

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	14/03/2016
Site:	Fanstones Farm, Swanmore Park, Park Lane, Swanmore
Proposal:	New dwelling
Planning reference:	SDNP/15/5933/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Graham Morrison (Chair) Adam Richards John Starling Andrew Smith Luke Engleback Kay Brown
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes Hayley Stevenson Natalie Fellows
Winchester Design Review Panel Member	Andrew Hoare
Item presented by:	Scott Masker Penny Stokes
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
<p>1.0 Discussion/Questions with applicants</p>	<p>The Panel asked the size of the house. The applicants stated that it is now approximately 138 square Metres. It had been in two separate parts, but Winchester Design Review Panel felt the two elements that were separated should be joined together.</p> <p>The Panel inquired about the colour choice. The striking red colour that can be seen from the drawings was chosen to emphasise the metaphor of an apple. This is something that can be discussed.</p> <p>The Panel asked if there is a site plan which shows the boundaries, boundary treatment and parking. This has not been fully considered yet. The garden curtilage needs to be restricted around the house.</p> <p>The Panel asked the applicants to expand on the building's relationship to its setting. The applicants explained the intention was for the building to sit comfortably with the other agricultural buildings on the site. It is seen as wanting to sit like a barn in the landscape with the agricultural element coming up as close to the building as it can with as little of the domestic contrivances that will occur around the type of house.</p> <p>The Panel asked if changing the location of the building affect its performance in terms of low energy design. It should not have an effect, but it is agreed that it is now more exposed.</p> <p>The Panel asked if there is an intention to reinstate an old style orchard. The applicants stated they had not got as far as a landscape strategy and this is therefore not something that has been thought about.</p> <p>The Panel asked the reason for the placement of the master bedroom and office. To take advantage of the views and to be able to hear the horses at night time if there was a problem. The office is more of a study.</p> <p>The Panel asked how high the building is at its highest point. It is 6.5 Metres at the top of the parapet to ensure the solar panels are well screened.</p>
<p>2.0 Panel Summary</p>	<p>I. The panel found the presentation helpful in understanding the intentions behind the scheme. It accepted the principle that Paragraph 55 should apply to all scales of</p>

	<p> dwellings and it was of interest to them that this particular project was low cost. The discussion therefore centred on the appropriateness of Paragraph 55 to this project and the relationship of the proposed building to its place and its setting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. The panel believed the principle of a Paragraph 55 dwelling in this location had some promise but remained to be convinced about both the success of its relationship to the landscape and the value of the ‘apple crate’ metaphor. The outcome seemed neither powerful enough to be seen as an object in the landscape nor fragmented enough to settle its position on the site.3. The panel considered that the significance of the prominent axis at the end of the lane was not well enough addressed. Placed in this most visible of positions, exposed both visually and to the weather, the elevations seem somewhat fussy and overelaborate. The composition compared unfavourably with the directness and straightforwardness of simple farm buildings and barns found in the South Downs National Park.4. The panel needed to see a greater sense of landscape thinking in order to connect the building to its context and to the adjacent paddock. It wished to see a much stronger land management narrative that integrates the building with both the manmade and the natural broader landscape. The reluctance to expand the consideration of the design beyond the perimeter of the building site itself weakened the proposition and was found to be unhelpful. A site plan and appropriate drawings of the barns, scale, parking and context of the site is a basic requirement5. The panel wondered if the initial location (closer to the other structures) might have worked better both for a contextual relationship and in relation to the prevailing wind exposure. This might offer a greater chance to connect with the architectural landscape of the existing roofs and the barns. Should this option be pursued, however, the height of the building with its flat top raises questions of how such a form would sit within a group of buildings with pitched roofs.
--	---