

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	18/5/2017
Site: Proposal:	Gamekeepers Cottage
Planning reference:	SDNP/17/02460/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) Stella New (Planning Officer) Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer)
Observers:	Kieran Breheny (Applicant) Caroline Breheny (Applicant)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	Ian Phillips
Item presented by:	Greg Lomas Tom Richardson Jonathan Goodall
Declarations of interest:	The planning agent Jon Goodall is known to Genevieve Hayes David Hares advised that he had met the applicants at his son's school

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 about cars; during the presentation the applicant explained the position of the garage as an effort to reduce the depth of car entry, but they continue to feature a drive all the way along the front of the site. The Applicant said that they expect the driveway to be needed to allow the occupants access to the front of the house to drop off guests or materials.</p> <p>2. The Panel asked whether the Applicant had considered the impact of development on views from Arundel Castle. The Applicants said that their focus so far had been on local views and that they will pursue a full LVIA assessment after they have received their pre-app advice and based on that response.</p> <p>3. The Panel asked about the precedents shown during the presentation; while plenty of precedents have been considered, not many of them are local to this site, especially in terms of heritage assets. The Applicant explained that they were intending to use materials that lend themselves more to contemporary building and contrast less with the local environment. The brickwork will be more relevant to the malm stone; they felt that red brick would lean too much towards a pastiche.</p> <p>4. The Panel said that they understood the design rationale behind the flint wall, but questioned whether its fenestration was appropriate. Additionally, they suggested the Applicant consider extending and enlarging the wall; at present it starts and stops with the house, but it could easily be used to make strong spaces beyond the house in the surrounding grounds. The Applicant agreed that there was a lot of potential on the outside of the house, but they had not explored this yet; they noted that there wasn't a landscape architect on their team at this time, which would benefit this consideration.</p> <p>5. The Panel asked whether the proposed location of the studio was based on the existing location of the garage. The Applicants said that they are open to relocating it, but they think that repurposing it would be a better option.</p> <p>6. The Panel asked about whether there was a proposed use for the associated land at the back of the property, saying that the building should be a consequence of the landscape. The Applicant said that the land was outside of the residential curtilage. They have not proposed a use for that land so it is likely to be left as grassland.</p> <p>7. The Panel asked about the history of the site and whether the applicants had done much research in to it.</p>

	<p>The Applicant said that they are looking in to it at this time. They believe that the surrounding land was used as an orchard.</p> <p>8. The Panel asked what the percentage increase in area was between the proposed dwelling and the existing one. The Applicant said that the Gross Internal Area has doubled.</p> <p>9. The Panel asked about the roof form; is it intended to be a shed or barn form, or is it intended to be a residential form? The panel were curious about the roof style and the rationale behind it, wondering whether the applicants might view this build as something more superficially similar to an elaborate shed than a house. The Applicant said that one of the main drivers in the project was trying to increase the amount of internal space of the building without substantially impacting the massing of it. Trying to maximise internal space was the main reasoning behind the architectural style. The Panel said that if this was done deliberately it could be effective, but the symmetry of the gable end is not necessary, as the existing house is asymmetrical.</p> <p>10. The Panel noted that the precedents shown that feature an occupied roof tend to be very dominant, but this proposal seems apologetic. The Applicant said that they did play with the idea of having a cantilevered box in the beginning, but ultimately decided on a scheme with a more slender element.</p> <p>11. The Panel asked how the overall height of the building compares to other buildings in the village. The Applicant said that although the cottage is high on the landscape, there are higher buildings further up the lane in Warningcamp.</p> <p>12. The Panel asked what consideration had been given to the Dark Night Skies policy, including roof light shading. The Applicant said they are aware of the policy and have tried to put windows in only where necessary.</p> <p>13. The Panel asked whether the Applicant had considered keeping the original building and extending it. The Applicant said that they had considered this, but there had been a previous application that had been refused for extending the house so they felt the best option was to start from the beginning and construct a whole new house.</p> <p>14. The Panel questioned the positioning of the garage, believing that the site of the garage was currently part occupied by a high quality apple tree. The Applicant said that they will implement a full arboriculture survey and any trees that would be removed will be surveyed as part of that. They noted that they have not made substantial progress on the garage proposal and its surrounding landscaping yet.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<p>I. The Panel opened by thanking the Applicants for attending at</p>

	<p>the pre-app stage and providing a lot of useful documentation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The Panel said that they like to see applications in the park being landscape led even from very early stages like this one. 3. The Panel expressed an interest in how the new build would relate to its neighbour. While contemporary is okay, they would like to see how the application sits with its neighbour. 4. The Panel noted that the application seems to be constrained by keeping the new building on the footprint of the existing one, which they don't feel is necessary. 5. The Panel encouraged the Applicant to consider what they'll do with the associated land, noting that it has already been seeded with fruit trees. 6. The Panel expressed some doubt about the current position of the garage. In particular, they expect to see tree surveys done at early stages of applications, as they have particular concerns about the potential loss of the apple tree on the garage site. 7. The Panel recommended that the Applicant should further explore the relationship between their site and the neighbour, including overlooking from the upper floor balcony over the neighbour's land. 8. Further to this, the panel are keen that the Applicants explore whether the scheme should be dominant or subservient to the neighbouring property. 9. The Panel agreed that the architecture could be a stronger feature if the Applicant was a bit bolder. For example, the barn typology used for parts of the house would fit well with extending the length of the building. The Panel encouraged the applicant to play to the strengths of the styles they're looking at, as this would help it sit more comfortably in the landscape. 10. The Panel recommend that the Applicant takes a closer look at local precedents, including some larger barns, in order to learn the local vernacular and draw inspiration for the vernacular of the scheme itself. 11. The Panel suggested that some more thought be put in to how to fenestrate the two different parts of the building; currently the zinc and the flint components both seem to be fenestrated in the same way, but they could be stronger elements if the fenestration was different between the two parts. 12. The Panel encouraged the Applicant to look more closely at the studio and garage. The Architecture of these buildings should follow that of the house while being obviously subordinate. Also consider the placement of the studio and garage, as the studio could probably benefit from appearing more integrated in to the house, while the garage location is sensible but has some problems, such as the previously mentioned apple tree. 13. Finally, the Panel suggested that site planning should relate to the topography of the land and there are a lot of features of the site that could be made use of.
--	--