

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

Date of meeting:	18/10/2016
Site:	Penns Field, Heathfield Road, Petersfield, Hampshire
Proposal:	Residential development comprising 80 dwellings with vehicular access off Heathfield Road and predestrian/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 John Starling Andrew Smith Adam Richards
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes Paul Slade Rob Ainslie Veronica Craddock
Committee Members in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Matthew Utting (Agent) Kebbel Homes Stephanie Georgadidis Tom Hayhurst Dorota Kaminska-Majkowska Helen Selwyn
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>1. The Panel opened by commenting on the making and opening out of spaces – Subsequently, they asked what the applicants might do with the spaces between buildings along the spine road.</b>  The Applicant said that the main boundary garden wall will be a higher wall. Some concerns have been raised about building a long, featureless wall, so they wanted to integrate garden pavilions into the walls. A matter they're still considering is whether the walls should be higher, to increase the feeling of enclosure, or have the roofs of the pavilions exceed the height of the walls to provide variety in levels.  <b>The Panel asked whether the Applicant had considered trees in the gaps between the houses to provide links to the Green Spaces.</b>  The Applicant said that they were considering it.</p> <p><b>2. The Panel noted that all the buildings appear to hug the paths except for the buildings on the eastern edge 55, 56 and 57. They felt that it might have been more interesting if these houses had followed the path. They noted that around this, there's a more urban pattern of staggering, so why not follow the path here?</b>  The Applicant said that they were originally intended to follow the course of the path, but it was decided not to do so following discussions on how to get glimpses when you walk up the path – it was deliberate.  <b>The Panel asked whether the decision was, therefore, deliberate?</b>  The Applicant said yes.</p> <p><b>3. The Panel highlighted that one of the great selling points of this development is the presence of the footpath as a full route around it, but commented that the path appears to get lost around houses 24, 25 and 26, disappearing briefly in to the shared surface area and then reappearing further down.</b>  The Applicants said that the only way they would've been able to carry the path through this section without it entering the shared surface area would be to cut a path through existing vegetation, which they want to retain.  <b>The Panel asked if the shared surface area needed to go that far.</b>  The Applicant said that it did, in order to insure there's enough room to manoeuvre.  <b>The Panel asked if it needed to be 5.5m in width.</b>  The Applicant said that the Highways Authority had confirmed that they expected it to be of that width, so they were obliged to make it that wide.</p> <p><b>4. The Panel asked if the streets were adoptable as rights of way, but not adopted?</b></p>

	<p>The Applicants said yes, they're not adopted.</p> <p><b>5. The Panel suggested that the path could be a more dominant element.</b>  The Applicant said that they have seen plan extracts that encourage a turn to the right through the green link.  <b>The Panel said that this all looks like a resolvable problem.</b></p> <p><b>6. The Panel asked if the woodland will be fenced.</b>  The Applicant said that, while the woodland does contribute an important ecological function, they have no intention of fencing it.</p> <p><b>7. The Panel highlighted the significance of plots 81 and 28, as key plots on the site due to their positions on the corners. They invited the Applicant to say something about what makes the buildings on them special.</b>  The Applicant said that plot 28 is the home on the corner and that, while the footprint is the same as other houses, the house will have a different elevational form.</p> <p><b>8. The Panel stated that the development seemed a little tight and angular, particularly highlighting the green space, and suggested that the applicant round off the corners a little to make it smoother. They then asked what is the difference between the green and red dots on the plan.</b>  The Applicant explained that the red dots represented wildflower areas, while the green dots are grass areas that are going to be mown.</p> <p><b>9. The Panel said that the landscaping seems incoherent on the edges and could have been nice. At the moment the central landscaped space ends in a very strong pinch point on what is otherwise the most important green space. They observed that it was interesting that the Applicants had put so much in there rather than on the highlighted significant plots of 28 and 81.</b>  The Applicants said that they did this on advice received at one of the workshops.  <b>The Panel said that what they've ended up doing here is creating hard edges, pinching out the soft spaces behind.</b>  The Applicants said that they have had conversations about the roof forms, and their intention here was to break up the regularity of the roof lines so people don't see them as constant.</p> <p><b>10. The Panel asked if the Applicant could talk about the centre space. They expressed concern about the pinched gap between plots 31-35 and 59-64 and this pinching of the gateway space.</b>  The Applicant said that the centre space has changed from what we first planned. At the start it was more of a continuous link from one level to the other. It's now changed somewhat, the Applicant not having expected to end up with such a large open space. They now want this green space to become the focal point of the</p>
--	--

