

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	18/5/2017
Site:	68 – 74 Malling Street, Lewes, BN7 2RH
Proposal:	Demolition of existing buildings and construction of five family dwellings (C3) together with associated parking and landscaping.
Planning reference:	SDNP/17/01684/FUL
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold CHAIR Kay Brown Luke Engleback Paul Fender James Fox Graham Morrison
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes (Design Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Emily Anderson (Planning Officer)
Observers:	Lisa Rues
Item presented by:	Karl Paul Burgess

Declarations of interest:

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 opened by asking about the parking; is the Applicant confident that you can manoeuvre cars in and out in the quite confined parking area. The Applicant said that tracking is addressed in their design and access statement and that the conclusion was that, while it is certainly tight, it should not be difficult. Additionally, the Applicant suggested that people living in the area would get used to navigating it.</p> <p>2. The Panel noted that the living spaces for units 3, 4 and 5 were up on the first floor with big bay windows looking out over the adjacent road. Further to this, they asked whether the Applicant had thought about noise abatement or reorienting the windows to minimise interruptions The Applicant said that they had not really considered this. They feel that the view should not be wasted and so are not keen on reorienting the windows, but the windows are going to be high performance ones. They also said that they have considered installing MVHR (Mechanical Ventilation Heat Recovery), which might not be great for mitigating the noise but they feel is the right choice for ventilation in this development.</p> <p>3. The Panel asked about the mono-pitch bays, in context with the more varied rows of cottages to the north. The Applicant said that they wanted to have a resonance with local designs, not to ape them. They do not want their application to look like Georgian cottages, but they are trying to pick up some design options from historic local brewery buildings.</p> <p>4. The Panel asked about the height of the wall on the first floor of unit 3. The Applicant said that it was 1.6m The Panel asked how that compared to cross sections in terms of visibility with neighbours.</p> <p>5. The Panel asked how the bay windows and mono-pitch roofs would work regarding the ventilation of the development, noting that there were no obvious vents. The Applicants reiterated that they were looking in to MVHR for ventilation.</p> <p>6. The Panel asked about water management off the roofs and whether there were any down pipes. The Applicant said that there are downpipes, with a planting bed at the bottom of the downpipe on the front elevation. They noted that they still have to resolve how the water connections will work and need to get in to the details, but that currently the rain will run off the roof on to the sedum roofs on the back.</p> <p>7. The Panel asked about the section going through the mews houses (units 1 and 2). Are there any views</p>

	<p>from those houses in to the living areas of units 3, 4 and 5?</p> <p>The Applicant said that there is a high wall around it.</p> <p>8. The Panel asked if the applicant has done a shadow casting of the site. They noted that the undercliff could give a lot of shade, especially during the winter.</p> <p>The Applicant agreed that the site would be heavily shaded for large parts of the day, especially during winter, but this was largely unavoidable. They cited it as one of the reasons for being generous around fittings such as windows, in order to allow in as much of the limited daylight as possible when it is available. The applicant noted that there is constant variation in sun bounce off the trees opposite the site.</p> <p>The Panel asked about whether the houses at the front of the site (Units 3-5) would put shade on the houses to the north, on Southdown Place. Will the bulk of the proposal reduce the light to neighbouring sites?</p> <p>The Applicant said yes, but noted that any development of this site would unavoidably encounter problems with shading. They said that they have been working to make sure that they meet daylight and sunlight requirements</p> <p>The Panel asked whether the Applicant could cut down on the end of unit 3 in order to reduce shading of Southdown Place</p> <p>The Applicant said that they already have a lot of difficulty squeezing everything they need in, due to the site constraints.</p> <p>The Panel suggested that the Bays could be pitched in the other direction in order to keep the same amount of space while still reducing shading.</p> <p>9. The Panel asked about the adjacent Steamer Trading building, noting that the top floor of Steamer Trading had a bay and a balcony that overlooked the site and asked whether this floor was for residential use.</p> <p>The Applicant said no, it is just used as office space.</p> <p>The Panel asked if there were any windows in there.</p> <p>The Applicants said no.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel began by saying that this scheme is an ingenious scheme that appears to make best use of a tight site and had obviously taken some time to development. 2. The Panel noted that it still was not convinced by the parking, but that this is a fairly minor issue overall. 3. The Panel raised concern about the aspect to the North East and wondered whether units 1 and 2 could be moved to the South West of the site. Bays could be constructed that project and look down on to Davis Way so the scale and bulk of the building would have less impact overall. 4. The Panel recommended that a shadow analysis is done of the gable end of unit 3, which they think will shadow Southdown Place, and perhaps consider pitching the roofs in the other direction in order to overcome that. 5. The Panel suggested that the bays need more development of the details, in order to ensure. Currently the bays are

	<p>aggressively dominant against the context and calming that down would be beneficial to the overall street.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The Panel noted that the bed in the planned layout of the bedrooms would be close to the window and questioned whether that would be comfortable, especially given that the front three units look out on to a very aggressive, noisy road. 7. The Panel suggested that the wall by Southdown Place could be in a perforated brick design or made from slatted timber panels in order to let some light in while keeping the privacy of the occupants intact. 8. The Panel raised a concern that the gables are too high above the roofline of the surrounding buildings, which looks quite aggressive. They also expressed some doubts about the detailing shown in the CGI. Additionally, they feel that the spandrel panel does not work particularly well 9. The Panel finished by saying that they hope that the scheme will be carried forward and reminded the Applicant that they have a reputation to maintain.
--	--