

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 22 February 2022.

SDNP/21/06025/ADV | Black painted 'A' Frame board with white hand written information including: name of shop 'Juniper', map showing location of shop and examples of goods sold. Sign to be displayed in Hobbs Lane. | 33 Lavant Street Petersfield GU32 3EL. *Applicant: Mrs Victoria Primrose. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers (EHDC). Ward: St Peter's.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. Objection.

REASONS

2. On 19 Nov 15 the people of Petersfield voted by referendum for Petersfield to become more pedestrian and cycle friendly, that is to say, a more 'walkable' town. Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan was 'made' (adopted) by South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), the Local Planning Authority (LPA), in January 2016.

3. One of the visions for the town centre was to create a shared space environment from the railway station, down Lavant Street, along Chapel Street through The Square and down The High Street to the war memorial. This town 'spine' was recognised to comprise the main shopping streets. The project has yet to be implemented. In the meantime, pedestrians and vehicles remain segregated with pedestrian use restricted to pavements.

4. Most pavements in Petersfield are too narrow for pedestrians and wheelchair/pushchair users to pass without moving into the road. Any further restrictions to the width of pavements and footways would be unacceptable.

5. A-boards do just this by obstructing the free flow of pedestrians and wheelchair/pushchair users along pavements and footways. A-boards should not obstruct footways. It appears that the one proposed would do so. Not only are they dangerous for the poorly sighted but they obstruct the 'free flow' of foot traffic, wheelchairs and pushchairs.

6. Petersfield town centre is littered with A-boards. The issue is significant. Worst of all is the clutch of A-boards in The Square within the Conservation Area opposite Rams Walk. Petersfield Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP17) notes that a plethora of A-boards has become an obstacle to pedestrian movement in the town.

7. The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (section 224) creates an offence of displaying an advertisement without consent. This includes A-boards.

8. The applicant in this case is to be congratulated for submitting a proposal for approval to the LPA in accordance with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 as amended.

9. South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19) Policy SD53: Advertisements provides that advertisements should have no harmful impact on public safety.

10. The location of the A-board proposed is at the foot of the stairs to flats on the south side of Hobbs Lane, some distance away from the location of the shop in Lavant Street it would be designed to serve. If the location proposed were to be on the forecourt of the 'Juniper' shop we would not have an objection.

SDNP/21/06328/HOUS | Single storey side/rear extension. | 4 Penns Road Petersfield GU32 2EN.
Applicant: Mr C Hilton. Agent: Thorns-Young Ltd. Case Officer: Bernie Beckett (EHDC). Ward: St Peter's.

RECOMMENDATION

1. **No Objection.**

REASONS

2. This planning application is for a small rear infill extension in a concealed space between the standard terraced house rear projection and the neighbours conservatory.
3. The proposed flat roof is probably in this case justified to ensure no loss of light enjoyed by the glass roof on the other side of the boundary.
4. There is question mark hanging over the boundary treatment between extension and conservatory as it is not shown on the plans.
5. The applicant should in addition be asked to consider a visually superior flat roof finish. The torched-on felt solution is undesirable. A lead lookalike single plywood membrane would be much preferred. The latter is visually superior and more sustainable in both manufacture and maintenance.

SDNP/21/06371/FUL | Retrospective application for Replacement External Plant Equipment behind New College Building | Churchers College Ramshill Petersfield GU31 4AS. *Applicant: Churcher's College. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Rosie Virgo (EHDC). Ward: St Peter's.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. **Neither Support nor Objection**

REASONS

2. It is unfortunate that no pre-application advice was sought from the Local Planning Authority for this second retrospective application.
3. The application is submitted following the withdrawal on 11nov21 of retrospective application SDNP/21/03698/FUL apparently to include data on noise levels from replacement external plant equipment installed outside the Churcher's New College Building located on the south-east side of the B2070 facing dwellings 38, 40 and 42 on the north-west side of the B2070 some 40m away.
4. A Plant Noise Impact Assessment was undertaken in accordance with BS4142:2014+A1:2019 on 14/15dec21 by Environmental Equipment Corporation Ltd the results of which are contained and analysed in a report dated 15dec21.
5. The report states that the noise impact at the closest most sensitive location, the front window of the dwelling at 40 Ramshill, is calculated to have a low or very low impact based on a worst case scenario of all equipment operating simultaneously at maximum duty.
6. The report states that 'assessing the site in accordance with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework has shown that the resultant noise levels would be below the level at which no effects are observed to occur during standard daytime operations' and concludes that 'On the basis of this assessment, it is considered that noise does not pose a material constraint to the operation of the existing condenser units'.

