

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting: 04/10/2016

Site: Barlavington, Midhurst
Proposal: 50 - 60 dwellings

Planning reference: SDNP/16/03725/PRE

Panel members sitting: David Hares (Chair)
Paul Fender
John Starling
Robert Adam
Andrew Smith
Lap Chan

SDNPA officers in attendance: Genevieve Hayes
Richard Ferguson
Paul Slade
Michael Scammel
Katherine Stuart

Planning Committee in attendance:

Item presented by: Jeremy Higgins – Pro Vision (applicants agent)

Declarations of interest: None

The Panel's response to your scheme will be placed on the Planning Authority's website where it can be viewed by the public. The SDNPA operate a transparent service, whereby pre-application and application details, although not actively publicised will be placed on the online planning register. This is unless the applicant gives reasons why the enquiry is commercially sensitive.

COMMENTS

	Notes
	14.08
1.0 Discussion/Questions with applicants	<p>The Panel asked for some clarification about the scale of the site as presented, as it was not clear what the measurements of the blocks were on the indicative diagram. The Applicant's agent explained that the shapes on the diagram indicated blocks of approximately 55m.</p> <p>The Panel asked if they have looked back on to the site from long views and about how the interior of the site would appear. The Applicant's agent said that an LVIA of the site had been commissioned to both inform the design of the proposed development and to ensure that it did not have an adverse landscape or visual impact on the National Park. It was for this reason that the top portion of the site was free from development.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the massing and height of stories of the site, and suggested that before going on to establish that some 3d design images or sections would help to clarify some of the details of the proposal. In a similar vein they expressed a desire for more information on the ridgelines, and the scale of the site as a whole. They suggested that, overall, even some simple sketch images would help clarify these parts of the application and having this information would make a big difference in how the application is received and interpreted. The Applicant's agent said that they hadn't wanted to present an essentially finished application, so that they would have room to change it about as required, but said that they were happy to provide the further information the panel had requested including a 3D model of the proposed scheme superimposed into a photograph of the site taken from the South Downs Way The Panel agreed with this idea, saying that even minor dimensional changes can make a lot of difference and this could help identify those changes.</p> <p>The Panel commented that 50-60 dwellings seemed like a very high number to put on the site The Applicant's agent stated that this number of dwellings was a starting point and the form in which the proposed dwellings were provided would have a significant influence on the number of dwellings to be provided and their resultant impact.</p> <p>The Panel said that this scheme is very reminiscent of the Penn's Field, Petersfield, scheme, and recommended using a central road system instead of a road in a ring around the outside, as this would encourage more interaction between the development and its setting, where the ring road would cut off the development. They</p>

	<p>also said that the brief for house types needs to be clearer and it's important to think about who is going to live on this site. The Panel felt that the site might not be suited to affordable housing because of its isolated location.</p> <p>The Applicant's agent confirmed that he would look at the Penns Field proposals. Regarding the Panel's comments about the suitability of the site as a location for affordable housing, the Applicant's agent advised that the site is within viable walking distance of the school and amenities in Midhurst, as well as close to existing bus routes, making it suitable for affordable housing.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the progress of their habitat survey and whether they had completed Phase 1 and 2.</p> <p>The Applicant's agent advised that Phase 1 and 2 Ecology survey of the site had been completed, and identified the presence of some protected species, especially Bats. The Applicant's agent went on to say in terms of the current BAP designation that applies to the site, a NVC survey of the site has been undertaken which demonstrated that the sites designation as a woodland BAP was not justified.</p> <p>The Panel reiterated the need for the housing style to be clear and defined by the community, going on to say that if the applicants are to suggest that they are to provide bespoke architecture then that is what they'll be expected to deliver.</p> <p>The Applicant's agent said that their client has developed in Midhurst before and that they are aware that the bar here is very high, so this development will be of correspondingly high quality.</p>
<p>2.0 Panel Summary</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel thanked the applicant for bringing the scheme to the panel at this early stage. 2. The Panel felt that 3d modelling and sections would be helpful, with a wider model aiding in understanding the site in relation to typography. In particular, views from the South and internal views are of significant concern. Internally, sections would make clear how the proposal will fit with the existing built form of Southlands etc. 3. The Panel expressed an interest in seeing the work of the landscape consultant, as they are keen for the scheme to be landscape led and would like to see more information on how it will fit in to the landscape. 4. The woodland on the edge of the scheme will have a major impact on the site and the views, so the management of the woodland will have to be well considered and a management scheme for it would be a good addition. 5. The layout of the scheme and connections to roads and rights of way needs to be elaborated on, with careful thought given to their interaction. 6. The Panel expressed some scepticism about the suggestion that children might walk to school from this development and suggested that more consideration

	<p>needs to be given to access arrangements and how the residents will access and interact with the town as a whole.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. The Panel raised some concerns about the clearance of trees and wanted to know whether there was a tree survey done before clearance and what the results of that survey were. 8. The Panel finished by saying that it would be helpful to see the process by which the applicant reached this stage – By seeing the workings out from previous stages of the application, the Panel can better understand how the applicant reached the current layout that they intend to use. If the applicant returns to the Panel, the Panel would like to see this information. 9. The Panel said that they would welcome the scheme returning to them, provided that they resolved all of the above considerations.
--	--