the sustainability of the design or its suitability in the face of the climate emergency. Extensive glazed openings are proposed and roof overhangs are non-existent. The proposal is expected to comply with SDLP19 policies SD1: Sustainable Development; SD2: Ecosystem Services; SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources; SD50: Sustainable Drainage Systems; and SD51: Renewable Energy.

9. No reference is made to SDLP19 policies SD8: Dark Night Skies or SDNPA TAN: Dark Skies, nor are any mitigation measures included in spite of the large areas of glazing proposed.

10. No reference is made to the Environment Act 2021 despite its requirement that environmental damage caused by new development is to be made good. This requirement is reinforced by government recommendations on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). As promoted by the Local Government Association, BNG is an approach to development, and/or land management, that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was beforehand. It is clear from the application that very little or no effort has been made to ensure protection of the natural environment or to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. It would in contrast appear that past and present works on the application site and under the current planning application have damaged or will damage the natural environment and reduce biodiversity.

POLICY

11. In summary, the policies, recommendations and guidance with which the application should comply include but not exclusively:

- SDLP19 policies: SD1: Sustainable Development; SD5: Design; SD7: Relative Tranquillity; SD8: Dark Night Skies; SD9: Biodiversity; SD11: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows; SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources; SD50: Sustainable Drainage Systems; SD51: Renewable Energy; SD54: Pollution and Air Quality.
- SDNPA SPD guidance on Sustainable Construction and Design Guide.
- SDNPA TANs on Dark Skies; Ecosystem Services (Householder); Extensions and Replacement Dwellings.
- Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15) policies: BEP1: Design, character, setting and quality; BEP7: Sustainability; NEP7: Biodiversity, Trees and Woodlands.
- Petersfield Town Design Guide (PTDS10): Guidance 6.3: Design; 6.4: Sustainability; 8.2: Open Spaces and Trees.
- Petersfield Biodiversity Action Plan (PBAP09).

SDNP/21/05081/HOUS | Detached outbuilding following demolition of existing outbuilding | 18 Station Road Petersfield GU32 3ES. *Applicant: Mr P Donovan. Agent: ALG Planning + Development. Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers. Ward: St Peter's.*

No Objection: The design put forward is considered to add a positive contribution to the street scape of Tilmore Road from which it mainly will be seen. The design language is positive and traditional and within the size restrictions of an earlier not implemented scheme.

SDNP/21/05091/HOUS | Part single, part two storey extension and front Porch canopy | 47 Princes Road Petersfield GU32 3BH. *Applicant: Mr Nick Granger. Agent: Quantrill Architectural Services. Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers. Ward: Bell Hill.*

No comment as several virtually identical applications have recently been approved along Princes Road.

SDNP/21/05122/TPO | Ash (T1) - Reduction of crown. Current height 19 metres - remove 4 metres retaining 15 metres. Overall crown spread of 23 metres - remove upto 5 metres from each aspect retaining an equal and overall crown spread of 14 metres. | 33 Hanger Way Petersfield GU31 4QE. *Applicant: Mr J Gault. Agent: Sequoia Tree Services Ltd. Case Officer: dele Poulton. Ward: Heath.*

No comment

SDNP/21/05147/HOUS | To replace the existing west facing (timber) boundary fence with a brick wall including 1.8m high (brick) piers at 1.8m intervals. Timber - close board fence panels will then be installed between the brick piers. | 2 Woodlark Gardens Petersfield GU31 4RQ. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs Hayward. Agent: JB Architecture Design Ltd. Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: Heath.*

No Objection. Replacement of the existing fence with a brick wall and fence panels should result in an improvement in the street scene.

SDNP/21/05148/FUL | New Detached, Two-storey Dwelling, together with Car Port to serve existing dwelling. | 63 Princes Road Petersfield GU32 3BH. *Applicant: Mr J. Pollard. Agent: Graham J Pretty. Case Officer: Kate McLoughlin. Ward: Bell Hill.*

No Objection. The site is found within the Settlement Policy Boundary for Petersfield. The design appears to be of an acceptable kind but it is recommended that it is revisited to raise the visual quality to better reflect the design standard advocated for in the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan. The house will be partly concealed by vegetation but will have a prominent front elevation facing Princes Road in addition to the more concealed side elevation facing Winchester Road. A greater positive impact on the street scene would be desirable. It is therefore important that the tree/shrub screen facing Winchester Road should be retained, reinforced, and maintained in perpetuity.

