

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

Date of meeting:	20/06/2016
Site:	Bury Gate Farm
Proposal:	Replacement dwelling (Revised design to previously approved plans, ref. SDNP/15/01189/FUL)
Planning reference:	SDNP/16/01880/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Graham Morrison (Chair) Mark Penfold Paul Appleton John Starling Kim Wilkie
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes Nat Belderson Paul Slade John Saunders (Chichester District Council) Martin Mew (Chichester District Council)
Planning Committee in attendance:	
Item presented by:	Sandy Rendel - Architect Ben Burrows - Applicant
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
	16.35
<b>1.0 Discussion/Questions with applicants</b>	<p><b>The Panel inquired about the relationship of the proposed scheme to the consented scheme, specifically the roof massing. They asked if the recesses in the front elevation are in the calculations.</b> The applicant said that the second story of the proposed is 450mm higher, however the massing of the roof on the consented scheme was more overall.</p> <p><b>The Panel</b> The applicant</p> <p><b>The Panel asked for more information on the choice of architectural style, noting that the proposal has a New England colonnade look. The Panel asked what had encouraged the architect to place a building such as this in this context, and added that the building has a different character on the approach.</b> The applicant explained that a more broken down scale was sought for the approach in order to set up a dramatic effect of the reveal on the south side.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked about the long view and was wondering if the applicant would consider taking the barns down to enhance the view.</b> The applicant said the barns are not related to the application site, but are in their ownership. The applicant felt that they serve as a buffer to the road.</p> <p><b>The Panel commented that the positioning of the garage, does not seem to help the rear space and recommended that it could move in closer to the main building.</b> The architect explained that he wanted to create a courtyard, and is aware that this area of the scheme could benefit from further work. He liked connecting the elements of the house, garage, gym/office because of the change in levels.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if the belvedere on the roof top is enclosed.</b> The applicant said that it had been glazed originally, but had amended it to be completely open. The Panel raised concerns that if it was now open the chimney might be too low and that people might take the open belvedere as an invitation to walk on the roof.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked about the approach, and if the applicant saw it as a 21<sup>st</sup> century villa despite the landscape, or the form was being developed to trigger events in the landscape.</b> The applicant responded by saying that the landscape design needs more consideration and they are aware that there is a lot</p>

	<p>of work to be done to tie the building to the landscape, and to make it more responsive. The idea is to be drawn in to the building and then have the landscape revealed to you once you are inside the house.</p>
<b>2.0 Panel Summary</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Having visited and understood the site, its context, the views and the landscape, the Panel welcomed this revised proposal. It considered it to be not only bold and confident but a much more direct and appropriate response to a powerful setting. It encourages the applicant to pursue this proposal in favour of the previous scheme. It is a more serious composition, better suited to its site and more worthy of its context.</li> <li>2. The Panel felt this would be a very successful composition. An informal plan, evident from the approach from the road, is cleverly resolved in a dignified colonnade that looks to the view towards West Burton. Standing on a rise of the hill, it will seem like a Palladian villa and, in contrast with the formality of this long view, the entrance will seem informal and domestic. The end result is an enjoyably clever piece of planning which both takes advantage of the site geometries and resolves the distant views.</li> <li>3. The Panel understood that this was a design in development and it welcomed the opportunity to comment at this stage. It commented on a number of areas it was keen to see develop.</li> <li>4. The first is the broader landscape and the setting of the new house. Though the site boundary is relatively close to the house, it appears that the house 'owns' the landscape beyond – a landscape that is a part of the composition. The panel observed that the existing barns in particular, will detrimentally impact on the setting of the house and it suggested that the design would benefit from these barns being removed, or at least having an associated planting strategy to help diminish their impact.</li> <li>5. The second was the more local landscape strategy. The Panel would like to see how the design of the garden might develop and wondered if the garage could be better placed to make the entrance more welcoming, it wondered also about the quality and eventual character of this entrance courtyard. It suggested that more thought be given to the nature of the fences that surround the property – particularly in relation to the long view of the house.</li> <li>6. The third concerns materials. The Panel noted that the use of concrete was intended but wished to better understand exactly what this meant. The Panel is aware that the term 'concrete' conjures up a dull image to the layman and, therefore, further elaboration is required. It was encouraged by what was said but needed to see more evidence of what is intended.</li> <li>7. The fourth concerns the forms and its silhouette. The Panel enjoyed the idea of a belvedere but it believed it will only work if the materials are right. Metal frames</li> </ol>

	<p>were described but more information is needed to be persuaded that such secondary materials will blend or counterpoint well with the primary.</p> <p>8. The Panel concluded that this could be an excellent building – an enjoyable home planned comfortably and easily and taking note of and contributing to its setting. The design will only benefit from more work – on its landscape, its materials and its detail. At this stage of the design, these are obvious but expected gaps and the Panel would very much like to see the design again once the gaps are filled in.</p>
--	---