

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

| | |
|---|--|
| Date of meeting: | 20/2/18 |
| Site: | Arun Cottage, Bury, West Sussex |
| Proposal: | Development of Farmhouse to dwelling. Demolishment of Arun Cottage with replacement workshop and domestic accommodation. |
| Planning reference: | SDNP/17/06267/PRE |
| Panel members sitting: | Mark Penfold (Chair) Luke Engleback John Starling Lap Chan Paul Fender Adam Richards |
| 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: | Graham Morrison (Architect) Richard Dollamore (Agent) |
| Declarations of interest: | The applicant and agent are known to all the Panel members as Graham Morrison is vice chair of the SDNP Design Review Panel and Richard Dollamore is a former staff member of the Authority. |

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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel asked whether the existing chimney was going to be kept. The Applicant said that this is a matter that is currently being debated. The Applicant believes that in order to build suitable roof insulation in to the Farmhouse, the impact of the chimney as existing will be diminished. As a result, the Applicant is uncertain whether it should be retained on the basis of its intrinsic material value, or demolished and rebuilt so as to retain the same readability. 2. The Panel asked if the fireplace would be functional The Applicant said that all chimneys would be functional if they can get wood burners for them. 3. The Panel asked about the roof styling and materials over the laundry. The Applicant said that the material would be patinated zinc, with an interest in presenting the laundry as subordinate to the main building. 4. The Panel asked about the material of the top of the crown roof The Applicant said that this would also be zinc. 5. The Panel noted that one of the reasons for using zinc on the laundry was to demonstrate its subservience; would it be possible to use zinc on the cottage as well for the same reason? The Applicant suggested that there were two main reasons for selecting materials – demonstrating hierarchy and building composition. They acknowledged that zinc would work well for the cottage roof, but they have chosen clay tile for the roofing out of concern that the Parish and Local councils would be more comfortable with the use of the more traditional clay tiles. 6. The Panel asked the applicant to confirm that the area at the north end of the Farmhouse was a work space. The Applicant confirmed that it was. The Panel asked whether it could be made to be identifiably separate, to signify it's alternate use. The Applicant said that they considered the whole building to be one house; while they will signify the alternate use through distinct external works, they don't feel it needs to be separate or subordinate to the residential area. 7. The Panel suggested that the Applicant was trying to create distinctions through the elevations but that the roof was blending it all together, raising that the Applicant doesn't seem committed to either option. The Applicant said that they are trying to do both. 8. The Panel asked about the differences in cladding |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| | <p>at the front, rear and sides of the farmhouse. The Applicant said that the cladding around the studio was different, but the cladding at the front of the house would be the same as the cladding on the sides.</p> <p>The Panel asked whether the external appearance of the workshop could reflect the external appearance of the studio.</p> <p>9. The Panel asked about the colours that will be used on the boarding and how they would weather. The Applicant said that the workshop would feature a plain clay tile roof and vertical boarding, which wouldn't be painted and left to weather naturally. The inhabited buildings would be boarded similarly but the boards would be painted, primarily in greys and whites.</p> <p>10. The Panel asked if new windows would be installed. The Applicant noted there were no historic windows of particular value on site, so they would be replacing them all with newer, more energy efficient ones.</p> <p>The Panel asked if they'd all be the same type. The Applicant said that they'd be squares in the courtyard, but in other places the squares would get dropped.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the frames would all be white. The Applicant said yes.</p> |
| 2.0 Panel Summary | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by commenting that this was an exemplary scheme with much potential, with a particularly laudable approach to the farmhouse and farmstead typology. The incorporated workspace was regarded as of particular value. 2. The Panel noted that the swimming pool had the potential to provide a strong ecological element if built as a natural pool with suitable planting, potentially blurring the edges as working with the wider landscape. 3. The Panel felt that some forms and colours need further consideration, noting that the roof of the farmhouse building was quite large and could initially present itself as a fairly bright orange block of tone until it weathers. It was noted that the high weald has colours of light grey and white. 4. The Panel suggested that the studio felt a little apologetic and could afford to be bolder; perhaps could it be faced in stone to enhance its architectural language and make a strong end stop to the farmhouse. 5. The proposed zinc roof on the laundry was regarded as an appropriate material and it was suggested that the same principle could be applied to the roof of the cottage. 6. The Panel noted that the form of the cottage was much better represented in the model and the sketch drawings than as presented on the elevations drawings. The panel suggested that a Sussex hip on one end and cat slide on the other were appropriate forms for this simple building. 7. The Panel noted that orchards fit the historic typology of Bury, which could be useful if the Applicant wishes to |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>introduce planted screening, it was suggested that cherry trees would be a good choice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. The panel were delighted that such an exemplary and beautifully considered scheme had been proposed that sought to remove and mend the inappropriate additions to the farmhouse and to bring in a working and living typology into the settlement . 9. The Panel suggested considering the High Weald AONB Colour in Landscape study when considering an alternative to the orange roof tiles. |
|--|---|