

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Date of meeting: | 20/06/2016 |
| Site: | Hambledon Vineyard |
| Proposal: | Replacement cellar following demolition of existing cellar, demolition of existing cellar and creation of new cellar (To adjoin former replacement cellar), for storage of Vineyard's produce and increasing the height of winery roof by 3.7m to accommodate additional production facilities. Also considered, future proposals for the addition of a visitor centre and associated car park; and change in access arrangements. |
| Planning reference: | SDNP/16/02527/APNB – SDNP/16/02528/FUL – SDNP/16/02529/FUL – Hambledon Vineyard |
| Panel members sitting: | Graham Morrison (Chair) Mark Penfold Paul Appleton John Starling Kim Wilkie |
| SDNPA officers in attendance: | Genevieve Hayes Victoria Corrigan Paul Slade Michael Scammel Veronica Craddock |
| Planning Committee in attendance: | Norman Dingemans (Ex Officio) |
| Item presented by: | Martin Hawthorne |
| 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 if you could clarify what the applications are and what we are commenting on. What isn't in the application?</p> <p>The applicant gave an overview of the three applications; Extension of the existing cellar, construction of additional cellarage and raising the roof of the winery to accommodate further machinery. They said that the items that they were displaying that weren't part of an existing application were the changes of the access road, the addition of a visitor centre and the associated car parking.</p> <p>The Panel responded by saying that we needed to be careful to clearly distinguish what parts of the proposals apply to existing applications.</p> <p>The Panel acknowledged that the cellar was placed underground for the benefit of the wine stored there and asked if there would need to be any additional utilities associated with the cellar for climate control purposes.</p> <p>The Applicant said that there would be provision for climate control utilities, with systems for monitoring and controlling both light and heat inside the cellar, but that the cellar being positioned underground would help minimise variation and therefore reduce the need for direct control.</p> <p>The Panel asked if there was an overall masterplan for the vineyard – even if applications haven't been put in. The Panel acknowledged the applicants aspiration for a million bottle facility, but wondered how it would all fit in.</p> <p>The applicant said that it's complicated, but that the applications coupled with the proposed future applications broadly constitutes a masterplan. He then went on to provide some insight in to the wine producing process in order to explain the need for the vineyard to grow.</p> <p>The Panel re-iterated their question about master planning, before asking specifically about access considerations.</p> <p>The Applicant said that the number of lorry movements involved in the operation of the vineyard was fairly low, due to the large quantity of bottles that can be fit in to a single lorry – Proposing that the average lorry could take a maximum of 35,000 bottles, he suggested about 12 lorry movements a year. For public access, they've allowed for some disabled parking close to the front of the proposed visitor centre and a larger carpark further down the road, which they feel will be well screened by the existing tree cover and landscaping.</p> <p>The Panel suggested that they should probably double the predicted number of lorry movements, before asking the applicant to summarise what they'd just said.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>The applicant said that there'd be about 25 lorries a year and that parking space would be built on the existing parking area.</p> <p>The Panel asked how the applicant had reached their conclusions on the obtrusiveness of the view from two miles away.</p> <p>The applicant said the LVIA was from a footpath running near the vineyard which was either two miles, or two kilometres; they were not certain. However, they were confident that the viewpoint in question is a substantial distance away.</p> <p>The Panel said you can see Hambledon village quite clearly and it will be extremely visible, as would any new roads and a car park. This would be further complicated by an expected loss of trees associated with the project.</p> <p>The applicant said that they can't see an unacceptable landscape impact, suggesting the nearby trees as a screening feature and saying that most of them will actually be left intact.</p> <p>The Panel re-iterated their belief that the road and parking, parking in particular, would be visible from the approach to Hambledon.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the new access road, which features two sharp right angle bends. They also observed that, while shifting the entire stock could be done in as little as 12 lorry movements, it would likely require a lot more, as the lorries are unlikely to take out a full load of 35,000 bottles in a single shipment.</p> <p>The applicant said that the proposed future access arrangements would be based on an existing road, which limited their ability to change it. Regarding the lorry movements, they clarified that the Hambledon vineyard primarily supplies large, nation-wide retailers who buy bulk shipments – It wouldn't be distributing its wine in small shipments that would take more lorry movements.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the spoil would be kept on site.