

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting: 04/10/2016

Site: Hurstfold Farm
Proposal: Demolition of existing warehouse unit and redevelopment as 10 no. houses with associated access and parking.

Planning reference: SDNPA/16/03737/FUL

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

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

Planning Committee in attendance:

Item presented by: Roger Beach
Lionel Fanshawe
Jon Forsyth
John Sadler

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 how the farmstead analysis undertaken (specifically the scale and massing) relates to the proposals. The Applicant said that their proposals are very different from the case studies, as this will be a residential development and the relative size will vary to accommodate need and function.</p> <p>The Panel supported the concept of designing the scheme relative to a farmstead, but were concerned that this sets up an unnecessary hurdle for the Applicants and that it would be better to say that they are building a residential development based on the farmstead concept, rather than claiming it is a conversion. The Panel also asked how far the Applicants are going towards building this as a farmstead. The Applicants said that they stop themselves at the stage of adding trappings and fixtures.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the yard is going to be made purely of gravel. The Applicant said no, there will also be low wall and hedge boundaries as well.</p> <p>The Panel asked if there was any provision for under cover parking of cars in front of the houses. The Applicant said that there is a mix of parking options and that all of the houses have some degree of undercover parking. They went on to say that the yard design allows some freedom for the parking of cars out in front of the houses.</p> <p>The Panel asked how the Applicant intends to control boundary treatments such as close board fencing in between and at the back of gardens. The Applicant said that outer boundaries and woodland would be maintained by a management company, but inner boundaries will be the subject of the homeowners. They suggested that they might yet look at either a covenant or management company for inner boundary control.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the applicant had considered doing something else to the land designated as pastures, perhaps planting an orchard or woodland. The Applicant said that the pastures are going to be privately owned and they have no plans currently for anything other than use as pasture.</p> <p>The Panel suggested that extending the red line of the application might make this easier.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the trees on the eastern boundary, stating that they hadn't seen any on the site.</p>

	<p>The Applicant explained that they intended to do some new planting along this boundary.</p> <p>The Panel highlighted that the terrain of the site is heavy clay, and asked whether the Applicant had considered putting in a pond which would be characteristic of a farm yard.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they had thought about it, but it is not in the proposal. They suggested they would look into the feasibility of adding one.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the plan for soil filling.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they had established an agreement to provide fill, at a rate of 60% subsoil and 40% topsoil.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the neighbourhood plan requirements for the site.</p> <p>The Applicant said that the existing planning consent was to expand the Industrial estate situated to the North southwards in to this site and that the client felt that this residential development was a kinder alternative to industrializing the site and is supported by the community, with the site recommended for residential development in the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The Panel asked whether it was possible to install solar panels, possibly liaising with the Industrial Estate to the north about installing them on some of the Industrial buildings.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they hadn't considered installation of solar panels.</p> <p>Further to this, the Panel asked about whether they had considered other sustainability options such as wood fuel or ground source heating.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they planned to install an air source heating system.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel started by saying that they understood the concept the Applicants have adopted with the design rationale– While they feel it is slightly contrived, they think it is good overall. 2. The Panel feels like the application would benefit from sharpening the details, with more information added on sections and levels. 3. The Panel said that the management plan is critical for the whole site including the grazing area and needs to be well thought out. 4. Access to the pasture/grazing areas of the development should be addressed and demonstrated, as it is likely that it is going to need to be accessed by large, heavy vehicles to bring animals in. 5. Another area the Panel thought should be given extra consideration is management of SuDS, which they felt wasn't properly addressed. 6. They wanted more details about how the proposed Air Source heating system is going to be managed, with particular concern registered for the risk of noise

	<p>pollution from the system.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Overall, however, the Panel felt that this application is a good alternative to the expansion of the neighbouring industrial estate. 8. As a final point, a concern was raised about garden sheds springing up around the houses, with the suggestion being made that the Applicants put some guidelines in place on this matter, perhaps to encourage any sheds being built in a specific, uniform and well-designed fashion as this would have an impact on the overall quality of the scheme.
--	--