

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

Date of meeting:	18/11/2016
Site:	Ramsdean Rd, Stroud
Proposal:	Erection of 20 dwellings (8 affordable) or erection of 26 dwellings (8 affordable) and village hall or erection of 30 dwellings (12 affordable) and village hall.
Planning reference:	SDNP/16/05076/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold (Chair) Kay Brown Steven Johnson Graham Morrison Kim Wilkie
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes Paul Slade Emily Anderson Victoria Corrigan Stella New
Planning Committee in attendance:	Heather Baker
Item presented by:	David Cranmer – OSP Architecture Julian Bohling – OSP Architecture Representing CALA homes
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 asked what has informed the housing numbers.</b> The Applicant said that a 2014 HARA (Hampshire Alliance for Rural Affordable Housing) study suggested a need for 8 affordable units and 12 open market dwellings. However, there is a desire locally for a village hall – CALA believes that to make a village hall viable, an additional 6 open market units would be required, bringing it up to 18 open market dwellings (26 total). This in turn necessitates a proportional increase in the number of affordable dwellings by 4, to 12, bringing the total number of dwellings to 30.</p> <p><b>2. The Panel inquired about how the village hall would be paid for and maintained.</b> The Applicants said that they currently only have rough calculations, but they will be meeting the parish on the 24<sup>th</sup> of November to work on the details. Their current intention is to gain permission for the houses, but provide the community with funding to build the hall themselves, so that they can create a hall that's suitable for them.</p> <p><b>3. The Panel asked if the Applicants could link the design proposals more tightly to the character of the area, suggesting that the design as it currently stands could be placed anywhere – What ties it specifically to this site?</b> The Applicants started by highlighting the road frontages, and that properties facing a linear road is a key feature of the character of the area. They said they had provided this link by locating some of the buildings onto the road. They then noted the importance of identifying a rural character in the vernacular of the architectural style and the materials used. They also said that the layout of the proposal was a cul-de-sac form that has already appeared off the main roads in this area. The Applicants subsequently said that they were at a very early stage and their plans are still in development. They went on to say that developing in the SDNPA's very different; it's about soft surfaces, boundary treatments and dark night skies, where the details will be key. They hope to choose a palette of materials that will reflect the best parts of Stroud. They closed by saying that the current centre of the village was the large car dealership, which nobody wants as the village hub – With this development, CALA homes hopes to create a new village hub that the community can be proud of.</p> <p><b>4. The Panel congratulated the Applicants on their</b></p>

	<p>overall site assessment and particularly for mentioning the fact that the quality of agricultural land was tier 4. The Panel said that in their opinion is a convincing spot for housing and an opportunity to create a great scheme. They acknowledged the applicant's study of local Cul-de-sacs, but pointed out that the other one in the area is very linear, with two clearly defined straight roads, while this plan proposes a wiggly road. They also felt that an area of analysis that is missing is studying the formats of similarly sized villages.</p> <p>The Applicants said that the Panel makes an interesting point, but explained that the wiggly road is an attempt to create a more natural form.</p> <p><b>The Panel suggested that the form of having a village green addressing the road, with terraces that fit around the green, is a typology that's seen quite often, particularly in council housing, and can be sometimes be successful. They also suggested that having two accesses to the development would help use the land even more effectively.</b></p> <p>The Applicants suggested that there was a good example of this sort of thing in Lodsworth.</p> <p><b>5. The Panel asked if they had considered talk to the Seven Stars pub about building the village hall on their land.</b></p> <p>The Applicants said that they haven't, but they are happy to talk to them about permeability between the development and the pub, particularly if they build the hall on the northern end of the development.</p> <p><b>The Panel suggested that, if this were pursued, the pub could use the hall as a function room when it's not in village use.</b></p> <p><b>6. The Panel asked if the site was outside of the development boundary.</b></p> <p>The Applicants said it was.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if that presented any difficulty.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that it wasn't as difficult as it sounds, as there is a clear and well established need for housing in this village and this site is the best possible candidate for it.</p> <p><b>7. The Panel asked if there had been a public consultation.</b></p> <p>The Applicants said that there had – 68 parish members came to an initial consultation in July and they have met with the parish twice since then as well as having a planned meeting again next week.</p> <p><b>8. The Panel stated that there is an opportunity to establish this development as a village centre, with the pub on one side and the school on the other, with the chance to integrate the two within the development through an effective circulation system.</b></p>
--	---

