

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	20/2/2017
Site:	Foundry Farm, Shillinglee Road, Shillinglee, Northchapel, West Sussex, GU8 4SY
Proposal:	Extension of an existing barn and changing the use of some of the land from agriculture to mixed agriculture and equestrian use.
Planning reference:	SDNP/16/06355/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold CHAIR Graham Morrison Kim Wilkie Adam Richards Paul Fender Kay Brown
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes (Design Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Richard Ferguson (Case Officer) Stella New (Case Officer) Lillian Wakely (Planning Assistant)
Authority Members in attendance:	
Item presented by:	Jack Hosea Ryan Hackimian Heather Daniell Ben Allgrove
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 questioned the decision to integrate the proposed barn in to the woods, as this stands to hide the building behind the trees. The Applicant explained that the origin of this plan was the position of the existing barn, which is integrated in to the trees. They wanted to use the same space that was used by the original barn so as to avoid substantially altering the site layout. They also noted that, because of the plan to fell the existing pine woodland, the barn would be exposed for at least 15 – 20 years as the woodland regrows, and won't be completely concealed until about 30 years after the initially felling. The Panel commented that, in that context, some of the main qualities of the barn's design will be lost because they will be concealed by the trees, as will the original design rationale for the positioning of the barn due to the changed relationship between the barn and the gulley/ditch to the rear of it. The Applicant said that they liked the idea of changing the landscape and they were expecting that the barn would be seen differently at different times over the 30 year period, so had designed it accordingly.</p> <p>2. The Panel asked if they still intended to use mirrors in the construction of the barn. The Applicants said that they had now dropped that plan, with the intention to use more natural materials instead.</p> <p>3. The Panel asked which is more important, the goats or the lavender planting. The Applicants explained that they were well aware of the danger of individual parts of their scheme not working out, so they wanted to have some diversity in their proposal to help cover for that possibility. As a result, weighing both options equally works to their benefit and they have no particular preference.</p> <p>4. The Panel noted the implications of the different plans – The site is currently predominantly pasture, so pasturing goats on it would not require substantial landscape change, but creating raised beds to handle the lavender growing would make a huge difference. The Applicant explained that their plan to start with just a half-acre patch of land for growing lavender is a response to that, as this allows them to assess the viability and impact of the lavender beds before committing to a larger development. It is their view, however, that the landscape could be improved by the installation of the raised beds, amongst other features such as the planting of dogwood,</p>

	<p>which would reduce the openness of the area to give it a more intimate, closed in feel.</p> <p>5. The Panel observed that one of the key advantages of a classic agricultural barn is how adaptable they are, so building a more traditional style barn would give the applicant room to change strategy if any one part of their business doesn't work out. The Applicants said that the modular construction of the barn is intended to give the building a high degree of versatility.</p> <p>6. The Panel asked the exact building height. The Applicant said that the ground to ceiling was 3.3m in the main barn, then the upper floor to roof was 2.4m, for a total of 5.7m overall. They explained that 3.3m was required on the ground floor to allow farm vehicles to enter, but it would still be less than 6 metres from ground to gutter.</p> <p>7. The Panel noted that the applicants appeared to be interested in the materials proposed both for their abstract qualities and for the practical application. They then asked about the scheme to continue the charred wood finish over the roof and asked how the PV cells would be integrated in to that. The Applicants said that they are currently planning to have the PV panels flush with the roofline, inserted in to gaps cut in the wooden slats to create a consistent roof form.</p> <p>8. The Panel asked about the water runoff, noting that they didn't see any gutter on the plans. The Applicant explained that they wanted to have a hidden gutter atop the parapet with fins that go up and over the gutter. They plan to use the guttering to harvest the water for use on site.</p> <p>9. The Panel asked about the drainage channel near the barn and asked whether the Applicants had considered moving the barn forward so that the ditch would not have to be moved in order to accommodate the barn. This would help to avoid needing to reroute the ditch, which would cause ecological damage. The Applicant reiterated that they wanted to keep the proposed footprint, in order to insure the plan was uncontroversial. They also established that proximity to the field was important, as it will be an actively used farm building.</p> <p>10. The Panel asked whether there was a phasing element in relation to the business plan that led to the decision to separate the two buildings. They noted that the argument about landscape incorporation is reasonable, but weren't clear on what the function of the courtyard spaces between</p>
--	---

