

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	20/06/2016
Site:	Land at St Mary's Church, Sheet
Proposal:	Bespoke design two storey dwelling with garage and parking together with associated transfer of land to community.
Planning reference:	SDNP/16/00997/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Graham Morrison (Chair) Mark Penfold Paul Appleton John Starling Kim Wilkie
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes Paul Slade Sabah Halli (East Hampshire District Council)
Planning Committee in attendance:	
Item presented by:	Nick Wake Ian Ellis Stuart Bone
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 applicant planned to deal with the shading, as the orientation of the house leaves the south side heavily shaded.</p> <p>The applicant agreed that the south side would be heavily shaded and that they had put a lot of thought in to the matter. They think that, during the summer months, the lighting situation should be okay by virtue of the sun being quite high in the sky and providing light for the south side; however, they don't want to add too many roof lights to the build out of concern for levels of sky glow and the importance of limiting impact in light of the Dark Skies initiative. They have, however, got side windows that will allow light in from the east and west to help mitigate this.</p> <p>The Panel brought up the fact that the site was outside the boundary and asked, what would the applicant have done differently had the site been within the boundary? Are they making the point that this shouldn't be inside? Or do they feel that it should be inside, especially given the recently granted permission to build housing on the far side?</p> <p>The Applicant said that they thought they'd still do much the same thing even had the site been inside the boundary, as they wanted their build to be of excellent quality regardless. They agreed that the field not being included fragmented the boundary, but they weren't saying that it should be included in the boundary as a result.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the proposed natural pool; whether a more natural form would be better and whether it would be used as a swimming pool?</p> <p>The Applicant said that the pool was not intended for swimming, but did not rule out the possibility. They then explained that the main purpose of the pool was to provide an attenuation area, hopefully helping moderate water flow in to the nearby stream and reduce flood risk.</p> <p>The Panel asked if you would be able to look down in to the ground floor bedrooms from the living room.</p> <p>The Applicant said that you could not.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the applicant could explain how the staircases are designed.</p> <p>The Applicant indicated on the plan how the stairs would likely function. They also explained how the stairs connecting the kitchen area to the living area would work, telling the Panel that there'd be a small set of stairs to facilitate movement between the two.</p> <p>The Panel asked if this was a paragraph 55 house.</p> <p>The Applicant said no – While they think the home is of high</p>

	<p>quality, they're not intending to argue that it's exceptional.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the how the CGI view of the front door and the model overlap, as the CGI version involves more abrupt shifts in architecture.</p> <p>The Applicant said that the model is a useful tool for assessment of the roof, and an ongoing work in progress, but not a perfectly accurate representation, explaining that its purpose is first and foremost as a tool.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel acknowledged the site was of considerable significance to Sheet. Given its location, the Panel thought it anomalous that it was not included within the settlement policy boundary. Though the Panel believed that from a design perspective, the site was capable of development, it considered that any proposal for this particular site would have to be exceptional both in the quality of its design and its response to the very particular and sensitive context. 2. Though the applicant presented a clear and well thought through proposal the Panel was unconvinced by the relationship expressed by the design intent to an extraordinarily unique context. In particular, it was unpersuaded by the architectural reference to an agricultural building and, given its location, it considered this would be a difficult narrative to explain with conviction. The site is in the heart of the village and, though the Panel noted the design decision to avoid a pastiche like relationship to local architecture, it felt that a more familiar, perhaps simpler, form could be more beneficial to the context. 3. The Panel considered the approach to the house to be unnecessarily stark. Its asymmetric and staccato quality – a consequence of the varying cross section responding to a north-facing bank – seems to produce an uncomfortable relationship with the church (seen in a background). If a sculptural form was to be pursued (though the Panel was not necessarily recommending it), it felt that a softer, smoother roof that included the garage, might make the composition seem less abrupt. Such a plan might integrate more harmoniously with the flow of the landscape. 4. To close, the Panel re-iterated that this was a wonderful site and that they felt, with a fresh approach, that a truly appropriate design might be possible. But, it believed, such a design ought to arise out of the intrinsic character of the village and field, rather than explicitly seek to contrast with it.