



Petworth Town Council

The Old Bakery, Golden Square,
Petworth,
West Sussex, GU28 0AP

Petworth Town Clerk
clerk@petworth-tc.gov.uk

Tel: 01798 344883

A MEETING OF THE HIGHWAYS, TRAFFIC AND PLANNING COMMITTEE TOOK PLACE ON WEDNESDAY 9TH JUNE 2021 AT PETWORTH TOWN COUNCIL, THE OLD BAKERY, GOLDEN SQUARE, PETWORTH & VIA VIDEO CONFERENCING, COMMENCING AT 7PM

MINUTES

PRESENT: S Atkins (Chair), C Sproson, C Kemp, P Hewlett, D Burden, E Singleton, J Fynes, J Law, S Frossard, L Smith (Clerk), P Atkins, B Crozier, C Wood & S Sweeney (all for agenda item 6) and five members of the public.

52/21 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman requested that mobile phones should be turned off. He advised that as it was the first meeting after the Town Council's Annual Meeting, the committee needed to elect a Chairman and Vice-Chairman. Under the proposal of Cllr Singleton, seconded by Cllr Hewlett, it was unanimously resolved to elect Cllr Atkins as the Chairman of the committee. Under the proposal of Cllr Hewlett, seconded by Cllr Sproson, it was unanimously resolved to elect Cllr Law as the Vice-Chairman of the committee.

53/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

54/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

55/21 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes from the Planning Meeting on 12th May 2021 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record of the meeting. Proposed by Cllr Atkins, seconded by Cllr Fynes & unanimously approved.

56/21 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MEETING

None.

57/21 SQUARE FIELD PRESENTATION

Cllr Atkins advised that the developers of the Square Field site were in attendance to provide those present with an update on their plans. He reported that a pre application which included meetings with the Town Council and the South Downs National Park Authority had taken place as had a public consultation.

Mr P Atkins reported that following their last presentation to the committee, they had received general sign off from South Downs National Park Authority on the final masterplan layout and were commissioning detailed technical studies to test and support the scheme before working up the full planning application in July.

Mr C Wood provided a presentation of the revised scheme (referred to as option C) and advised that it was not a current application but a presentation of the revised scheme following on from their previous pre application submission. He reported that areas the South Downs National Park Authority requested they address for the scheme were as follows:

1. The Green is welcomed as a design principle and therefore further consideration needs to be given to its size, shape and use by different parts of the new residential community. It was also noted by South Downs that The Central Green might benefit from more lawn and to- try and maximise the size, detail how it will be landscaped and designed for multiple use?
2. 20mph pedestrian friendly road hierarchy and pedestrian/vehicular street design elements should be pulled out and explained as Members will welcome and appreciate attention to detail and ideas.
 - C. Detailed design details will be critical to ensure that this aspect of the scheme works
 - D. Arrival space needs a small study as looks tight (off hammerhead) and one needs to tie our scheme Into Rotherlea. Reduce speed as you enter or approach the site (20mph)
 - E. If 'lost' hammerhead' might be subsumed as part of the Littlecote design. RT had no issue with design changes to this adjoining area and suggested that this will require discussion/agreement with County as landowner/highway authority. This may require discussion and agreement with Alex Pringle County Highways Design Officer.
3. Parking strategy needs to be further explained. Nice mix of off street and garages.
4. The type and character that is proposed for house and frontages requires some further thought – formal or informal, design and style of boundary fencing and planting etc.
5. South-East change to estate layout is interesting and needs further explanation and rationale by way of local 'character' study within DAS.
 - A. Explain why informality has adopted and localized benefits.
 - B. Explain design rationale and what trying to achieve, creating local character that 'frames' and creates informality to the ecology/landscape pond area.
6. Buildings 1,2 and 3 are located forward of Rotherlea' s building line, the two need to tie together from a streetscape perspective.
7. Orientation of units, 37, 38, and 39 appear to be a little 'tight' with narrow units. Why have they been orientated that way – might be better with gable fonts - create further visual interest to the scheme/buildings.