	<p>the structures would be.</p> <p>The Applicants stated that the buildings were intended for combined use, with the main purpose of the split being an architectural response to the position of the building, with an intention to reduce the mass of it.</p> <p>The Panel asked what the gap between the buildings would become.</p> <p>The Applicants said that it would mostly be woodland, to help integrate the building in to the surrounding woods.</p> <p>11. The Panel asked about access to the building, noting that there are a lot of doors facing out in to the woods at the southern end of the building.</p> <p>The Applicants explained that the primary access route is the same as the existing one and the animals would be lead out through the central isle of the buildings and leave via the front entrance. The installation of external doors to the outside in the stable area is a fire safety feature, rather than being intended for day to day use as access points.</p> <p>The Panel noted that the goat pen was also at the end of the building and asked whether the Applicants intended them to go back out through the building or whether they'd go out on to the woodland.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they would be bringing the goats out through the building, explaining that they wanted to use the space as efficiently as possible. They then reiterated that the majority of external doors were intended as emergency access and not expected to see day to day use.</p> <p>12. The Panel questioned the proposal of using the trees felled on the site as material for the construction. While they acknowledged that the suggestion was sustainable, they were concerned about the practicalities of it – Would the timber need any seasoning, how would it be cut to a suitable size without a sawmill, what would the effect of charring be on greenwood, etc.</p> <p>The Applicants acknowledged that their current plan is aimed to achieve optimum sustainability but that it is not guaranteed to work. They went on to explain that they would performing some testing beforehand to confirm the theory, as well as being prepared to look at alternative options, such as importing timber from off site, should their plan prove unworkable.</p> <p>13. The Panel noted some clear spots appearing on the plans for the north facing roofs and questioned whether these indicated roof lights. In the event they are roof lights, the Panel said that consideration needs to be given to the Dark Night Skies implications.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledged that they are roof lights but that they doubt the lights will be on in those buildings at</p>
--	--

	<p>night. However, they are happy to look at other options for mitigating and preventing impact of lighting on the night skies from the roof lights.</p> <p>14. The Panel asked about the trees in the central courtyard, noting that they could grow quite large and questioning whether there was a risk of the PV cells being overshadowed as the trees grow. The Applicants acknowledged that this will need consideration and that they'll be careful with deciding what trees they'll plant and how tall they're likely to go, but said that they think the current positions of the PV cells would get plenty of sun, noting that the provision of PV cells is enough that they don't need 100% efficiency to provide enough power.</p> <p>15. The Panel asked if the energy provision for the barn was entirely electrical. The Applicants said that they were looking at the possibility of a biomass boiler to use for heating. They also mentioned that they were considering trying a novel heating system which would use exothermic reactions of anhydrous salts with water during the winter to generate heat, then use excess power from the PV system in the summer to dehydrate the salts, allowing them to store excess electricity in the summer for use in heating during the winter.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by noting that this had been a very challenging application to consider. The proposal that has been constructed involves a very carefully designed, complex building, but the purpose remains a barn. Barns are traditionally expected to be simple in form, with large, robust agricultural barns being a common sight in the National Park and wholly inoffensive. This presents a dilemma, as the design is commendable but far gone from what would typically be expected. 2. The Panel went on to say that the landscape around the barn has real strength, but the beauty of the land is as a pasture. 3. It was noted that the barn that's already existing served a functional purpose and, were it owned by a farmer already working the nearby land, any need to accommodate growth would simply result in an unremarkable functional expansion being added on to it. 4. The Panel observed that the woodland around the barn was not there historically, so it would be reasonable to remove it and focus replanting somewhere out of the way, allowing the barn to be seen more widely and not hiding it. 5. The Panel said that they had already discussed earlier the practicalities of the barn, noting the needs for access and simplicity, and said that these practicalities are what normally defines the design and siting of a barn. The Panel would like to see the application again in future and if they do, they'd like to see a better analysis of the functional aspects of the barn in relation to the landscape. 6. The Panel observed that the applicants were being very rational, but they had produced a plan that seemed very self-

	<p>conscious, when a barn in the national park is typically the reverse. They suggested that it might be more sensible to keep the barn as is and look at expanding it rather than replacing it.</p> <p>7. The Panel said that if the Applicants return with this application, they would like to see the intentions of the application clearly displayed in regards to the typology of the landscape.</p> <p>8. The Panel ended with the point that both options – The current scheme or the alternative of using the existing barn – have their merits, with the former being a more exciting option while the latter is more conservative and in keeping. Whichever way the applicants choose to go, the Panel would like to see them again once the plan has developed further.</p>
--	---