7. We are not acoustic experts. We are unable able to assess or ratify the conclusions of the report. Consequently we are unable to recommend approval or refusal of this application. This is for the LPA's Environmental Health Officer working closely with the Case Officer having regard to application SDNP/21/03698/FUL and the data and conclusions now submitted.

8. Having said that, we support the objection from the occupant of 40 Ramshill to application SDNP/21/03698/FUL particularly concerning the absence of noise barrier and soundproofing engineering which we would expect the applicant to install to protect the amenity of local residents.

SDNP/21/06429/HOUS | Single storey rear extension, porch infill extension, partial garage conversion, change of use and extension. | 71 Marden Way Petersfield GU31 4PW. *Applicant: Mrs Rebecca Liedtke. Agent: VECA Architects Ltd. Case Officer: Ashton Carruthers (EHDC). Ward: St Peter's.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. **Objection.**

REASONS

2. We do not object to the principle of the proposed development but we are very disappointed that the extensions are designed with flat roofs, notwithstanding that both will be planted with Sedum.
3. The flat roofs proposed are contrary to the provisions of the draft South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19) SPD: 'The Design Guide' and the SDLP19 Technical Advice Note 'Extensions and Replacement Dwellings'.
4. Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan Policy BEP1 mandates the highest standard of design. SDLP19 Policy SD5: Design mandates a landscaped approach and respect for the local character through sensitive and high quality design that makes a positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposals do not appear to do this. Hence our objection.

Note that one of our trustees has a pecuniary interest in thois application and has therefore played no part in the preparation of these comments.

SDNP/21/06431/FUL | Change of use and redevelopment of the site to provide a recharge centre for electrically powered vehicles, with control and battery room and secure area for the delivery and storage of Bio Gas. Up to 60 eco-lodges (Use Class C1), and engineering work to create an earth sheltered block comprising up to 1,330m2 of tunnel floor space for a flexible mix of uses within classes C1 and E(a)(b)(c). The formation of a two-way entrance off the B2070, the laying of a perimeter vehicular access road, with link roads, cycle tracks, and areas of hardstanding to provide up to 127 parking spaces. Engineering work for the purpose of landscaping and operations to install drainage infrastructure. | Land North of A3 Junction The Causeway Petersfield Hampshire. *Applicant: Re-Charge One A3. Agent: Fredrick Adam Ltd. Case Officer: Richard Ferguson (SDNPA). Ward: Buriton & East Meon Ward.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. **Strong Objection.**

REASONS

2. The ideas put forward in this planning application are premature in terms of local consultation on community infrastructure planning and completely lacking analysis of how existing resources within settlement boundaries can be utilised better and transformed to reflect the increased use of Electric Vehicles.

3. This proposal is in essence for a new trunk road service station along the A3 that falls outside the framework set out in the SDNP Local Plan, Buriton Village Design Statement and the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan.
4. The reason for putting it forward is based on sustainable i.e. green infrastructure arguments but it is not clear how people in Petersfield will benefit.
5. There is extensive parking included in the scheme in addition to shops, eateries and accommodation.
6. The positive is that it does raise the question for debate of how to deal with the inevitable changes to electric vehicle charging.
7. The Buriton Parish objection sets out a comprehensive set of planning policy objections to this application that would appear relevant.
8. We are constantly looking for opportunities and arguments for the reuse of brownfield sites and the reuse of our existing resources so we must convince developers to think harder about the sustainable alternatives for using what we have got rather than going for the easy option of building on green field land.
9. There are presently three service stations within the Petersfield settlement boundary and it is necessary to establish how these can be best transformed as the sale of fossil fuel dwindles otherwise they will just end up as empty plots.
10. There are numerous public car parks within Petersfield that easily can be much better provided with EV charging points. These are within easy pedestrian reach of all local shops and restaurants.
11. Do we need shops selling cars, bicycles and other goods out in a countryside location that one has to drive to and in direct competition with the Petersfield town centre?
12. The Buriton slip roads are notorious for being short and hence accident prone - in particular the one joining in a north bound direction. Do we need more traffic on these? Why is this particular junction better than the next one?
13. It is questionable if the numerous solar panels included are as invisible from QE Park and Butser Hill as suggested. These are glass surfaces that do reflect light.
14. Dark skies adjusted lighting is said to be included but they will still be visible from Butser Hill. Vehicles driving in the dark will surely have their headlight on even when driving within the proposed centre.
15. Do we need 40 eco-lodges for letting? Is it not possible to provide these, if needed, within the settlement boundaries of Petersfield and Buriton?
16. There is no analysis fully supporting this proposal and comparing what is presently available.
17. We need a comprehensive review of how EV charging locations are to be distributed within the National Park and indeed if at all required. The South Downs Local Plan needs to be updated in this respect.

