

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

Date of meeting:	16/03/2016
Site:	Trademark House Ramshill Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4AT
Proposal:	mixed use development comprising 209 square metres of commercial development, six apartments and ten houses
Planning reference:	SDNP/16/00276/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
EHDC officers in attendance:	Nicky Powis
Item presented by:	Simon Knight John Milligan
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 for drainage plans.</b> The applicant replied that the drainage plans are not in place but they are aware that they are an important aspect of the scheme as part of the shared services.</p> <p><b>The Panel stated that when on site, it was evident the baseline survey is not accurate, the substation has not been annotated and there is an anomaly on one of the corners.</b> The applicants agreed this is something that needs to be revisited and was not picked up on after the survey had been done.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked which materials are being considered for the roofs.</b> The applicants said that they had originally thought of a grey slate material but are considering exploring ironstone.</p> <p><b>The Panel inquired about the internal layouts, specifically having a bathroom on the ground floor as well as the first.</b> The ground floor bathroom is for access: reasons however the applicants stated they will revisit the plans.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if the scale of the building that faces Rams Hill is appropriate in context.</b> In terms of scale it sits next to an unattractive petrol station, the applicants said they feel they would like there to be a presence of quality on that road. There are also large scale buildings opposite at Churchers College. The roofline is close to the height of the neighbouring houses to the East. The applicants felt it's important the roofline is articulated which does affect the height.</p> <p>The brick detailing is something the applicant are now keen to move on with the submission having looked at the local vernacular. The verticality of the windows has come from Churchers College located opposite the site. Looking into how functional it can be made.</p> <p><b>The Panel asked if refuse and emergency vehicles accessing and leaving the site had been thought about.</b> This is something that needs to be looked at in more detail. Currently have 3 metre carriageways and a hammerhead which will be used for turning of larger vehicles allowed under the requirements of the fire regulations.</p> <p><b>The Panel pointed out that the windows on the side of the building which fronts onto the main road overlook</b></p>

	<p><b>the petrol station, and commented that this may not be allowed from a fire point of view.</b></p> <p>The bedroom will prove a problem and needs to be looked at.</p>
<b>2.0 Panel Summary</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The panel commended the presentation. The project was clearly described and it appreciated the provision of a model and appropriate views. It welcomed the general principle and architectural intention of the scheme which it found to be bold and plausible.</li> <li>2. Despite a strong idea behind the planning of the site, however, there was a general concern that there may be too much development being proposed on too limited a site.</li> <li>3. There was also a concern about the accuracy of the documentation and a worry that some of the assumptions on which the design is based may be erroneous. The panel recommended that the survey of the existing site and site plan of the proposed development be better coordinated and calibrated.</li> <li>4. Specifically, it commented that it may not be possible to place the trees on the north side of the garage block and there may be dimensional issues both in relation to the windows on the west boundary wall and in relation to the access to the site. The panel also observed that windows were planned on party walls and this may give rise to difficulty should the neighbour wish to develop. It also advised that vehicle turnarounds and tracking should be checked.</li> <li>5. Much work still needs to be done in relation to the site plan and its landscape. The landscape survey should clarify what type of trees exists and whether they could be removed in order to make the access work. A decision is required on whether parking or landscape will be provided to the north block. The panel believed that the landscape option would make a better place than the parking option.</li> <li>6. In the planning of the dwellings themselves, the panel commented on the ground floor arrangement in which a full bathroom may not be required. It was also concerned about the level of sunlight available to the norther block.</li> <li>7. In terms of the elevational compositions, the panel welcomed the contemporary approach within a traditional town. It believed this offered considerable promise if these ideas were properly developed. These ideas would be all the more convincing if references could be made to forms, typologies and detail found in the town. The panel considered that the recessed dormers, for example, might project rather than recess.</li> <li>8. The panel would like to see the scheme again after further development. It hoped it would then see more fluency in handling the layers and detail. With such a scheme, much would depend on how this detail was handled. The buildings should be interesting and avoid being dull. Elements such as chimneys which help modulate the silhouette will be more convincing if they</li> </ol>

	<p>also have a clear purpose. Though there is still much ground to cover in the design, the panel was encouraged by this first presentation and looks forward to the further design development of what could be an interesting and rewarding project.</p>