

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	20/2/18

Site: Land North East of Andlers Ash Nursery, Andlers

Ash Road, Liss, Hampshire

Proposal: Erection of 77 dwellings

Planning reference: SDNP/17/06506/FUL

Panel members sitting: Mark Penfold (Chair)

Luke Engleback John Starling Lap Chan Paul Fender Adam Richards Graham Morrison

SDNPA officers in attendance: Genevieve Hayes (Design Officer)

Hannah Grimes (Link Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Richard Ferguson (Case Officer)

SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:

Item presented by: Liz Symes,

Craig Burden, Natalie Fellows,

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	
1.0	I.	The Panel asked whether the farmhouse structure
Discussion/Questions		was made up of two separate houses and asked
with applicants		why.
		The Applicant confirmed that it was. They explained that
		the total size of the farmhouse was too large to fit the
		local need, so it was decided to split it to make it more
		viable.
	2.	The Panel began asking a set of four questions:
		How are the Applicants addressing Climate
		Change, Connectivity and the Local Community,
		and why have the Applicants aimed for an
		Edwardian style? The Applicant addressed the
		Edwardian Style first
		The Applicant explained that the layout and character of
		the site was derived from the Village Design Statement
		and the character of the village centre, which saw
		substantial growth during the Edwardian era when the
	_	Liss train station was constructed.
	3.	The Panel addressed the Climate Change
		question next, noting that the large quantity of
		paving would increase surface water runoff and
		asking whether mitigating factors such as
		raingardens or channels would help reduce the
		impact. The Applicant explained that they've worked to arrange a
		The Applicant explained that they've worked to arrange a sustainable drainage feature and a swale in the open space
		to help with surface water.
		The Panel asked what would happen to the
		streets; how they would be drained and whether it
		would be a hard system.
		The Applicant explained that they'd been in discussion
		with the drainage engineers to determine the best option,
		which would be a mix of hard and soft options. They
		noted in particular that the courtyard area would be
		porous construction.
		The Panel observed that the courtyard will need
		more than just porous materials to drain
		effectively.
		The Applicants explained that they understood the
		principle and that they want to try and integrate several
	_	different solutions to help resolve the problem.
	4.	The Panel addressed the Connectivity and Local
		Community question next, asking how the
		development will integrate in to Liss.
		The Applicant explained that they've tried to connect the
		development in to Liss where they can by adding
		footpaths, building on connections with the school,
		addition of some small open spaces in addition to the
		main large open space in the centre, all with the intention
		to foster a sense of community. They noted that Liss PC
		had asked for an access gate on to Andler's Ash road for

the open space, which is in line with the Applicants ideals of allowing people to easily flow through the site, but it presents serious safety concerns because of the speed of the road it would open on to and the poor visibility splays.

5. The Panel questioned how the Applicants would draw people in to the site, noting that the development seems to have very little interaction with the road.

The Applicant explained that they wanted to maintain as much of the mature features along the road side as possible, which has the unintentional side effect of reducing site interaction.

6. The Panel asked if the open space had been determined by the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Applicant said no, it had been defined by the historic field patterns, but noted that the residents were inclined to view this as two separate developments and it had been led by the development briefs in the Neighbourhood plan. They also observed that the open space is also where water gathers after rainfall, so it makes sense as a buffer.

7. The Panel noted that the site area of site 3V seemed to have increased by about 50% since the previous applications and asked why.

The Applicant explained that they did this in an effort to help integrate the single lone house between the two sites, noting that he increase in size to 3V allowed them to bring the site up to the historic field boundary.

8. The Panel suggested that the farmyard concept was improving, but asked why it wasn't being extended the cover the whole development; noting that much of the rest of the character is derived from the frontage of the homes on the other side of Andler's Ash road, which are not all exemplars.

The Applicant agreed that the existing Andler's Ash houses weren't notably outstanding, but explained that the indications they'd received suggested that having two separate characters for the two sites was more desirable.

2.0 Panel Summary

- The Panel opened by expressing their frustration; there
 was not much that could be said in this summary that was
 not already addressed in the previous session's summary,
 so they encouraged the Applicant's to reconsider what
 was said in the previous set of minutes.
- 2. The Panel raised the concern that the green space, which is a large space with a lot of potential, was not being utilised to its fullest.
- 3. The Panel questioned whether there was any clear hierarchy in the arrangement of housing within the development.
- 4. Finally, the Panel stated that they got no sense of this application being landscape led.