

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

Date of meeting:	18/05/2016
Site:	Penns Field, Heathfield Road, Petersfield, Hampshire
Proposal:	Residential development comprising 80 dwellings with vehicular access off Heathfield Road and pedestrian/cycle/emergency access off Barnfield Road with landscaping, open space, foul and surface water drainage systems and other engineering works.
Planning reference:	SDNP/15/06484/FUL
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold (Chair) Graham Morrison Paul Fender Lap Chan John Starling Merrick Denton-Thompson Paul Murrain
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes Paul Slade
Committee Members in attendance:	Robert Mocatta Heather Baker Neville Harrison
Item presented by:	Stephen Annalise Matthew Utting (Agent) Kebbel Homes Stephanie Tom Haygood
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
<b>1.0 Discussion/Questions with applicants</b>	<p><b>The Panel opened by conceding that the constraints applied by the client are limiting, but asked how the unique corner house types are justified.</b></p> <p>The Applicant explained that the change in house types was being used in an effort to create distinct corners, but that the change was going to be based purely in a change to the material set used, rather than a difference in design.</p> <p><b>The Panel raised the fact that the previous application lacked legibility, and asked about the series of buildings outlined on the plan in green – Are the Applicants relying purely on material differences to provide distinction and not changing the space?</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that they are not all different individually, but as a collection and group. They've tried to create a relationship between the buildings and the surroundings, which will be achieved through boundary treatments. This is intended to create a character for the site that has been inspired by their studies of the local area. They also expressed how they have created legibility in this iteration of the plan through their road hierarchy and surface treatment.</p> <p><b>The Panel queried the street composition. How many car parking spaces would there be per dwelling? What is the rationale for parking and movement here? Why do we have some houses set back from the road while others aren't, even on the same street? Why are there houses that stare in to the car parking court? While this might happen elsewhere in Petersfield, most residents wish that it didn't. The Panel weren't clear on what's informing the road composition here. The typology seems like its suburban meshed with Petersfield, but that these don't mesh well in the format given.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that this particular site is very difficult to work with and that the client would be happy with a suburban design, but that the scheme had always been steered to try to reference Petersfield Town Centre. They gave as an example the similarities between design of a two bed house within their development and a two bed house in Petersfield town centre, by matching the width, height and depth, but that they've also tried to keep a unique and contemporary overall look for the builds. However, they need to balance this against the local character, which is one of suburban development. In this plan they've striven to match the design of the site as a whole to Petersfield town Centre, while individual buildings have been designed to fit in with the suburban character.</p> <p><b>The Panel said that the development is on the edge of Petersfield, but that doesn't automatically make it suburban. What's important is to understand the logic of</b></p>

	<p><b>the site. As it stands, the edges are not consistent; they're trying to solve a problem, but only creating new ones.</b></p> <p>The Applicant explained that they were told that they should avoid a circular roadway around the entire site, and that there are good ecological reasons to avoid putting roads along the edges of the sites. This, and a desire to put the frontages on to the playing field/woodland was what informed the road layout. They've been very careful about how they integrate parking in to the site. Finally, the Applicant reiterated that this isn't final yet.</p> <p><b>The Panel inquired about the stream on site, Tilmore Brook, and whether there were plans to regrade that.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said no, but that they are working with ecologists on the matter.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked for more information about proposed coppicing.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that there is a high proportion of hazel and cherry surrounding the site and that everyone is in agreement that it needs coppicing to regenerate the woodland. They have sound ecological reasons to establish better control of the hazel and cherry trees growing in the area.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked whether the sewer system currently on site is sufficient, suspecting that the sewer would need to be rerouted and asking for more details about the pumping station and the drain.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that yes, they would need to perform some work on the sewer system and that this will be incorporated in to the road network. In order to compensate for the size of the development, a new pumping station and will also need to be installed to increase the capacity of the sewers. The plan calls for the pumping station to pump sewage to the north, which necessitates putting the station in its proposed location, as it needs to be accessible for servicing.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked whether surface water storage would need to be drained.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that the sites surface water will be addressed with an underground storage and SUDS systems, featuring grey water filtration and similar systems. This system would be privately managed.</p>
<b>2.0 Panel Summary</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That Panel started by saying that they don't feel that this plan has moved on at all since its previous iteration, and that there are a lot of fundamental problems with it.</li> <li>2. The Panel felt that the spine road, leading in to the mews, doesn't really work. There was concern that the road frontages, the spine road in particular, will be dominated by either boundary walls to the sides of individual plots, or parking.</li> <li>3. Although we can see that a great deal of context analysis has been produced, we do not think that scheme has moved on</li> </ol>

	<p>in terms of the place-making aspect and we remain unconvinced by the spatial morphologies and how they relate to the Petersfield analysis that has been carried out.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The buildings don't respond in any characterised way, it is impossible to be limited by a standard set of house types when creating characteristic areas within the site. In particular, the southern end of the site indicates three key buildings on approach, however these unit types are repeated throughout the site; they lack any sense of being special.</li> <li>5. The vision of the scheme is still not coming across; who will live here and what is the place you are trying to make? Merely changing the boundary materials will not produce character. Corner buildings and the block structure needs to be re-examined. The site layout could be improved with the introduction of more individual units that respond to place, allowing individual areas within the plan that could create a unique identity. The architecture is struggling because of the currently limited palette of standard house types.</li> <li>6. The street infrastructure and composition needs more work; there needs to be variety in the street composition. The spatial types between buildings should be able to be named, for example are they squares, greens, linear parks etc. There seems to be a lot of grass verges, the use of which cannot be defined. The site layout might benefit from the creation of both a figure ground plan and a reversed figure ground plan.</li> <li>7. The street scene needs to be crafted in order to create a series of quality spaces and streetscapes. There are currently large areas of no active frontage, and a random mix of characterless spaces.</li> <li>8. The aim of this development is to be a 'place' of character and quality within a National Park, it has to be something more to achieve this aim. You can't build appropriate character with just a handful of house types – More diversity is required.</li> <li>9. There is a concern that the street lighting and layout is being led by highway design and that highway engineers are being given too much prominence. In light with the new Dark Skies reserve that the South Downs is a part of, street lightning needs to be carefully considered, perhaps even discarded entirely.</li> <li>10. The Panel suggested that that the architects meet with the panel during a future design workshop, and that they are given the freedom to explore a range of new spatial typologies in order to resolve the above issues.</li> </ol>
--	--