

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Date of meeting:                        | 18/10/17  |
| Site:                                   | Adams Field House, School Hill, Slindon   |
| Proposal:                               | Erection of a replacement dwelling  |
| Planning reference:                     | N/A   |
| Panel members sitting:                  | Graham Morrison (Chair)<br>Lap Chan<br>Andrew Smith<br>Nicolas Pople<br>David Hares<br>William Hardie   |
| SDNPA officers in attendance:           | Genevieve Hayes (Design Officer)<br>Mark Waller-Gutierrez (Design Officer)<br>Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer)<br>Vicki Colwell (Major Planning Projects Officer)<br>Paul Slade (Support Services Officer)<br>Johnathan Dean (Education Officer) |
| SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance: | None  |
| Item presented by:                      | Trevor Colman<br>Andrew Simpson<br>Emma Hyett   |
| 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> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Panel asked what the cross sectional width of the barn would be.</b><br/>The Applicant said that it would be 6.5m</li> <li><b>The Panel asked how the volume compares between the existing and the new building.</b><br/>The Applicant said that the total increase was about 14%. The building would be wider but won't be as tall as the previous one.</li> <li><b>The Panel asked if the front entrance faced South-East.</b><br/>The Applicant said yes.</li> <li><b>The Panel asked where cars would be parked.</b><br/>The Applicant said that there was a garage further down the drive which was intended for car parking. They noted that the drive leads all the way to the house and the courtyard in front of the house might be used for parking on rainy days or in other situations when the driver might want to minimise the journey from their car to the house.</li> <li><b>The Panel asked how close the cottages to the South were to the house.</b><br/>The Applicant said that they were about 110m away from the house.<br/><b>The Panel asked about their apparent proximity considering the site plan.</b><br/>The Applicant noted that the cottages had been built with very little space for back gardens.</li> <li><b>The Panel asked the Applicant to clarify what they meant by shingle as a roofing material.</b><br/>The Applicant explained that they meant Zinc shingles, which would be used over the entrance.</li> <li><b>The Panel noted that the rooves appeared to be asymmetric and asked what the pitch was.</b><br/>The Applicant said that the rooves were all pitched at 30 but that the point at which the roof starts was different on each one, resulting in them peaking in different places.</li> </ol> |
| <b>2.0 Panel Summary</b>                        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel opened by noting that single houses are always difficult to review, because much of the focus is on the details. However, they expressed gratitude for the applicant coming to show their scheme to the panel and they feel that the decision to withdraw the old scheme was a good one.</li> <li>The Panel established that they would focus on design matters, but warned that there were likely to also be a lot of policy questions that the scheme will need to address in due course.</li> <li>With this established, the Panel said that in purely design terms, they felt that the principle of a replacement dwelling on this site was fair.</li> <li>On the subject of the landscape of the site, the Panel acknowledged that the Applicant had put a lot of consideration in to the greenery on site and spoke about</li> </ol>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>it eloquently, but they didn't provide enough information on the reasoning behind the siting of the house itself. The Panel would like to see a better explanation of why the Applicants have proposed this location.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The Panel felt that upon reaching the house, there would be a sudden compositional change due to the change in levels. There's a feeling that the house appears as if it was just dropped in to the site – It doesn't take advantage of the landscape as well as it could.</li> <li>6. The Panel expressed admiration for the Applicant's knowledge of the history of Slindon, but noted that Slindon has a very clear typology and they don't feel like the house ties directly in to this typology very well. They suggested that the Applicant review this and consider how best to tie the house in to the local setting.</li> <li>7. The Panel thought that the symmetry of the house has resulted in an unresolved duality. The purpose of the symmetry isn't clear; do you have control of it? The Applicants need to be able to explain the reasoning for the symmetry, what it achieves and how the interior relates to the landscape around the house.</li> <li>8. The Panel suggested that the slide be detachable.</li> <li>9. The Panel observed that there's going to be a large number of different materials used. While all of the materials selected are suitable individually, combining them successfully in to a single build will require a lot of careful orchestration, so they recommended the Applicant be prepared to work on that.</li> <li>10. The Panel expressed some scepticism about the 30 degree angle on the roof, feeling that this would be out of place in a barn typology. They felt that this pitch either needs to be done with irony, or better justified with more evidence and an explanation of the reasoning, to reassure them that the Applicants have it under control.</li> <li>11. Finally, the Panel reiterated their earlier sentiment that this house is invariably going to receive far more scrutiny than a larger scheme of hundreds of houses would, but if it can endure this scrutiny and take on board the advice it receives, the end result could be exemplary, but as yet, this goal seems quite a long way off.</li> </ol> |
|--|--|