

Petersfield Society Comments on Planning Applications to be considered by Petersfield Town Council Planning Committee at its video meeting starting at 18:30hrs on Tuesday 21 December 2021.

SDNP/21/02864/CND | Variation of Condition 17 of permission SDNP/53228 (on EHDC website) to allow the building to be used for mixed commercial uses captured by the new use class E (additional information (Highways Technical Notes) received on 23/08/2021) (additional information received 02/12/2021) | Buckmore Studios Beckham Lane Petersfield GU32 3BU. *Applicant: Mr N Armitage. Agent: Advoco Planning Ltd. EHDC Case Officer: Matthew Harding. Ward: Bell Hill.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. Objection unless confirmation is included in the application that vehicular access to the site would be solely from the new access from the Premier Inn site and not along Beckham Lane.

REASONING

2. We objected to this application previously on the grounds that Beckham Lane should not be used for vehicular access to the site.

3. We support the applicant's proposals to limit the 'Class E' uses on the site. However, our concerns about possible use of Beckham Lane for vehicular access still hold. This is a narrow lane, and also a well-used public footpath, not suited as a vehicular access to an Employment Area.

POLICY

4. Unless the vehicular access is confirmed as solely from the Premier Inn site and not from Beckham Lane, the application proposals are contrary to the relevant provisions of South Downs Local Plan policies SD19: Transport and Accessibility, SD20: Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Routes, and SD21: Public Realm, Highway Design and Public Art.

SDNP/21/03545/OUT | Outline planning application for up to 10 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. SDNPA Case Officer: Rafa Grosso Macpherson. Ward: Not listed.*

PREAMBLE

1. Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15) reserved two sites for self-build affordable homes only: Site H2 for 101 dwellings on land north of Buckmore Farm and west of Bell Hill and Site H11 for 11 dwellings on land north of Reservoir Lane. This outline application concerns the latter.

2. PNP15 includes 9 pages of community intent, policy, recommendation, description and references about self-build housing. Its Housing Policy HP7: Custom and self-build homes provides that:

- a) Planning permission to 'set out' sites H2 and H11 as individual or collections of serviced plots together with the associated supporting infrastructure, will be granted,
- b) Planning permission for either individual self-build or custom build dwellings on plots within sites H2 and H11 submitted by an individual, by a builder or a developer acting on behalf of an individual, or by a community group of individuals such as a Community Land Trust, will be considered favourably.
- c) Planning permission for a self-build dwelling will only be granted for applicants who:

i. Demonstrate that they have a local connection; and

ii. Undertake in a section 106 agreement that the occupancy of the property will be restricted to people with a local connection in perpetuity; and

iii. Undertake in a section 106 agreement that they will live in the property as their main residence once it is complete; and

iv. Undertake in a section 106 agreement that once the development has commenced, they will complete the building of the dwelling within 2 years.

3. Design Principles identified by PNP15 as applicable to Site 11 include the retention of the existing residential character of detached dwellings on larger plots.

4. Annex C of PNP15 includes in its section 'Affordable Homes for Local People': Self-build costs can be as low as £1100 per square metre, which would see a starter home of around 80m² costing £88,000 to build. Add on the cost of the plot – which, if administered by a Community Land Trust could be less than £100,000, and it is clear that self-build homes would be significantly more affordable than conventional developer-built homes. (2015 costs).

5. The application has been 'called-in' by South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) which as Local Planning Authority (LPA) will make the determination itself.

6. PNP15 and South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19) include a number of other policies with which all development in Petersfield is subject. These include for the highest standard of design, sustainability in the face of the climate emergency, and biodiversity.

RECOMMENDATION

7. Principle supported but not the detail. Further amendment is recommended.

REASONING

8. There are three restraints upon this development: Cost, design and affordability. The first two conspire against the third. Inflation and design requirements reduce affordability. This has affected the overriding benefit of self-build.

9. The Housing Enabling Officer confirms 'a clear need for more affordable housing in the area' but raises substantial difficulties in the proposals linked to PNP15 policy HP7.

10. The Affordable Housing Statement confirms that only 50% of the dwellings will be affordable homes, consisting of 2no 2-bedroom houses at an affordable rent and 3no 3-bedroom houses to be sold at no more than of 70% of the market value. A resale covenant will ensure this discount is applied in perpetuity to guarantee the homes remain affordable for future purchasers.

11. Notwithstanding the PNP15 requirement for all self-build homes to be affordable, 50% of the dwellings ie 4no 4-bedroom detached houses and 1no 3- bedroom detached house cannot by any reasonable stretch of the imagination be considered affordable. As the Housing Enabling Officer states 'the market value will make them unaffordable for those on Hampshire Home Choice, or the Help to Buy register.

