

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	18/01/2015
Site:	Rotherlea, Petworth
Proposal:	Erect 33 dwellings, access and parking.
Planning reference:	SDNP/15/01862/FUL
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold (Chair) Graham Morrison (Vice Chair) Duncan Baker Brown Kay Brown Merrick Denton Thompson David Hares Adam Richards
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes Robert Ainslie Hayley Stevenson
Item presented by:	Sally Adams (WSCC) Vivien Summerill (Summerill Architects) Bob Hull (Henry Adams)
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
1.0 Discussion/ Questions with applicants	<p>The Panel asked the applicants to clarify how the fronts and backs and the access arrangements work on South Grove. The applicants acknowledged that this is a difficult situation and that they have spent a lot of time trying to figure out the best solution. They had concluded that fronting the five houses onto South Grove works better. Although the gardens back onto the shared surface area, the parking area for the flats and the houses should be fairly quiet. They have also allowed an emergency/pedestrian route through to South Grove.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the applicant thought there may be a problem with people parking on South Grove to enter their house rather than parking in the rear and walking around to the front. Or that they may use their back door as the front door. The applicant agreed that this could be a problem. Then explained how most of the parking for the other houses is on plot. The visitor parking on South Grove has been allocated to allow parking for the school run.</p> <p>The Panel asked how the County Council plan to dispose of the land, and asked if it would include a detailed design. The applicants said that that was not necessarily the case, but any decision is subject to cabinet member approval. However, the County Council has taken the view in the last few months that it should aim to develop the scheme itself, possibly as part of a joint venture. There is an intention to provide a detailed scheme and work with a developer.</p> <p>The panel commented that they would hope that the County Council would commit to ensure high quality design in the National Park.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the immediate context, the adjacent school and care home. They asked if the brief had referred to the context, of those two uses. The applicant confirmed that they are not looking at the site in isolation and are concerned with overlooking, traffic issues and anything that would affect the operation of those uses.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the applicant had employed a landscape consultant. It was noted that the removal of trees along the eastern border would enhance the SDNP landscape. The applicant explained that the trees identified are right on the boundary line. The trees that are inside the red line have been removed. The applicant feels that they have had mixed messages about the trees, it was suggested that the poplar trees should be retained for legibility but the applicant intended to remove them. It was agreed that appointing a landscape consultant might resolve this.</p> <p>The Panel commented that the applicant said that they wanted to relate to the identity of Petworth to give a sense of place, and asked which particular features were used to present this. The applicant replied that they were given some photos by the previous SDNPA Design officer for reference about two years ago.</p>

	<p>The Panel asked if these images are part of the Design and Access Statement. The applicants said they were not.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the applicants have done their own character analysis of Petworth. The applicants said that they had done some research and identified some elements and materials. In the immediate context, some of the houses are set back and some are not. The aim for the character was to get away from a typical housing estate. The applicant added that they had had conflicting advice, which had led them to produce a design with parking courts at the back of the properties, but were since then told to get away from parking courts.</p> <p>The Panel asked about South Grove, and asked how it would be possible for cars to exit the road, pointing out that it is a dead end. The applicant explained that car users could reverse into the emergency/pedestrian route to turn around.</p> <p>The Panel pointed out that as this is a pedestrian route and potentially, there would be a lot of pedestrians using this route during the school run period this may not work and could be dangerous.</p>
<p>2.0 Panel Summary</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel and expressed support for a County Council which acknowledges the National Park designation, and aims to achieve a scheme that is exemplary within the SDNP. The panel believe that this approach is necessary. 2. The Panel offered a Design Workshop session to resolve the design issues for this site. 3. The Panel highlighted the key concerns they have with the proposed scheme: The public realm, the street pattern and the streetscape. 4. The Panel identified that the starting point of these issues is the road 'Rotherlea', that it is not in the right location to make a good scheme work on this site. 5. The Panel suggested that if there is room for flexibility on the part of the applicant, a workshop session could successfully resolve the design issues. By looking at scenarios and considering the impact of moving the road a DRP workshop session could make the scheme work in terms of landscape and design, but would also consider the criteria set by the County Council to enable the site to be viable and retain the same number of dwellings. 6. In the event that an invitation to conduct a workshop session with the applicant would not be accepted, the Panel set out what they believe is not working with the scheme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public realm in its current form is unacceptable. The reason for this is on one side is the back of a care home which concludes with a car park at the other end, and on the other side is a series of car ports which would contain the back end of cars. The character of this street scene is neither Petworth nor anywhere that is well designed. • The backs and fronts of South Grove are not clear or

	<p>defined. This issue stems from the placement of Rotherlea.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. The Panel felt strongly that an exemplary scheme that the county council would be proud of was achievable on this site. That there is an opportunity here to develop a public realm that could stand out as an example for anyone else doing a housing development in or out of a National Park. 8. The Panel respects the fact that the County Council have had differing advice throughout the process so far, but made clear that the aim of the workshop session would be to move the application forward and achieve the best possible outcome for all stakeholders.
--	---