

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

Date of meeting:	14/03/2016
Site:	Remount Pulens Lane Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4DB
Proposal:	Development of site with up to six houses - meeting required
Planning reference:	SDNP/15/02794/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Graham Morrison (Chair) Adam Richards John Starling Andrew Smith Luke Engleback Kay Brown
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes Hayley Stevenson Natalie Fellows
Item presented by:	Ian Ellis Allison Gal Michael Garner Andy Ramus
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 asked if the applicants would explain the orientation of the houses in more detail.</b> The applicants said the gardens have been orientated south, gaining views of the river and attracting the southern aspect. On the other side the garden will still have views and be landscaped but will not have a view of the river.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if when one was walking down the driveway, it would be clear that one is looking at the private sides of the houses, or is there a mixture of private and public spaces.</b> The applicant explained that there is a communal corridor which the private part of the houses are facing away from.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if there is a reason for the straight line edge at the bottom of the site.</b> The applicant explained that this is the site boundary.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if the design concept is to keep the houses low, and is it the idea that the surrounding houses see over them.</b> The applicant commented that the houses on Pulens Lane are not going to see over the top as that is where the ground levels off.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if the layout of the individual houses are all the same.</b> The applicant stated that there are two variations: 3x 400 Square Metre 5 bedroom house 2x 320 Square Metre 4 bedroom house.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if the applicants know the BD category of the large oak tree.</b> The applicants explained that the completed tree survey revealed that the oak was previously identified as having honey fungus, but it is the wrong time of year to confirm this. The tree surgeon will return to do the appraisal on the tree when this can be determined. The applicants stated they would look to keep the tree if possible.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if measures were in place that address rain water run-off from the large roof areas.</b> The applicants stated they are looking to reuse the water but want to keep the roofs predominantly for solar use.</p> <p><b>The Panel suggested that the site plan gravitates to the top of the site, and the road ends at a hammerhead. They asked if there is an intention to develop the site beyond the boundary.</b> The applicants said that there is no intention to do this. Highways have advised the access road is only suitable for 10 dwellings, there are 5 houses existing on the access road and the proposal for five new ones gives the total of the 10 permitted.</p> <p><b>The Panel further asked if the applicants are content with the road ending in a straight line.</b></p>

	<p>The applicant A place is needed to turn around and hence the use of the hammerhead. The area will remain a straight-line but will develop over time with planting.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if the applicants feel they are making the best use of the site in relation to the river and the village.</b> Due to ownership, the applicants stated they cannot get public access to the countryside beyond and therefore have used the site for private use.</p> <p><b>The panel asked about the history of the site.</b> The applicants explained as far as they can go back, the site was fields before being used as an equestrian centre.</p>
<p><b>2.0 Panel Summary</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notwithstanding any policy issues that may arise from the National Park, the panel believe, in terms of design, this site is capable of development. The proposal for five large dwellings was realistic and even generous. With only a part of the land ownership being developed, however, the site layout seemed to terminate arbitrarily on a line of ownership rather than a topographical feature. And, with a site bounded by a river, it was surprising that more was not made of a response to the river in the site planning.</li> <li>2. The panel considered the particular landscape design of the public areas, with its rolling mounds and walls, an over-elaborate response and perhaps a disguise for what, in typological terms, is simply a cu-de-sac. The scheme would be better if it lead somewhere more purposefully rather than ending up in a hammerhead. The space as designed tells of a sequence leading to something worthwhile and not just the disappointment of a hedge or the boundary of the next development.</li> <li>3. Furthermore, there was a pronounced concern that the houses might seem invisible from one to another. This potential sense of isolation might be emphasised by the planning of the house themselves as very few ground floor spaces actually look into this shared landscape space. These are houses that turn their back on the community. The site plan may be modern and benefit from abstraction but the panel felt it needed more considered justification and development.</li> <li>4. With these provisos, the panel thought the plans and architectural composition of the individual houses seemed confident and accomplished. The grouping of the houses within the space was, from a visual point of view, similarly well accomplished and the provision of an animation in the presentation illustrated this. The panel was encouraged to see a design proposal that did not simply rely on imitation or a copy of something in the village. To this end, the effort behind the proposal is to be commended.</li> <li>5. The panel believe the scheme is capable of development and encouraged rethink of the site planning principles. It noted its concern, however, that the first house may detrimentally affect the adjacent existing listed building. The panel felt this combined with the overall nature of the shared space was an abstract idea triumphing over some valuable aspects of an already interesting and rich context.</li> </ol>