12. Failure of the scheme to meet affordable policy requirements is extremely disappointing especially after 5 years of work by the Petersfield Community Land Trust and its preceding Steering Group. The expectation of Petersfield Community was that Sites H2 and H11 would provide affordable homes for those those with a local connection in Petersfield who cannot afford to buy or rent market housing. This has not been achieved.

13. The current site layout is a big improvement on previous proposals. We question the benefit, however, of shared use access roads, minimal tree planting and small common 'green areas' all of which could easily be extended and improved.

14. The Design Code is, we believe, unduly restrictive in the name of 'consistency'. Many of the materials proposed are unduly expensive. We see no reason why building construction materials should not include less expensive and more sustainable materials while still achieving the highest standard of design.

15. The Design Code covers little in the way of sustainability and serious energy efficiency. All new development is required to be sustainable. Little information is provided that the proposed dwellings would address the challenge of climate change and be sufficiently sustainable for the 21st century or that they would meet the requirements of SDLP19 policies SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources; SD50: Sustainable Drainage Systems; SD51: Renewable Energy, or similar policy requirements in PNP15, or guidance in PTDS10. Little evidence is provided that the proposed dwellings will be heavily insulated with fireproof and waterproof materials such as stone wool, that solar hot water collectors, solar PV arrays, heat pumps or heat exchangers with their housings are proposed or that the external envelopes are designed to shed excessive rain or insulate against excessive heat.

16. SDLP19 policy SD9: Biodiversity applies. No evidence is provided on how its requirements will be met.

17. Compliance is essential with the provisions of the Environment Act 2021 s98 and Schedule 14: Biodiversity gain as condition of planning permission. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is supported by the Local Authority Association. It aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state of no less than 10% than it was before works are carried out.

18. No evidence including for example the integration of bat or bird boxes into brick/ stone walls or tile/timber wall cladding or roofing is proposed. This is an unfortunate omission. For information on types of bat and bird boxes available see 'Designing for Biodiversity: A technical guide for new and existing buildings' by Gunnell, Murphy and Williams published by RIBA Publishing supported by the Bat Conservation Trust, RSPB, Buglife, Action for Swifts, The Barn Owl Trust, Swift Conservation and GreenSpec.

19. HCC Ecologist raises a number of unaddressed questions about protected wildlife including reptiles and dormice consequent upon the findings of the ecological surveys. These should be answered in the outline application rather than left to conditions.

POLICY

20. To the extent they are applicable to this outline application, all relevant policies, recommendations and guidance in national, regional and local policies, recommendations and guidance should be met. These include within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF21), National Design Guide (NDG21), South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19), South Downs Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), South Downs Technical Advice Notes (TANs), Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15), Petersfield Town Design Statement (PTSD10), Petersfield Biodiversity Action Plan.

SDNP/21/05461/LDP | Lawful Development Certificate for a Proposed development - Insertion of rooflights to the front and rear elevations to facilitate the conversion of an existing loft space to habitable accommodation. | 20 Bannerman Road Petersfield GU32 2HQ. *Applicant: Mr Sanders. Agent: Beckmann Architecture Ltd. EHDC Case Officer: Kate McLoughlin. Ward: St Peter's.*

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.

REASONING

4. We are concerned, however, that if the application for a Lawful Development Certificate is successful there may not be any planning control over the design of the proposals.

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 we would expect the proposals to comply with policies on design, including the highest standards of layout, detail, materials, proportion, scale, integrity, neighbourliness, on dark night skies, and on sustainability in the face of climate change. For appropriate policies, recommendations and guidance see paragraph 8 below.

7. Compliance is essential with the provisions of the Environment Act 2021 s98 and Schedule 14: Biodiversity gain as condition of planning permission. Supported by the Local Authority Association, Biodiversity Net Gain aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state of no less than 10% than it was before development works are carried out. We would expect, for example, the integration of bat or bird boxes into brick walls or tile cladding to be proposed but can find no evidence that they are. For information on types of bat and bird boxes available see 'Designing for Biodiversity: A technical guide for new and existing buildings' by Gunnell, Murphy and Williams published by RIBA Publishing supported by the Bat Conservation Trust, RSPB, Buglife, Action for Swifts, The Barn Owl Trust, Swift Conservation and GreenSpec. Additionally we would expect the gardens of properties for which works are proposed to be enhanced by the addition of trees where possible and bee-loving bushes and plants. For climate resistant tree species see 'Petersfield's Trees: their importance and value' (<https://petersfieldsociety.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Petersfield-iTree-survey-download.pdf>).

POLICY

8. Applicable policies, recommendations and guidance with which the proposals are expected to 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; and SD51: Renewable Energy

..

- SDNPA Supplementary Planning Documents on Sustainable Construction and Design.