Mr C Wood presented how the revised scheme addressed the issues outlined above and advised that the benefits of the new scheme and the changes made were as follows;

- A. Entrance area re-configured and arrival space re-considered
- B. Plots 1 & 2 moved onto same alignment as the Rotherlea frontage
- C. Central Green space size increased and surrounding dwellings re-configured
- D. Road hierarchy reviewed and updated
- E. Plots 25 & 26 rotated slightly to signal a change in the street pattern in South East corner

Cllr Atkins thanked the developers for their presentation and advised that those members of the public present wanted to make representations regarding the Square Field development. He asked Mr P Atkins to pre-empt the concerns the public had regarding access to the access to the Square Field site and its connection to the adjacent Rotherlea development.

Mr P Atkins reported that four additional parking spaces had been included in the scheme, ensuring that the parking provided will be at the top end of the required standard. He advised that the Transport Statement for the development had been accepted in principle by West Sussex County Council and that it is felt enough parking would be provided for residents and visitors.

Mr P Atkins reported that the development would provide 40% of affordable housing despite the neighbouring Rotherlea development scheduled to deliver 100% affordable housing.

Cllr Atkins asked if there was a connection between the Square Field and Rotherlea developments. Mr B Crozier advised that he had hoped to tie the Square Field and the Rotherlea schemes together however the Rotherlea developers had not agreed to do so.

Cllr Hewlett reported that the access road to the site is very narrow, with on street parking already difficult. She advised of her concerns that the development would make the situation worse, potentially for the long term.

Mr P Atkins advised that the development is meeting the required Highways standards and reiterated that an additional four parking spaces had been added to the revised scheme. Mr B Crozier added that the developers intend to ensure the site does not add to the existing parking problems in the area.

Cllr Law asked whether any infrastructure checks had taken place at the site. Mr P Atkins advised that all the initial service and utility checks had taken place with no issues identified. Mr B Crozier added that all drainage and electricity matters have been solved and that there is capacity to access the mains.

Cllr Kemp reported that infrastructure checks for 150 new homes took place whilst the Neighbourhood Plan had been produced. He thanked the developers for the work being done on the parking issues and for their objective of working with the Rotherlea site.

Cllr Frossard asked the developers whether the site would have the capacity to charge electric vehicles. Mr P Atkins advised that electric cars could be charged from all properties at the site.

58/21 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Three members of the public made representations on the plans for the Square Field site. Comments included concerns regarding how vehicles would turn safely if the hammerhead is affected by the development, how refuse vehicles could safely access the Square Field site given that they currently reverse in to the access road due to the width of the road and on street parking, whether the width of the access road would be increased given that there is only the space for single lane traffic at present and where the contractors working on the site would park whilst the building was taking place.

Mr P Atkins & Mr B Crozier advised that they would consider the public's representations regarding site access, on street parking and construction traffic whilst finalising the plans for the development. They offered to share further technical details with the members of the public present and reported that they would send this to the Clerk for circulation.

Cllr Atkins thanked those present for their participation.

Mr P Atkins, Mr B Crozier, Mr C Wood, Ms S Sweeney and five members of the public left the meeting.

59/21.1 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SDNP/21/02122/LIS

First floor extension, roof extension and conservatory to side elevation. Installation of 1 no. attic dormer to rear and removal of 1 no. chimney.

332 Grove Street, Petworth GU28 0BD

Comment: No objection subject to dark sky lighting provision.

59/21.2 SDNP/21/02251/HOUS

Two storey extension to side elevation. Garage to be converted to habitable accommodation.
12 Fairfield Rise, Petworth GU28 0SG

Comment: No objection.

60/21 ADDITIONAL LATE APPLICATIONS

SDNP/21/02766/HOUS & SDNP/21/02767/LIS

Proposed rear conservatory.

The Coach House, Barton Lane, Petworth GU28 0DA

Comment: Objection on the basis of the white uPVC materials used for the windows are not of the appropriate quality to match the location or in keeping with the local environment.

61/21 DECISION SHEET

Decisions noted.

62/21 DATES OF SDNPA PLANNING MEETINGS

Dates noted.

Meeting Closed 7.59pm.

Signed
Chairman

Date.....