

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting: 18/5/2017

Site: Andlers Ash Nursery, Liss. GU33 7LR
Proposal:

Planning reference: SDNP/17/02391/PRE

Panel members sitting: David Hares CHAIR
Lap Chan
Mark Penfold
James Fox
Nic Pople
John Starling

SDNPA officers in attendance: Genevieve Hayes (Design Officer)
Paul Slade (Support Services Officer)
Victoria Corrigan (Planning Officer)
Mike Hughes (Performance and Technical Manager)
Nat Belderson (Link Officer)
Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer)

SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance: Ian Phillips

Item presented by: Natalie Fellows
Julian Bohling
Viv Hill

Declarations of interest: John Starling is on the Liss Flood Action Group.

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 if the Applicant had looked at a figure ground of the surrounding areas. The Applicant said that their initially efforts were to find ways to break up the buildings, frontages and parking and that they had looked at some of the immediate context and copied a cul-de-sac approach that is used locally, which was seen quite positively by the neighbourhood plan team.</p> <p>2. The Panel noted that the application features ribbon housing on one side, while on the other a more farm yard type of character, and asked what the reasoning for this was. The Applicant said that the results of their analysis suggested that the farm style would be likely to provide the best fit for the site, as the site is caught between two farmsteads.</p> <p>3. The Panel asked why no buildings were being put in to the open space between the two sites, which is occupied by a single existing house. Currently that single house stands out as an isolated feature, but could be integrated in to the development. The Applicant said that they main reason for this was the suggestion from the neighbourhood plan which called for the middle area to be left, as well as a desire to break up the development, but they agree that the house could be part of the frontage of the development.</p> <p>4. The Panel said it would be best to look at a number of options for the layout of the site, altering the size and shape. They also expressed a desire to know what the purpose of the green link was, as that would help in defining what size and shape the development should take.</p> <p>5. The Panel asked about the shape of the development areas; are they just the areas allocated in the neighbourhood plan? The Applicant said that they were allocated and that the Neighbourhood Plan was keen to avoid development creeping up the hill.</p> <p>6. The Panel asked whether the line of trees have been thought of as part of the development, as they are already existing. The lines of trees could give the site a distinctive character, as they are party of the history of the site, and would be extremely valuable assets. To grow equivalent trees from saplings would take twenty years, so the existing trees represent a substantial investment right now. The Applicant said that it could happen, but they are the property of the existing landowner and they could sell the trees off to be felled before the developer buys the land off them.</p> <p>The Panel acknowledged that it's fine to move away from the existing site context, but in order to do so the development has to move to something that's</p>

	<p>better than the existing. The trees are an interesting feature, especially in the grid pattern that is reminiscent of the site's past as a nursery. These grids also allow them to align with the field beyond and create a strong viewpoint.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they would like to create a boulevard through the trees, but they doubt that it would be possible.</p> <p>The Panel suggested that it would be difficult but certainly possible and would create a great characterising point for the site.</p> <p>The Applicant noted again that the trees could be sold off by the landowner and would be quite expensive for the developer to buy out themselves, as well as raising the concern that the grid of trees is contradictory to how the houses would be laid out.</p> <p>The Panel suggested that the Applicant look in to how to design the houses to accommodate this and think about how they can be responsive to the trees.</p> <p>7. The Panel asked if the Applicant spoke to the Parish about the chance for the site to accommodate more than 70 homes.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they had and that the response of the Parish was essentially a no, but they would be happy to look at delivering more homes if the Parish was willing to endorse it.</p>
<p>2.0 Panel Summary</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by thanking the Applicant for coming at this early stage and appreciated seeing the range of diagrams. 2. The Panel suggested that the neighbourhood plan boundary seemed arbitrary and should probably be challenged. The way they have been drawn makes it difficult to achieve a good layout and the stray house in the middle of the area should be integrated effectively. 3. The landscape buffer to the east/west with drainage and SuDS will help with surface water flooding, but it needs to be more substantial (Both wider and deeper) in order to increase its capacity. 4. The Panel were keen on the idea of retaining a memory of past use in the form of keeping the lines of trees. They feel this would be a brilliant opportunity to create a strong character that makes this development unique. It would also be a strong starting point for a landscape strategy. 5. The footpath should run along the entire front of the development to create an effective spine to the development, as at the moment the footpath is disrupted at the isolated house in the green finger. 6. A factor that will be important to the Parish will be flood risk management, so expanding on how this will be handled would help in talking to them. 7. The Panel encouraged the Applicants to talk to Southern Water about the sewerage options for the site and display how it would work. The nearest sewage works have capacity, but the installing of appropriate piping needs to be thought through and presented clearly to the community to get local support. 8. Finally, the Panel suggested that in the grid idea there is

	potential to explore the idea of farm-yard style additions to the housing. Such typologies could work well with the tree concepts and there are some good examples at Kippens and West List that could be studied for inspiration.
--	--