</p> <p>The Applicant said that a neighbouring farmer would take the majority of the spoil on to their adjacent farm, to use in some building work. The small remaining amount of spoil would be retained on site and used in the construction of the future visitor centre. The Parish council has asked the Applicant to avoid establishing any large piles of spoil. In conclusion, no spoil would leave the site except in transfer to the adjacent field, which would likely be carried out cross country by tractors, rather than using the road system.</p> <p>The panel asked what the current use of the existing house was and whether that would be a better place for a visitor centre, mentioning how it's positioned behind the trees.</p> <p>The house is currently in use as a residential property, where the vineyard owner lives. The Applicant believes that the proposed site presents a much better opportunity for visitor interaction between the centre and the wine making process, it provides good room to expand if the centre needs to grow in size and it</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | <p>helps keep the vineyard centralised. Finally, the Applicant wants to limit the amount of traffic coming past the house, as it is still a residential dwelling and high traffic would be disruptive.</p> <p>The Panel said that when they were on site, the applicant helpfully stacked a number of cardboard boxes to help visualise the changes to the winery building. They also mentioned the possibility of marquee sites – How much usage do you expect to see?</p> <p>The Applicant said that the project with the marquees was very much a tertiary concern – over the past year they'd only had two events held in marquees on site.</p> |
| <p>2.0 Panel Summary</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Though the Panel expressed its support for the aims of the vineyard to expand and be commercially more successful, it was uncomfortable with the expediency and fragmented nature of these proposals. In this review, it hoped to be able to help the applicant produce a more considered plan – a task made more challenging because of the rolling applications and tight deadlines. 2. Fundamental to the application is the enlarged cellar. Placed almost entirely below ground level, its location seems logical both from both an operational and site planning perspective. 3. The proposal for the Winery is more complex. Its south elevation will be prominently visible from the entry to the village and the lack of satisfactory three-dimensional view or CGI only increased the Panel's anxiety. In this regard, a more considered landscape strategy might offer some mitigation, as would an alternative material to the profiled metal cladding that is proposed. The Panel suggested this could be replaced with timber boarding for the walls and with a grey roofing material. It commented that it is perfectly possible to produce a simple and appealing structure - one that would add to the environment, rather than pretending to disappear into it. It added that the 'heritage green' colour of the existing structures achieved the opposite. 4. From the north, the Winery is partially screened by a line of trees. Some of these are dying – partly from disease and partly because little care was taken for the tree roots when it was originally constructed. The Panel suggested that, as part of the landscape strategy of this application, the dying ash trees should be replaced with beech trees as this species is evidently growing successfully close by. 5. The applicant presented further proposals that will in the future be submitted for consideration. Though not formally a part of this application, they elaborated the context for the current application and the applicant invited comments from the panel. The overall concern of the Panel was the lack of a coherent master plan for future expansion of the project. Concern was expressed about vehicular access in general and, in particular, the |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>capacity of the car park and the possible impact of coaches. The proposals seemed to represent an ad-hoc immediate problem-solving approach rather than a strategy for a long term plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The Panel believed that the car park will be prominently visible from the village and it felt that insufficient thought had been given to its layout, landscaping and design. 7. Though the Panel considered the siting of the proposed Visitor Centre to be logical, it considered its design to be less than adequate. This would be the most significant new building in the village but its proposed elevations signal a poorly disguised supermarket. The Panel recommended an entirely new architectural approach - something that the vineyard can be proud of, that justly represented the quality of its award-winning produce. 8. The Panel wished to see a well thought through landscape strategy that not only looked to a long term future but also dealt with more immediate concerns about what to do with the spoil from the excavation of the new cellar. 9. The Panel was very concerned about access of the site. Though it was not competent to question the accuracy of the figures presented, it felt that the number of future movements has been underestimated, especially if the planned expansion is successful. 10. The Panel concluded that this application and the associated proposals are a missed opportunity. The Panel would prefer to see a more considered architectural approach aligned with a more robust landscaping strategy. The current scheme aspires at best only to be inoffensive and consequently lacks the confidence that a well-designed proposal would have in better representing the aspirations and the produce of the vineyard. |
|--|---|