

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	19/12/2016
Site:	Liphook Golf Course, Wheatsheaf Enclosure, Milland, Liphook, West Sussex, GU30 7EH
Proposal:	Construction of an underpass proposed beneath the B2070 just to the north of the existing skew rail bridge to facilitate the safe crossing of Liphook Golf Club Members.
Planning reference:	SDNP/16/06300/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Graham Morrison (Chair) Kay Brown Mark Penfold John Starling Kim Wilkie
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes Paul Slade Kelly Porter Lillian Wakely Nat Belderson Natalie Fellows
Item presented by:	Mike Kendall Mike London David Flemming
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
<p>1.0 Discussion/Questions with applicants</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="560 315 1353 651"> <p>1. The Panel asked why the tunnel was running under the road at an angle, instead of going straight. The Applicant said that this decision was partly an effort to minimise disturbance to the residents nearby by situating the tunnel entrance further from their homes and partly to avoid awkward topology underground, trying to stay above the water table to avoid problems with drainage. They also said that they weren't considering a curved tunnel in order to insure that there's clear sight lines through the whole tunnel, so that users could see from end to end.</p> <li data-bbox="560 689 1353 958"> <p>2. The Panel asked whether, if the tunnel is not going to be lit, the golf club are going to consider adding gates to either end to lock the tunnel after dark. The Applicant said that this will depend on whether or not the subway is adopted as a public right of way. If it is, then they would not be able to install gates, but otherwise they would consider installing gates and locking them between dusk and dawn.</p> <li data-bbox="560 996 1353 1167"> <p>3. The Panel asked if the applicants had a planting strategy. The Applicants said that they do not have one yet, but are keen to make one that is in line with SDNP guidance as part of their full application.</p> <li data-bbox="560 1205 1353 1839"> <p>4. The Panel asked whether the subway could be built under the existing overhead power lines, which would prevent the removal of some very important mature oak trees. It could possibly also reduce the cost, as the Applicant wouldn't need to pay for the removal of the trees, although they might need to dig the tunnel in deeper to account for the road being lower. The Applicant said that they felt doing so would cause more disruption, but that they are willing to discuss it. The Panel asked if there were any restrictions on building under power lines. The Applicant said that there are, but nothing that couldn't be overcome – in particular, using tall machines like cranes that could interfere with the power lines isn't allowed. The Panel asked about wayleaves relating to the power lines, noting that this could be a significant restriction to building under the lines. The Applicant said that they had not yet investigated this.</p> <li data-bbox="560 1910 1353 2007"> <p>5. The Panel asked whether the Applicant had considered employing traffic calming measures along the road.</p>

	<p>The Applicant said that they looked at this, in consultation with Highways, but Highways did not consider investing in traffic calming on this stretch of road appropriate. They did suggest a possible realignment of the road at the railway bridge that could have improved safety to a minor degree, but the club would have had to pay for it themselves and they would need to register as a major developer in order to do it. They also felt that the benefit of such a development would be limited, as changing the curvature of the road would add a visibility problem.</p>
<p>2.0 Panel Summary</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by stating that they have, on design terms, no objection in principle and that they think all the issues are resolvable. 2. The Panel went on to acknowledge that this is still a very early stage for this application, but they have already done a good job of demonstrating that alternatives like building a bridge have been considered and reasonably discounted. 3. However, the Panel feel that more surveying work is required, in particular a full tree survey, to provide some certainty over the trees to be removed above the tunnel and the proposed entrances. 4. The Panel feel very strongly that realigning the tunnel under the power lines would be the best course here, although they were divided on whether it would be best to continue to cross diagonally under the road as is planned, or to redesign it so it crosses straight under perpendicular to the road, decreasing the overall length of the subway. 5. The Panel expressed that it has little sympathy for concerns over loss of car parking space – They feel that the car park could be easily moved slightly in order to retain its current capacity and that the nearby cottage would substantially benefit from looking over a well-landscaped subway entrance instead of a car park. 6. Following this, the Panel stated that now was the time for the applicant to pursue landscape design in order to get the landscape strategy right. 7. The Panel then said that the alignment and landscaping of the tunnel need to be resolved in order to reduce the impact of the tunnel on the surrounding area. If there are new plans drawn up as a result of this, the Panel asked that they include tree positions, topographical information and contour lines. 8. The Panel also stressed the importance of engineering this subway with safety in mind, but agreed that simply installing motorway railings would not be a suitable solution. 9. The Panel feels that, notwithstanding the negotiations with Highways about adopting the subway, the Applicant should consider the detailing of the interior, including providing effective lightning. The current plans suggest a tunnel of about 15 metres in length, but with just a 3.3M aperture at either end of the tunnel, which would be very

	<p>poorly lit, especially during bright days when people's eyes would need to adjust to the darkness in the tunnel. Effective lighting would not add much additional cost or complexity, as lighting these days is very cheap and long lasting. With effective lighting installed, they could look at a more interesting interior design to make the subway a positive addition rather than just an expedient alternative route.</p>
--	--