

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	30/10/17
Site:	Midhurst Ambulance Station, Bepton Road, Midhurst. GU29 9HF
Proposal:	Demolition of the ambulance station and the construction of 1 no. 2 bedroom coach house, 2 no. 2 bedroom chalet bungalows and 1 no. 3 bed chalet bungalow with associated parking and landscaping
Planning reference:	SDNP/I7/04026/FUL
Panel members sitting:	David Hares CHAIR Adam Richards John Starling John Hearn
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Mark Waller-Gutierrez (Design Officer) Nat Belderson (Planning Link Officer) Hannah Chapman (Assistant Planning Link Officer) Sara Osman (Support Services Co-ordinator)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	John Saunders (DM Manager), Chichester District Council Stephen Harris (Case Officer), Chichester District Council James King, King & Drury James Drury, King & Drury Jonathan Moore, MH Architects
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
I.0 Discussion/ Questions with applicants	<p>1. The Panel asked for clarity that the applicants had considered precedents shown for design style The Applicants explained that they have considered the traditional buildings surrounding the site, and studied contemporary precedents that had worked well elsewhere. They believe their design blends with more contemporary style and uses materials from the modern buildings at the back of the site</p> <p>2. The Panel asked why the applicant had decided to hip one end of the coach house roof, and whether there would be an issue with height restriction from the coach house at the front of the site In terms of the rationale behind the coach house design, the applicant explained that the hipped roof at the southern end was in order to respect the roofline of the adjacent dwelling (Mint Cottage). They had chosen a more traditional building form and combined this with the use of contemporary materials. They explained that following feedback from the case officer and public consultation, they were now looking at the two alternative fully contemporary options. In terms of the undercroft height, the Applicant said that there would be some restrictions for taller vehicles (e.g. removal vehicles) but that the Highways Authority had not objected and that this would be clear upon purchase of the properties.</p> <p>3. The Panel asked about the extent of the glazing on the upper sections of plots 1,2 and 3 The Applicant explained that the glazing allows for light to get into the stairwell and central void of the buildings to enable maximum light into the interior space. More brick is used on the front elevations.</p> <p>4. The Panel asked for clarification on the differences between the two alternatives proposed for Plot 4 The Applicant explained that option 1 presents the articulated roof form onto Bepton road with the two storey brick elevation to the rear. Option 2 places the building sideways on with the two storey element facing onto Bepton Road, The floor areas are the same for both options. There were also two options for cladding. Originally the proposed cladding used pre patented zinc but a second option using timber is shown in response to comments on the extensive use of zinc fed back from Midhurst Parish Council.</p> <p>5. The Panel suggested that plans need to ensure good quality bricks were used for any brickwork facing onto street to ensure the plans were acceptable. The Applicant accepted the suggestion and confirmed they were prepared to do this.</p> <p>6. The Panel asked whether the Chimneys were working chimneys The Applicant said they were, and that each property would have a wood burning stove.</p>

	<p>7. The Panel asked who the target audience was and who is likely to live in the properties The Applicant explained that they have had to significantly reduce the floor sizes due to comments from the previous pre-application submissions. Therefore their market is likely to be single people who are downsizing and want to live closer to the town centre.</p> <p>8. The Panel asked where the refuse collection point will be The Applicant explained that all collection points will be at the front of Plot 4. They had consulted with the refuse collection teams and highways who agreed the site was suitable.</p> <p>9. The Panel asked for clarification on the sustainability credentials of the project The Applicant explained fabric first approach with 400mm thick walls.</p> <p>10. The Panel asked why the 3-bedroom property was sited where it appears to have a smaller garden The Applicant explained that the gardens of Plots 1, 2 and 3 had similar sized gardens, but the layout made the 3-bedroom outside space appear smaller. The site for the 3-bedroom property had been chosen because the property had a one-storey extension to the side which meant it had the least impact on the neighbouring property.</p> <p>11. The Panel noted the extensive use of timber close board fencing for the site boundaries and asked for clarity on this choice The Applicant explained that timber fences were to be used except where boundary markers already existed. The eastern boundary is a mixture of hedgerow and fencing so the plan is to keep the hedgerow and fill in with some new fencing. New trees will be added along the southern boundary, and the western boundary will stay as it is. They proposed to keep existing stone walls, including the wall at the front of the site. Plot 4, which fronts onto Bepton Road will sit in behind the existing stone wall.</p>
<p>2.0 Panel Summary</p>	<p>1. The Panel thanked the applicants for a well thought out scheme and liked the contemporary approach. They felt this was appropriate in this context, which included nearby buildings such as the Roman Catholic Church. The panel noted that they did not like the previous coach house design. They preferred option 1 for Plot 4 and liked the contemporary design which better tied in with plots 1-3 behind it.</p> <p>2. There was a long discussion about how to ensure that the existing stone wall at the front of Plot 4 worked with the materials of the proposed building behind it. The panel raised concerns that the proposed buff brick for the dwelling would not sit well alongside the existing Midhurst stone wall. Suggestions put forward included removing the section of low stone wall in front of the dwelling, and building up the section of wall along the garden boundary. This would also eliminate the need for the proposed timber garden fence which the panel had concerns about both visually and as a form of acoustic protection to the rear garden adjacent to the busy road.</p>

	<p>The Panel advised that it would be important to check whether it was necessary to retain the original wall as it is in a conservation area, or whether it could be rebuilt. The panel noted that this issue was not yet resolved and said the applicant needed to go away and work on this.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. In terms of materials, the panel noted it could be hard to find a good quality buff brick, and that a warm red brick or local stone could work well in this location instead and was quite characteristic of Midhurst. It was emphasised that the use of locally sourced materials such as bricks was an important thing for the National Park.4. The Panel recommended moving the window on the extension room on Plot 3 from the front to the side. This would ensure the design remained more pure when viewed from the front, and the extension wall would then appear more like a garden wall.5. The Panel noted that there were some discrepancies on the landscaping plans and also considered that further thought needed to go into the landscaping to ensure a high quality scheme. This detail should not be left to condition. The panel suggested integrating better quality (perhaps at front entrances or kerbs) with lesser quality materials (perhaps under car spaces), to improve on the overall quality of materials used, which appeared to have too much of a 'sameness' to them. They would like to see a more imaginative use of materials to replace the standard concrete block paving in the courtyard and noted that the planting was unresolved.6. The Panel noted that they did not agree there was an excessive use of zinc and that it would work well as a contemporary building material in this context.
--	--