	<p>development. In terms of landscaping, it gives a visual link and ties up with the swale elements. Also, from east and west, it addresses different focal points, instead of being in a connection and doing just one thing.</p> <p><b>11. The Panel asked about the services strategy – While lighting was discussed previously, what is the strategy for all the other required services?</b> The Applicant said that, following talks with Highways, the service zone has to be within the shared surface strip.</p> <p><b>12. The Panel said that, regarding the planting strategy, the choice of trees used needs to be carefully considered, because of the danger that some trees present to foundation depths.</b></p> <p><b>13. The Panel suggested that the SUDS area needs to be considered as an integrated landscape feature and treated accordingly. It was recommended that the volume of the SUDS system should be examined, as if there are periods where the SUDS empties completely it would look like a boggy mess.</b></p> <p><b>14. The Panel asked about public open space, and specifically whether the apartments had any amenity space.</b> The Applicants said no, they did not.</p> <p><b>15. The Panel asked the planning officer present if the SDNPA would be comfortable with this in planning terms. The planning officer stated that the development was deemed acceptable by the inspector.</b></p> <p><b>16. The Panel asked whether there was a landscape management plan in place.</b> The Applicants said that there will be one, delivered by legal agreement, but it still needs to be discussed. <b>The Panel recommended that coppice management be considered as part of this plan.</b></p> <p><b>17. The Panel suggested that more consideration be given to the detail of boundary walls and fencing in order to knit together the street scene in to a coherent whole.</b> The Applicant said that it would ultimately be easier to build the actual walls than continue change the proposals indefinitely. <b>The Panel warned against the danger of ending up with a diversity of wall panels.</b></p>
<b>2.0 Panel Summary</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Firstly, the Panel asked if this application was intended for submission to the committee soon, and how much room for change there was at this stage. The Applicant said that they would be resistant to large overhauls of the plans, but are happy to consider and potentially implement small changes.</li> <li>2. The Panel then formally began by suggesting that all the various strategies need to see more integration into the plan as a whole.</li> <li>3. Overall, the Panel felt that the planning structure has come a long way since they first saw the application and seen success as a</li> </ol>

	<p>result. The Spine and Mews were highlighted as particularly strong features, and the circle footpath was similarly applauded but there was a need to clear up the confusion around the mid-west region. The Panel also suggested that the long straight section on the eastern side could meander slightly for a more organic look. Similarly, they noted that the path meanders in the northern section around plots 55-57; they felt this area would be more charming if the housing followed the path. Finally, the Panel questioned why the eastern section plots 59 to 64, 68, 72, 75, 78-79, 80-81 are all staggered in a suburban manner.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Plots 81 and 28 need to be looked at in detail as plots of special significance. The Panel felt the development would benefit from these plots being made more distinct. Plot 28 in particular has an opportunity to improve the existing special character of the central green space that it overlooks if it was given a more unique appearance.</li> <li>5. The Panel weren't convinced by the 5.5m width suggested for the shared surface area and believe that a smaller width would probably be perfectly reasonable. Furthermore, they felt that the shared surfaced areas are too orthogonal and could be softer.</li> <li>6. The Panel raised concerns about the central space becoming boggy and nondescript when there's not enough water to fill the SuDS up.</li> <li>7. They suggested that there wasn't enough enclosure of views along the Spine space and this needs a lot of work on how to effectively integrate the boundary treatments. There was a general feeling that the formal quality broke down towards the edge of the development, with the boundary treatments, lack of enclosure and odd picket fences creating a confused message.</li> <li>8. There were also concerns about the eastern edge of the space squeezing things, the urbanisation of which comes at a cost to the green link, with Panel members feeling that the three storey elements were wrong.</li> <li>9. The Panel felt that the green space, as a whole, needed some further work and that there should be a study in depth of it in order to decide how it and all its surrounds come together. The Panel feels that the central green space has the potential to be the confident heart of the development, but it still needs some work to get there and is in danger of falling short.</li> <li>10. The Panel observed that some of the proposed tree species adjacent to the buildings have the potential to become very large, which will need consideration.</li> <li>11. That Panel had some concerns that a lot of their suggestions from workshops and reviews was quoted, and sometimes used in principle, but didn't always come through completely into the final designs. The strengths of the scheme need further refinement.</li> <li>12. The Panel believes that the scheme needs to be brought together with a landscape proposal integrated into the scheme, which needs to make the structure of the character areas distinct and clear. They felt that the pedestrian route is nearly right but needs some refinement.</li> </ol>
--	--