

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	18/1/2017
Site:	Bury Gate Farm, Bury.
Proposal:	Construction of a replacement dwelling and associated outbuildings, revised plans to approved planning permission SDNP/15/01189/FUL
Planning reference:	SDNP/16/05874/FUL
Panel members sitting:	Graham Morrison (Chair) Mark Penfold Andrew Smith Luke Engleback Lap Chan Stephen Johnson William Hardie
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes (Design Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Vicki Colwell (Senior Planning Officer- Case Officer) Lillian Wakely (Development Management Officer)
Committee Member	Neville Harrison (Planning Committee Member)
Item presented by:	Sandy Rendel (Architect) James Fox (Landscape Architect) absent
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>1. The Panel asked what the size of the house is. The Applicant said that the gross internal area, including the office, is 500m², with the garage as an additional 65-67m². This leave the total below 600m², compared to the original application, which had a total GIA of about 700m². The Panel asked what the distance to the road is. The Applicant said it was 150m from the road, and that the land slopes to the south and south east.</p> <p>2. The Panel asked if the barns have been removed. The Applicant said that the barns are still present, noting that the client does not consider them to be a part of the application, although they are in their ownership. They have thickened the planting nearer to the house, however, which should help obscure views of the barns. The Panel acknowledged this, but observed that planting too close to the barns could risk drawing attention to them.</p> <p>3. The Panel noted the estate fencing along the boundary of the garden and asked whether other options might provide a better result, suggesting a ha-ha. The Applicant said that they had considered installing a ha-ha, but that the client didn't want to put one in, so the fencing scheme is their next best option.</p> <p>4. The Panel asked what material would be used for the roof. The Applicant said that they will be green roofs, likely planted with sedum. They had considered using wildflowers, but considered a specific growth to be more viable. The Panel suggested that it might be worth looking in to the micro topography of the green roof and a minimal amount of substrates to add to the soil to facilitate wildflower planting.</p> <p>5. The Panel asked for a breakdown of the relationship with the brick and concrete to be used. The Applicant said that the columns on the south side would be made of hand made brick, while the colonades would be rammed earth. The Panel asked if they had considered using local sands for the concrete. The Applicant said that they haven't looked specifically, but were definitely planning to use a local aggregate and would look in to the matter.</p> <p>6. The Panel asked if the Applicant was going to include any aspects of sustainable energy generation. The Applicant said that they were conscious of the fact that</p>

	<p>they're creating a very substantial application and don't want to put too much in to the application and risk not getting permission as a result, but they're definitely considering developing sustainability of the building at a later point.</p> <p>The Panel asked them specifically if they've looked in to sustainability.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they have not in any great depth. There has been some consideration of the prospect of mounting photovoltaic panels on the South-facing side, but they want to keep the application simple and feel that this would be better added at a later date.</p> <p>The Panel asked whether they'd considered ground source heating.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they had considered it, but a nearby house had employed it and it had caused substantial damage to the landscape, which left them concerned about its long term effects.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by saying that they all really liked the house. The members of the Panel who were present at the session when this application first came to the Panel noted that since that, it has developed thoughtfully, considerately and in the right direction. 2. The Panel noted that one of the key things that came up last time was the landscaping need to effectively screen the barns with planting. They're concerned that planting too close to the barn could just draw attention to it, but a more measured approach will create a successful screen. They also observed that some of the proposed planting, while still on land owned by the applicant, fell outside the red line of the application. This might need to be controlled by condition, in order to insure the planting goes ahead. 3. The Panel re-iterated their belief that installed a ha-ha would be the most effective way of creating a boundary, allowing for a far more compelling view from the house that isn't disrupted by obvious boundaries. They suggested that some thought could produce something more financially viable than a classic ha-ha, such as forming it entirely from earthworks without building a wall, so they don't feel that the question of cost should prevent it. However, they acknowledged that the planning authority may be of a different opinion and want a clearly defined border. 4. Adopting sedum for the green roof feels defeatist. Using meadow flowers in concert with some careful thought about the micro topography would have a much more successful end result, especially for local biodiversity, as it would be much more attractive to butterflies. 5. The Panel suggested that it might be best not to use the word concrete in the application, perhaps terming it "stabilised rammed earth", in order to create a more compelling image than concrete. 6. Finally, the Panel reiterated how impressed they were with the quality of this application and wished the Applicant every success going forward, confident that this will turn out to be an incredibly well handled construction.