SDNP/21/05194/LIS | Listed building consent - External window and door replacement. External repairs to stonework. | The Grange The Causeway Petersfield GU31 4JR. *Applicant: The Grange Surgery. Agent: DHPUK. Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: St Peter's.*

No Objection: No visual change as replacement windows and doors are all of timber sections to essentially the same pattern as existing. The finer detail of necessary repairs to windows and external stonework to be approved by the conservation officer.

SDNP/21/05209/HOUS | Retrospective application dormer to rear roof slope and 2No. 'Velux' style roof lights to front roof slope. | 15 Linnet Close Petersfield GU31 4RF. *Applicant: Ms E Rogers. Agent: Thorns-Young Ltd.. Case Officer: Danielle Willis. Ward: Heath.*

Objection: The flat roof rear dormer is oversized and to an awkward design contrary to the guidelines set out in the SDNP emerging design guidelines for extensions. This application is hence recommended for refusal.

SDNP/21/05416/LDP | Lawful Development Certificate for a Proposed Development - Single storey rear extension. | 31 Gloucester Close, Petersfield GU32 3AX. *Applicant: Mr Mark Gill. Agent: VECA Architects Ltd. Case Officer: Bernie Beckett. Ward: Bell Hill.*

PREAMBLE

1. This application is for the Local Planning Authority to decide if the proposals constitute permitted development not requiring a planning application.
2. Whatever we think of the proposals is therefore irrelevant.

RECOMMENDATION

3. **Neither objection nor support.**

4. We are concerned, however, that if an application for a LDC is successful there may not be any planning control over the design of a development.

5. We suggest that, in this event, it is incumbent upon the applicant and agent to ensure compliance with applicable national, regional and local planning policies, recommendations and guidance.

6. In this case, although the existing property has few redeeming features, we would expect compliance with the recommendations of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission (BBBB20) and the requirements of South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19) policies SD5: Design; SD SD31: Extensions to Existing Dwellings, South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Technical Advice Notes (TANs) on Extensions and Ecosystem Services; and the SDLP19 Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2.1: Enhancing Local Character and 4.2: Front, Side, and Rear Extensions to Existing Residential Buildings. Other policies and guidance are listed below.

7. We would also expect sustainability and climate change issues to be suitably addressed and for the Environment Act 2021 requirement to be taken fully into account that environmental damage caused by new development is to be made good. This requirement is reinforced by

government recommendations on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). As promoted by the Local Government Association, BNG is an approach to development, and/or land management, that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was beforehand.

POLICY

8. Applicable policies, recommendations and guidance with which the application should comply include:

- SDLP19 policies: SD1: Sustainable Development; SD5: Design; SD7: Relative Tranquillity; SD8: Dark Night Skies; SD9: Biodiversity; SD11: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows; SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources; SD50: Sustainable Drainage Systems; SD51: Renewable Energy; SD54: Pollution and Air Quality.
- SDNPA SPD guidance on Sustainable Construction and in the Design Guide.
- SDNPA TANs on Dark Skies; Ecosystem Services (Householder); Extensions and Replacement Dwellings.
- Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15) policies: BEP1: Design, character, setting and quality; BEP7: Sustainability; NEP7: Biodiversity, Trees and Woodlands.
- Petersfield Town Design Guide (PTDS10): Guidance 6.3: Design; 6.4: Sustainability; 8.2: Open Spaces and Trees.
- Petersfield Biodiversity Action Plan (PBAP09).

PLEASE NOTE: One of our trustees has a pecuniary interest in this application and has therefore played no part in the preparation of these comments.

SDNP/21/05462/PNTEL | 10 Metre light pole | Opp 23 Garage Cottages Petersfield Hampshire GU32 3DJ. *Applicant: British Telecommunications PLC. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Susie Ralston. Ward: Bell Hill.*

(Determined on 16nov21 by EHDC: Objection)

SDNP/21/05476/TCA | Acer Negindo (Box Elder) - Reduce canopy height by 2 metres and width by 4 metres, leaving a canopy height of 6 metres and width of 5 metres. Remove deadwood and diseased wood where necessary. | 4 North Road Petersfield Hampshire GU32 2AX. *Applicant: Ms Angela Bryars. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Adele Poulton. Ward: St Peter's.*

SDNP/21/05526/TCA | Fir Tree - Light prune (for cutting points see photograph). | 20 Chapel Street Petersfield GU32 3DZ. *Applicant: Mr Terence White. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Adele Poulton. Ward: St Peter's.*

