

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

Date of meeting:	18/4/2017
Site: Proposal:	Land between Fernden Lane and Kingsley Green Replacement of former 'sports hall' and 'storage building' with new dwelling and garage building.
Planning reference:	SDNP/16/06278/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Graham Morrison CHAIR Kay Brown Luke Engelback Paul Fender Adam Richards Kim Wilkie
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes (Design Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Martin Mew (CDC Pre-applications Officer) John Saunders (CDC Development Manager) Nat Belderson (Planning Link Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer)
Observers:	Lisa Rues
Item presented by:	Ben Reed Doug Wright Emma Reed
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>1. The Panel started by acknowledging that, as an application sought under Paragraph 55, there are several specific areas that need particular consideration. Believing that there are three key areas of consideration; the landscape, the architecture and sustainability, they opted to begin with the landscape, asking whether the applicants had done a landscape character analysis of the site.</b> The Applicant said that they had done an initial analysis and tree survey, but had not yet done a full character, landscape and ecology analysis. They intend to perform these analyses going forward in order to achieve an understanding of the local ecology, as the promotion of local flora and fauna is one of their main priorities in the full application.</p> <p><b>2. The Panel asked what the applicants think are the essential ingredients that create the sense of place in this location and, further to that, how much of the landscape elements they expect will be changed over the course of the application.</b> The Applicants said that the site is dominated by woodland, which is primarily what creates its unique character and that they hope to develop a scheme that conserves as much of the landscape as possible. They acknowledged that some young plants will need to be removed to allow access, but they believe this will have very little overall impact.</p> <p><b>3. The Panel noted that the proposed access is quite tight and asked whether that will be the route for construction traffic.</b> The Applicant said yes, that would be the primary route for construction traffic, but acknowledged that it was quite tight and they would need to install some root protection to preserve adjacent trees. They said their arboriculture report has identified where the root protection zones should be and they feel that they can protect them to a degree whereby the traffic will not cause any lasting harm.</p> <p><b>4. The Panel suggested that the landscape should be considered first, before beginning the design of the house. They went on to ask whether the Applicant had fully appreciated the landscape before starting the design work.</b> The Applicant said that, having seen the existing school hall building, they felt that choosing the location of the house was a simple notion; with the existing foundations already in place, building on that footprint would reduce the overall impact of the scheme. <b>The Panel said that one of the main points of concern for them here was the need for access to the</b></p>

	<p><b>site, especially during the construction work, which could have a substantial impact on the landscape.</b></p> <p>The Applicant established that they planned to minimise wet trades and use local materials as much as possible in order to minimise damage from the work, acknowledging that the build would need to be carefully managed in order to reduce harm.</p> <p><b>5. The Panel asked whether the Applicant would be doing a landscape archaeology survey.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that they could do one.</p> <p><b>6. The Panel noted that the carport for the house was set on a different level to the main entrance. Noting also that the Applicants had suggested this would ultimately be their lifetime home, the Panel asked whether the Applicants had considered how they would deal with the level changes and any future accessibility requirements.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that their plans provide for reasonable access to the house, featuring ramps up to it. They also noted that the timber frame roof that they have planned could accommodate a lift, if it was required, for access to the upper floors.</p> <p><b>7. The Panel asked about the architecture, noting that it is a very cultural pursuit. They asked if the Applicants could talk about how the design responds to the setting, then about the wider culture. They noted that the Applicants had highlighted Falling Water by Frank Lloyd Wright as an inspiration for the build, but noted Falling Water's success was in how beautifully it responded to its setting.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that their design is a response to the nature of woodland, that woodland creates a strong sense of shelter through enclosure, as well as verticality. They went on to explain that the growth of trees and the canopy overhead helped to create routes through the woods, like pathways or tunnels that draw you in. As such, they aimed to create routes like that on the approach to draw you in towards the building. In addition, creating the sense of verticality in the building itself and reflect the sloping nature of the site through the horizontal aspect of the design, which follows the lay of the land, the approach zig-zagging up to the main building in the same way a hillside path would. Culturally they noted that it could mean all things to all men, but said that it had a clear technical side to it, considering the efforts to use renewable energy sources, the advanced power distribution system and the contemporary tactics for management of the internal climate. They noted that it also responds heavily to the context.</p> <p><b>8. The Panel asked how the Applicants see the views, in particular the meadow in front of the house. They noted that the proposed route might take away the</b></p>
--	---

	<p><b>surprise of the view.</b></p> <p>The Applicant explained that in their view, a large part of the scheme is about being surprised, to be able to go on a journey through the site and not until you reach the steps do you become fully aware of the house. Explaining how one can then turn to the landscape and see the expanse of the meadow as another aspect of surprise. They feel that this produces a rich, continual architectural journey as you move through the site.</p>
<b>2.0 Panel Summary</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Panel began by stating that houses seeking a determination under Paragraph 55 are required to meet a high standard and that it is the duty of this Panel to give advice on the issue, not to make the determination itself.</li> <li>2. In order to make a convincing argument, very much more detail and a stronger sense of conviction would have to be demonstrated. Though the Panel understood why, at this stage, a very light touch has been applied it was nevertheless clear that a number of issues have not yet been fully considered. The main topics are likely to fall under the headings of landscape and ecology, architecture and sustainability.</li> <li>3. Regarding the landscape, the Panel considered the information submitted to be well below the level required and even the main access route seemed to cause concern. This route in is thought to be an ancient track and, as such, should not be further considered without an archaeological survey. Concerning ecology the Panel stressed this was likely to be a particularly sensitive site. It noted that there was a tree survey but was not yet convinced by its accuracy as it considered that some of the conclusions concerning designations seem unexpected.</li> <li>4. Regarding the architecture the Panel noted that the design response was bold, but it was concerned, however, that designs as self-conscious as this, when proposed, tend to fall firmly in to either harming or enhancing the landscape. In this case, the Panel concluded that the application was falling on the side of harm. This was not necessarily a comment on the skill behind the design, it was more of a concern that the landscape on this site simply cannot accommodate a Paragraph 55 house. In other words, a very much more convincing case is necessary and has yet to be made.</li> <li>5. Regarding sustainability, the Panel considered that the Applicants efforts to justify a strongly sustainable design were both admirable and sensible but it took the view that the industry had caught up with such aspirations and such a strategy was less innovative than it used to be.</li> <li>6. The Panel discounted the argument of re-use of the existing buildings.</li> <li>7. The Panel concluded by suggesting that the Applicant should now consider their options. The Panel was unconvinced that the proposal as presented would produce a strong enough case for a Paragraph 55 approval. The Panel did not encourage it but, if the Applicants were determined to pursue the present design, it would be happy to be proved</li> </ol>

	wrong. The Panel did not wish to make any particular criticism of the design as it considered that it does not meet the test of Paragraph 55 on this site.
--	--