	<p>The Applicants said that CALA homes are an extremely proactive developer and that they think this is a very important conversation to have. They said they will look in to it further, suggesting that they could have another public consultation on the matter and proposing that they could develop a footpath connecting across the development.</p> <p><b>9. The Panel asked if there was an opportunity to create a public green space.</b> The Applicants said that they would need to look in to it, but acknowledged that if the village hall was moved off the site, there would be a great opportunity for the establishment of a green space in the gap left behind.</p> <p><b>10. The Panel asked what is known about the nearby Roman Villa, whether there are any comment on the patterns of development, why some houses front the road and some are further back and perpendicular, why a shared surfaces hadn't been proposed, whether there would be an issue of surface water on the boundary with the pub, whether they could introduce a SuDS system and whether they'd be able to look in to providing an open space.</b> The Applicant said that they're not quite at drainage yet, but will look in to it. <b>The Panel said that, at the moment, the density of the site is too great to fit in everything that they just mentioned, like SuDS and open spaces.</b> The Applicant agreed that it would be a fine balance. <b>The Panel said that all these aspirational factors will have an impact on the total housing numbers.</b> The Applicant said that their purposes need to come before their duty and they would have to be pragmatic in their design.</p> <p><b>11. The Panel suggested that the landscaping and trees don't reflect existing developments.</b> The Applicants said that boundary treatments will be vital in this.</p> <p><b>12. The Panel suggested analysing the existing figure ground in Stroud to get some inspiration on how to fit the development in with the local character.</b></p> <p><b>13. The Panel observed that it was a really good site for housing, but that the Applicants need to get the number of houses right.</b> The Applicants said that they had done a broad landscape analysis, looking in to how the density of housing should be distributed.</p> <p><b>14. The Panel said that it is important to be careful not to have the scheme dictated by highway engineering and be prepared for the issues they might face, such as being encouraged to construct roads that are out</b></p>
--	---

	<p><b>of character for the area.</b></p> <p>The Applicants agreed and said that they don't want to run too far in to adoptable standards, saying that they want to use a tarmac blend and cut in to the footpaths.</p>
<b>2.0 Panel Summary</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Panel opened by thanking the Applicants for coming, saying that they have come to the Panel at exactly the right time, providing enough information for the panel to work with but having enough flexibility to change.</li> <li>2. In particular, the Panel was pleased to have such a strong analysis, which was very helpful to them. However, factors such as contour lines on plans, flood risk and the impact on the nearby Roman villa all need to be included in the site analysis to create an accurate picture.</li> <li>3. The Panel were disappointed that the plans did not seem to draw suitably from the information provided by the analysis, which might have provided a greater sense of bonding with the local area, although they accepted that OSP were not involved with some of the earlier stages of planning.</li> <li>4. One of the key areas that the Panel feels needs to be looked at in depth is the pattern of development and capacity of the site. They suggested a figure ground analysis would be very beneficial in examining that.</li> <li>5. The Panel acknowledged that this was a very good site for housing which could help create a strong hierarchy in the area, but only if the roads and highways can be resolved suitably.</li> <li>6. The Panel raised a concern that the plans seemed to use a selection of standard house types, which isn't suitable for a development in a national park.</li> <li>7. The Panel noted that there was an open space marked on the plans as a "Village Green" and disputed the choice of name, on the basis that it was far too small a space to justify it.</li> <li>8. The Panel finished by re-iterating that this is a good site for housing and has enormous potential to become a stunning centre for the village, a chance to redefine the character of the village, but it needs to find a way to tie the village together.</li> </ol>