SDNP/21/04534/HOUS | Construction of attached garden store to the rear of the existing detached garage with timber cladding (Description amended 03/11/2021) | 21 Drove Road Petersfield GU31 4GA. *Applicant: Mr C Spencer. Agent: Engineering Architecture Ltd. Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers. Ward: Causeway.*

No comment as PTC have already submitted their response of no objection

SDNP/21/05588/FUL | Construction of footpath and associated works | Land South of Test Close and North of Marsh Close Petersfield Hampshire. *Applicant: Mr Dave Buczynskyj. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Jessica Riches. Ward: Causeway.*

PREAMBLE

1. SDNPA has called this application infor its own determination because the proposal relates to previously approved planning application SDNP/15/01296/FUL which was determined by SDNPA.

RECOMMENDATION

2. Objection.

REASONS

3. Approval for application SDNP/15/01296/FUL was granted on 09feb16 accpanied by a s106 agreement with the landowner.

4. According to the Planning Statement accompanying the present application, the previously approved plans showed a footpath connection in the north east corner of the site, adjacent to plot 64, to Test Close but that technical issues prevent the footpath being located as approved. The current application proposes an alternative location. No description of the technical issues generating the footpath relocation is provided.

5. The proposed new location of the footpath would affect a number of mature trees covered by TPO (EH244)91 but the arboricultural reports submitted argue that these trees would not be affected so long as a section of the footpath within the root protection zone were to be constructed with a 'no-dig' surface by laying a cellular confinement system (or similar) over existing ground levels. It is worth noting that several of the reports were written 10 years or more ago.

6. The 'no-dig' proposal is open to doubt. It should be assessed by SDNPA Arboricultural and Landscape officers before any determination is made.

7. Each end of the 'no-dig' section of the footpath - or a bridge will be ramped. This is shown on Elluc Projects accompanying construction drawing ELL-21178-PER-B-1000A. No incline is shown. This should be at a maximum of 1:20 to accommodate pedestrian, cyclist and wheelchair and pushchair movement. Drawing ELL-21178-PER-B-1000A is described in its notes as a 'General Arrangement' drawing 'subject to the Engineers' approval to include the structural integrity of the culvert, stability and flotation elements'. Further the drawing notes state that 'All existing details, dimensions, features and levels shown on this drawing are for guidance only ..'.

8. We do not understand why a bridge like that already constructed on the housing estate should not be used instead of the 'no-dig' proposal. Neither do we understand why a culvert is considered necessary. A bridge would negate such a necessity/

9. We cannot find the width of the proposed footpath in the application documents. It should be at least 2.4m to accommodate passing pedestrians, cyclists and wheelchair and pushchair users.

10. No reference is made to the Environment Act 2021 despite its requirement that environmental damage caused by new development is to be made good. This requirement is reinforced by government recommendations on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) promoted by the Local Government Association. BNG is an approach to development and/or land management that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was beforehand. It appears from the application that very little or no effort has been made to protect the natural environment or to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.

POLICY

11. Applicable policy, recommendation and guidance with which this application proposals are expected to comply is included in the following:

- South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19) policies SD1: Sustainable Development; SD2: Ecosystem Services; SD4: Landscape Character; SD5: Design; SD9: Biodiversity; SD11: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows; SD17: Protection of the Water Environment; SD19: Transport and Accessibility; SD20: Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Routes; SD21: Public Realm, Highway Design and Public Art; SD45: Green Infrastructure; SD46: Provision and Protection of Open Space; SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources; SD49: Flood Risk Management; SD50: Sustainable Drainage Systems.

- SDNPA Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) on Sustainable Construction and Design.

- Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan (PNP15) policies HP5: Infrastructure; HP8: Quality and layout; BEP1: Design, character, setting and quality; BEP7: Sustainability; GAP1: Access for Pedestrians, Cyclists, Mobility Scooter Users; NEP1: Green Infrastructure and Open Spaces; NEP2: Green Network; NEP5: Environmental Setting; NEP7: Biodiversity, Trees and Woodlands; NEP8: Flooding;

- Petersfield Town Design Statement (PTDS10) guidance 5.0 Setting, Character and Landscape; 6.3 Traditional Local Design; 6.4 Sustainable Building Design; 7.7 Housing; 7.8 Countryside; 8.0 Natural Environment; 9.0 Movement.

- Petersfield Biodiversity Action Plan (PBAP09).

<END>