- SDNPA Technical Advice Notes on Dark Skies; Ecosystem Services (Householder); and Extensions.

- 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/21/05552/HOUS | To add 1.1m of fencing on top of an existing low front garden wall, taking the overall height up to 1.9m, addition of a garden gate and fence between our front door and the neighbours front door again keeping the height up to 1.9m. | 10 Drove Road Petersfield GU31 4GA. *Applicant: Mr Keegan Campbell and Miss Charlotte Coumbe. Agent: None listed. EHDC Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers. Ward: Causeway.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. Objection.

REASONING

2. The application contains no explanation or reason as to why this particular section of fence needs to be 1.9M high rather than the standard 1.8M.

3. Approval of this application would set an undesirable implied approval of garden fences of that height covering the entire new housing estate in question and for other parts of Petersfield.

4. EHDC refused application SDNP/17/01038/FUL on 18may17 for a fence of similar height on the basis that by virtue of its height, design, visual appearance the fence would constitute a harsh and visually obtrusive feature.

5. We fully expect EHDC to take the same approach on this current application.

SDNP/21/05705/FUL | Replacement of external windows, external stone work and render repairs | The Grange The Causeway Petersfield GU31 4JR. *Applicant: The Grange Surgery. Agent: DHPUK. EHDC Case Officer: Luke Turner. Ward: Causeway.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. Objection.

REASONING

2. The principle of the application is likely to be acceptable. However, there is a significant lack of detail making a proper assessment impossible.

3. We support the comments made by the Conservation Officer whereby further detail is requested before the application can be properly considered and approved.

SDNP/21/05726/HOUS | Demolish existing single-storey side extension on both sides due to poor construction and poor thermal efficiency. Construct new side extension, Single storey, and two-storey to replace the existing, following demolition of existing single-storey rear conservatory and built existing store, new single storey extension to rationalize the ground floor living areas, replace the existing utility with new construction and provide a larger ground floor WC. Front porch extension. Change from window to bay window. Changes to fenestration to upgrade the windows and new electric sliding gate to front driveway entrance with sensor/remote control. | 64A The Causeway Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4JS. *Applicant: Mr & Mrs Farhall. Agent: Hampshire Design Consultancy Ltd.. EHDC Case Officer: Rosie Virgo. Ward: Causeway.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. Objection unless amended.

REASONING

2. 64A The Causeway is currently not an attractive building. The proposed changes will bring a better balance to the elevations apart from possibly the oversized ground floor rear bi-folding doors facing the garden.

3. It is suggested that the new window frames would be either uPVC or powder-coated aluminium. The aluminium option is both more attractive and sustainable as aluminium would be of a slimmer profile, contains lower embedded energy and is more suited to recycling. uPVC frames should only be used if they are manufactured using recycled plastic material.

4. The entrance gate should be set back as stipulated by the HCC Roads and Traffic Engineer.

5. The applicant is asked to consider the introduction of some greenery and small trees to the front garden to assist with local endeavours to mitigate climate change and also soften the street scene appearance.

6. Subject to the above changes we should be able to change our recommendation from objection to support.

SDNP/21/06010/PNTEL | Installation of 1 x wooden pole | Outside White Rose Station Road Petersfield Hampshire. *Applicant: BT Openreach Ltd. Agent: None listed. EHDC Case Officer: Rosie Virgo. Ward: Bell Hill.*

This application was determined on 20dec21.

SDNP/21/06050/PNTEL | Installation of 1 wooden pole for Broadband communications | Outside 18 Oaklands Road Petersfield Hampshire. *Applicant: BT Openreach Ltd. Agent: None listed. EHDC Case Officer: Kate McLoughlin. Ward: Bell Hill.*

PREAMBLE

1. We understand that this is not a planning application, but a 'Notification' under Regulation 5 of the Electronic Code advising the Local Planning Authority that work will commence within one month.
2. The pole concerned would be erected on Oaklands Road at the corner of Stanton Road.

RECOMMENDATION

3. Objection. Underground communication cables should be installed instead.

REASONING

4. We understand from an Openreach engineer that present notifications for pole installations result from the town-wide installation of glass fibre cables and wires consequent upon society's demand for faster telecommunications.
5. We also understand that Openreach would prefer to install all glass fibre cables underground for security reasons but that some tunnels are blocked resulting in the need to install overhead wires.
6. We should prefer existing tunnels to be unblocked where possible rather than for overhead wires to be used.
7. Poles are not the end of the matter. They 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.
8. Petersfield community worked very hard in the past to achieve the removal of overhead wires in the town. Street 'clutter' including 9 or 10m high wood telecommunication poles and overhead wires will damage the streetscape and negate previous efforts to enhance the quality and character of the town.

<END>