

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

Date of meeting: 18/5/2017

Site: Land South of Seven Stars  
Proposal:

Planning reference: SDNP/17/01744/FUL

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)  
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: 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</b> <b>Discussion/Questions</b> <b>with applicants</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>1. The Panel noted that when they saw this scheme previously, one of the main concerns highlighted was the lack of a sense of place. They asked how the Applicant is dealing with this.</b>  The Applicant explained that the village has an extremely linear form that would be very difficult to replicate outright. However, they have worked very hard to try and create an organic development, noting that a lot of cul-de-sac type developments have grown up along the main roads in this village. </li> <li> <b>2. The Panel noted that another concern that was brought up during the last review was the access and road layouts. They asked whether the Applicant had considered putting the road behind the houses that face the green space, to allow those houses to front directly on to the green space.</b>  The Applicant said that they think the current wider sense of space is served best by the road layout they are using and raised concerns that the specific formation mentioned would present some urban design issues, as the houses would be backing on to the road and exposing their back gardens to public space. </li> <li> <b>3. The Panel asked about how the current layout and options had developed, acknowledging that a lot of analysis has been done, but they have not seen much of it. The Panel would like to see more of the workings out to understand why the Applicant has reached the conclusions that they have.</b>  The Applicant said that the scheme has responded to the notes from the last session with the DRP. They have also taken in to account the comments from the community, particularly in relation to the location of the village hall. They noted that one layout they had considered was a single, long road to service the whole site, but they felt it would be too busy. Finally, they explained that CALA homes are not producing “executive” homes, but instead are trying to make homes that suit the context and needs of the local community. </li> <li> <b>4. The Panel said that the context analysis of boundary treatments in the village were good and they appreciated the pictures displayed that showed the prospective treatments. However, they would like to see how the treatments have been achieved on the plan. Additionally, it was noted that parking places break up some of the boundary treatments, which needs to be resolved.</b>  The Applicant... </li> <li> <b>5. The Panel asked about the housing mix. Terraces are common in the area but none have been included in the proposal. Additionally the plans feature maisonettes, which aren’t typical of a village setting.</b> </li> </ol>

	<p><b>Finally, the Panel asked how the Applicant would create home zones and access to the open spaces/amenity space, particular around the maisonettes.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that the maisonettes had been designed to look like two cottages rather than maisonettes and that they would have access to all of the open space around them.</p> <p><b>The Panel said that the erosion of the terraces as a local feature has been made because of the introduction of a semi and a detached on the frontage. Cars being a part of the frontages changes the character of the road; the Panel suggested a spatial analysis of the road composition should have been considered.</b></p> <p><b>6. The Panel said that they felt that all house types should be different, but that they were sympathetic to the needs of the developers to use fixed types.</b></p> <p>The Applicant noted that no house type is used more than twice, which they feel is a good result for a development of 26 houses.</p> <p><b>The Panel suggested that more diversity could be obtained with some creativity by retaining the same shell idea, but changing other features of some of the house types.</b></p> <p><b>7. The Panel asked who is going to be responsible for the open spaces, particularly around the maisonettes; whether it would be a management company or the occupants. Further to that, the Panel asked who would be maintaining the village hall and associated green space.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that Cala homes will build the hall from a design created by OSP architecture in communication with the parish. On management of the open spaces, this is still a matter that needs agreement but their expectation currently is that a management company will maintain some of the open spaces, with the maintenance of the proposed green being negotiated between them and the Parish. Regarding the maisonettes in particular, they hope to get some private amenity space for the residents but most will be managed by the management company.</p>
<p><b>2.0 Panel Summary</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Panel opened by thanking the Applicant for attending and saying it was very useful for them to see the scheme again and see how it has evolved.</li> <li>2. However, the Panel were not convinced that the Applicant had managed to answer all of the questions that the DRP raised at the previous session.</li> <li>3. The Panel suggested that adding consideration to the plans for contour lines, flood risk and the nearby Roman Villa would help clarify the plans and clear up some existing concerns.</li> <li>4. The Panel noted that a figure ground analysis was suggested at the last session, but they saw no evidence of this having been done.</li> <li>5. The Panel felt one of the key considerations should be how</li> </ol>

	<p>people are going to live here and who those people will be. The development features a lot of 4 – 5 bedroom houses, but this might not be necessary; as much as 30% of UK homes are only occupied by one person. A large proportion of smaller houses might be more appropriate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The Panel noted that terraces tend to work very well, have local precedents and use space efficiently. These scheme features no terraces at present and the Panel thinks that if terraces were added, the scheme would be able to find more space for effective landscaping.</li> <li>7. One of the key features of the development is the village green, so the Panel encouraged the Applicant to consider how it will work; Will it link to the pub? What sort of people will live here and how would they use the green? Is it big enough for young children to play ball games, or for a nursery based at the Hall to turn part in to a garden?</li> <li>8. The Panel noted that the water course at the northern boundary has not been considered in the development, which it felt was neglecting something that could be a valuable feature.</li> <li>9. The Panel asked whether there would be a relationship with the pub, perhaps through a pedestrian link; strengthening such a relationship could benefit the development. Additionally, the pub is itself a high quality building and it could benefit the development to see some elements from the pub being adopted in to the housing being developed.</li> <li>10. The Panel noted that this development, with its village green, could be the heart of the village, but it falls short of this right now. The Panel recommend the Applicant compare with other village greens in the area to see how they work; they feel that this one needs to see more density around the Green itself to make it seem like the heart of the development.</li> <li>11. On the proposed Hall, the Panel felt that the end of the hall should face out on to the green and noted that the hall will need external space if it's going to be used as a nursery, which is likely to be one of the common uses. Additionally, the Hall is going to need a large amount of storage space, likely about a third of the hall as storage, in order to account for the variety of uses its likely to see. While the Panel applauded the introduction of a hall as part of the scheme, it needs to be properly done if it's going to work well.</li> <li>12. The parking, how it works. The road around the village</li> <li>13. The Panel suggested that more diversity, especially at the affordable end, would be beneficial; introducing car ports for some of the car parking areas, for instance. At present, the volumes are too regular and they look repetitive.</li> <li>14. Finally, the Panel felt that more effort is needed to explain the choice of materials and why they are relevant. At present, the development feels like it could be anywhere; by better explained the use of materials it could take on some of the local character.</li> </ol>
--	---