SDNP/21/06451/HOUS | Redistribution of flat-roof ground floor floorspace to pitched-roof first-floorspace (i.e. reducing overall house footprint and removing all flat-roof). Large underground rainwater collection tank. Adding solar panels in principle. Internal Works. | 9 Eastlake Close Petersfield GU31 4ES. *Applicant: Ivan Huntington-Thresher. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Bernie Beckett (EHDC). Ward: Heath.*

RECOMMENDATION

1. **No objection subject to amendment.**

REASONS

2. It appears this application, which is very well presented, meets policy requirements. The submitted Ecosystem Service Plan and Additional Supporting Statement are excellent and accord with policy.

3. We are concerned to note that uPVC or powder-coated aluminium door and window frames are proposed. uPVC a highly unsustainable material and does not meet the requirements of South Downs Local Plan (SDLP19) policy SD48: Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources. Energy used in the manufacture of uPVC (embodied energy) has been shown to be as high as 2224 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. We see no reason why door and window framing should not be manufactured from powder-coated aluminium framing.

4. We are pleased to note the applicant's concern about trees nearby trees. We suggest the proposed building works are carried out in accordance with British Standard "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction to Construction - Recommendations" (BS 5837) (2012) which details the steps that should be taken to ensure that trees are appropriately and successfully retained when a development takes place.

5. These amendments could be included as conditions in any planning permission. The applicant may wish, however, to amend the application instead.

SDNP/22/00309/TPO | Oak (T1) - Reduce lowest overhanging branches from 7m to 4m back to specific growth point to maintain size. Remove deadwood. (see photographs) | 115 Sussex Road Petersfield GU31 4LB. *Applicant: Mr Derek William Attley. Agent: MSP Tree Care. Case Officer: Adele Poulton (EHDC). Ward: Heath.*

We have no comments to make at this stage.

SDNP/22/00611/PRE | Development proposal for Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan allocation reference H7 'Land west of The Causeway', comprising 56 market and affordable dwellings, the creation of a new access from The Causeway and associated Site-wide landscaping. | Land West of The Causeway The rear of No. 169 The Causeway, Petersfield. GU31 4LN. *Applicant: Thakeham Homes Ltd. Agent: None listed. Case Officer: Steven Lewis (SDNPA?). Ward: Causeway..*

RECOMMENDATION

1. Neither Support nor Objection

REASONS

2. This is a Pre-Application submission to the Local Planning Authority for an opinion as to whether the proposal would meet policy and stand a chance of permission.

3. The site of the proposed development is identified in Housing Policy HP1 and Table 1 of Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP15) for 64 dwellings at an approximate density of 28 dwellings per hectare. Policy HP1 holds that planning permission will be granted for new residential development on the sites set out in Table 1 and, as detailed in Section 11, provided that the proposals conform to the design principles and delivery considerations set out in Section 12 and meet the requirements set out in other appropriate policies of this Plan and the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy.

4. Section 11 of PNP15 identifies the sites including H7 for new housing. Section 12 provides under 12.3 a Site H4 and H7 Design Framework – Land south of Larcombe Road and west of the Causeway.

5. Design Principles for both H4 and H7 are that development proposals should:

- Have a well-connected internal street environment with multiple connections to the Causeway and into the existing neighbourhood at Test Close and Larcombe Road.
- Provide frontage to the playing fields and landscape beyond.
- Enable pedestrian access through the development and to the landscape beyond.
- The design of roads to include shared surface, planting and other traffic calming measures should help to prevent access roads being used as short cuts.
- Protect and enhance Stanbridge Stream as part of the development.

6. Delivery considerations for both H4 and H7 are:

- The development should contribute to improving the existing play and sports facilities at Paddock Way.
- Traffic implications must be carefully considered
- The setting of the listed building at 211 Causeway Road should be respected
- Provision of a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, as advised by Southern Water. Additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate development in this location.
- See also proposed mitigation measures detailed at Appendix G of the Sustainability Appraisal.
- Mineral Resource information will be required prior to development (see section 12.2).

7. We are encouraged to note the thoroughness of the application statements and very much hope that the applicants will ensure the proposed designs incorporate the ambitions of the developers, the Local Planning Authority and the community as represented in the Neighbourhood Plan.

<END>