

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting: 20/06/2016

Site: Hillsborough
Proposal: Paragraph 55-4
Planning reference: SDNP/16/04179/PRE

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

SDNPA officers in attendance: Genevieve Hayes
Hannah Grimes
Paul Slade

Planning Committee in attendance: None

Item presented by: Trevor Furse
Adrian Moore
Richard Crook
Jacob Chadwick

Declarations of interest: David Hares declared an interest as he regularly works with Adrian Moore. Consequently, although he would continue as the chair of the meeting, he was barred from contributing as a panel member and so only relayed the comments of the other panel members.

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 opened by explaining that Para 55 expects an application to be truly outstanding or innovative, and asked the applicant to explain how their application achieved this. The applicant responded by saying that they were trying to create a beautiful building. They feel that, in this pursuit, their main area of innovation is using engineered timber to support a living roof, which, to their knowledge, has never been done before in this area.</p> <p>The Panel asked them to reiterate, they believe the use of timber is the innovative part of the application? The Applicants said yes, explaining that the use of timber is functionally innovative, as is the way in which it will be engineered. They went on to say that applications on this basis need to be exciting, notable and they believe that in planning terms, this fits that, by creating a small, compact but very fitting house.</p> <p>The Panel asked the applicant to clarify the orientation of the house. The Applicant said that the scheme tries to respect its surrounds and, as such, the house has been built north-west facing.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the levels of the site – Specifically, is the site flat? The Applicant explained that the site at present was not completely flat, but their intent in carving the house in to the hillside was to help restore the site to more natural, fitting levels.</p> <p>The Panel asked what materials the walls will be made of. The Applicant said that they've aimed to use local materials for sensitivity – The interior walls specifically are going to be built of flint, and carefully detailed. Further to this, the Panel asked why the thickness of the walls vary. The Applicant explained that the wall at the back of the house is built right in to the ground, so it only required nominal thickness.</p> <p>The Panel asked why most of the proposed build is orthogonal when an ammonite has been suggested as a concept for the building. The Applicant said that they choose this style to make use of as much of the site as possible.</p> <p>The Panel acknowledged the difficulty of defining what actually is an “exceptional” build, before asking whether this house would be classed as an isolated home in the countryside. The Applicant said that the site would fall outside of a settlement boundary, if it had been established in policy, so they were</p>

	<p>advised to treat it as an isolated home</p> <p>The Panel commented that a timber structure is not a new concept in itself and that something about it would need to be innovative, even if it's only in a small way.</p> <p>The Panel asked what about the frame makes this application stand out?</p> <p>The Applicant explained that they had tried to create a biconvex form in the design, a complex geometry, using only timber beams, something they think no other schemes have done before. They went on to say that this, coupled with the design supporting a living roof purely using timber beams, was the key innovation of the project.</p> <p>The Panel expressed the need for the site to significantly enhance the street scene and the environs of neighbouring houses, saying this factor needs to be addressed.</p> <p>The Panel asked if they had performed a tree survey.</p> <p>The Applicant said yes, they had tree surveys done right from the start.</p> <p>The Panel asked whether this house would be an annex to the existing one.</p> <p>The Applicant said that, no, it would be a totally separate house.</p> <p>The Panel asked what consideration had been given to the impact on the existing house.</p> <p>The Applicant says that it had been suggested that they plant trees to screen the new build from other houses, but they also want people to know the house is there and not to hide it from view. They hope to soften the impact of the house, rather than hiding it.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the Applicants are going to look in to sustainability.</p> <p>The Applicants said yes and that they are already looking in to sustainability options.</p> <p>The Panel finished the discussion by saying that the effect on the immediate neighbours and strategy to mitigate that are going to be important.</p>
<p>2.0 Panel Summary</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by saying that the concept of an exceptional or innovative building is always a difficult one, due to the problems inherent in trying to define what "exceptional" actually is. 2. The Panel acknowledged that this scheme had obviously been the subject of a great deal of hard work. However, the Applicant needs to keep pressing the scheme in order to realise its full potential. 3. The Panel suggested the scheme might benefit by carrying the Fibonacci sequence through to the rest of the building.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none">4. The Panel suggested, that the Applicants consider looking at some of the work of architect Bart Prince for some inspiration on ways to follow a concept through the entire scheme.5. One key area of concern was the impact of the build on the neighbours, which the Panel feels need to be addressed in more depth.6. Overall, the Panel felt that, while the scheme was making a good attempt, it couldn't be described as truly innovative.7. The Panel felt that sections would've been a useful addition to the presentation.8. The Panel still has some concerns about the sustainability, in particular about the movement of spoil.9. The Panel suggested that the Applicants look at the Oxenbourne Case (Parsonage Barn, Application no: SDNP/16/01415/PRE, SDNP/16/04562/FUL)10. Finally, the Applicants asked if they should make a model of the proposal. The Panel said yes, this would be beneficial.
--	--