

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

| | |
|---|--|
| Date of meeting: | 18/12/17 |
| Site: | Andlers Ash |
| Proposal: | Erection of 70 dwellings. |
| Planning reference: | SDNP/17/02391/PRE |
| Panel members sitting: | Graham Morrison (Chair) Paul Fender John Starling Kay Brown |
| SDNPA officers in attendance: | Genevieve Hayes (Design Officer) Mark Waller Gutierrez (Design Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) |
| SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance: | Ian Phillips |
| Item presented by: | Charlotte Mimms (Fabrik, Landscape Architect) Craig Burdon (Architect, Planner, Urban Designer) Viv Hill (CALA homes) Natalie Fellows (OSP Planner) |
| Declarations of interest: | Andrew Smith – Fabrik instructed to do the Landscape – Withdrew from the Panel |

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 the Andler's Ash road and the relationship between it and the development, noting that the existing houses along the north side of the road face directly on to it, but on the proposed development the houses are pulled back from the road.</p> <p>The Applicant said that retaining the green buffer along the road is set out in policy as a priority, which limits the number of accesses directly on to Andler's Ash that can be built, preventing the proposed houses from directly addressing the road. Further to this, Highways have also expressed opposition to increasing the number of accesses on to Andler's Ash.</p> <p>2. The Panel observed that this application is now at a late stage in the application process and they haven't seen as much of the building details and elevations as they would have expected of an application at this stage.</p> <p>The Applicant explained that the time limit on the presentation had limited the number of images they could show and that the images they'd focused on were ones created for the public consultations, which were designed to be appealing to the members of the public rather than display technical detail of the scheme. They then went on to display some more detailed images that were in their presentation but hadn't been displayed.</p> <p>3. The Panel noted the importance of individual buildings in place making and observed that a lot of houses on the northern end were placed in a clear grid pattern; they then asked about the hierarchy of routes and buildings within this pattern.</p> <p>The Applicants said that there were a lot of buildings with varied plot sizes and shapes as a number of buildings turn corners; they also noted that there were a mix of terraced and detached houses on the site.</p> <p>4. The Panel asked whether the farmyard character of the southern element of the application had developed consistently with what the Applicant had expected.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that the southern element of the scheme was lower density overall, but this was being balanced by a higher density in the immediate farmstead character area.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the courtyard walls associated with the farmstead.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they are currently a work in progress, with the materials still to be confirmed but expected to be concrete squares framed with sets. They want these to appear associated with the "farmstead" structures and feel they're reflective of the enclosed</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | <p>spaces associated with a farmyard.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the existing farmyard adjacent to this site featured any listed buildings and whether the Applicant had looked at the farmyard explore the local vernacular; these buildings could provide a lot of inspiration and useful cues.</p> <p>The Applicant said that none of the buildings were listed, but they have looked at this farmyard, as well as a large number of other farmsteads across Hampshire and tried to adopt a character that's broadly reflective of both the local styles and the more general image of Farmsteads across Hampshire.</p> <p>5. The Panel asked about views from Hillbrow, noting that at present the avenues of trees make the site very distinctive from a distance.</p> <p>The Applicant agreed and said that they had identified this as a view point in their visual impact assessment.</p> <p>6. The Panel asked about where cars would be parked around the Farmstead character area.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they would use a mix of space around the rear, along the curbs and in the front of the site, with primary parking for residents being the space to the rear of the buildings.</p> |
| <p>2.0 Panel Summary</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel acknowledged that the application is quite far progressed, but it nevertheless considered, even at this late stage, that a number of the proposal's principles might need to be reconsidered. 2. The Panel acknowledged that the major space in the centre of the site was inherited by the Applicants rather than planned. The Panel took the view that splitting the site into two character areas was not essential from a design perspective, but it did provide a positive and valid starting point for a convincing site strategy. The success in separating the project into two character areas, however, depended on a confident and well-executed design narrative. 3. One of the two character areas was based on a simple grid pattern and this provided a successful, straightforward street pattern. The other was based loosely on the notion of a Farmstead – a thought generated from an earlier DRP meeting – but this proposition had not yet developed with sufficient conviction. Its location, adjacent to an existing, more authentic Farmstead, invites an unfavourable comparison when juxtaposed with the proposed build. The Farmstead is a familiar typology and if this narrative is to be pursued, it must be carried through with a much stronger sense of purpose. 4. On further detail, the Panel expressed frustration that there were no floor plans or proper elevations available to comment on. This information should have been provided and without it the comments of the Panel were at this stage essentially provisional information and limited to what was actually presented. 5. On landscape, the Panel found the description of the |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>proposals more convincing than the images. The Panel was a little alarmed by the explanation that the images presented were intended to be seen by the public and needed to be suitably accessible. This 'mismatch' may be understandable in terms of style but certainly not for content. This left another significant gap in the presentation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. On typology, the Panel raised concerns over the nature of repetition and the purpose of variety. In the proposal for the gridded layout, there is an arbitrariness in the repetition and location of house types and in the variation of elevations and materials that make little reference to place-making, context, hierarchy or narrative. To illustrate this point, the Panel pointed to the houses fronting on to the green displaying very little difference from the houses fronting a street. In the proposal for the Farmstead, the dwellings seemed to wear the 'clothes' of the building typologies they imitated but without them fitting. 7. The Panel commended the Applicants for attempting to make the idea of a Farmstead work but, in its present form, it is not successful. Their issues are not just about typology but also about space. To illustrate this point, the Panel pointed to the low wall in the courtyard. This was an understandable landscape intervention to divide the site into parcels but was an anathema to the character of a farmyard. The design lacks a proper narrative and appears more as if it was a farmstead built for the dimensional disciplines of the house types rather than a farmstead that might have existed and been subsequently converted to housing. There is a potentially worthy idea here that is not matched by the outcome. 8. More positively, the Panel is convinced by the basic diagram – the separation of the site into two distinct parts and the provision of a generous public green. Its concerns relate to the uniformity of building types with a limited typological palette that relates poorly to the context that is being created – leaving the scheme with a suburban feel. What has been achieved so far proves the site has considerable potential and constitutes the bones of a really good scheme that, with more confidence and with ideas carried through with conviction, could become a real part of the community that will benefit all of Liss. |
|--|--|