

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	20/2/18
Site:	Existing Private Car Park at St Peters Road, Petersfield, Hampshire
Proposal:	Erection of 2 x 3-storey buildings (one with roof accommodation) for mixed residential (2 x 1-bed and 11 x 2-bed flats) and commercial use (Classes A1-A2); formation of a 2-storey link to Dolphin Court to provide additional bedrooms and external amenity space; associated car parking, access and landscaping works. Demolition of existing garage block.
Planning reference:	SDNP/17/05718/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) Jon Holmes (Case Officer, EHDC)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	
Item presented by:	David Thomas (Architect)
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 Discussion/Questions with applicants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel asked why Flemish Bond was the chosen material. The Applicant explained that this was at the suggestion of the Conservation officer, who was keen on the use of Flemish Bond. 2. The Panel noted that the flats don't follow the line of the gable ends and asked why. The Applicant explained that the rear block started out with the gables following the flats, but they tried to grade it down from the North down to the scale at the rear. The Panel asked why the Applicant didn't change the gables to fit convention. The Applicant explained that they were trying to create a more interesting form around the courtyard. 3. The Panel asked what the distance between the buildings was. The Applicant said it was 10 metres. 4. The Panel asked if there were going to be lifts installed in both buildings. The Applicant said that there would be one in the rear building but not in the front building, as they didn't feel it was necessary. The Panel noted that this would present a problem for, for instance, visitors that might have access requirements. The Applicant said they hadn't thought of that and acknowledged that it was a good point. 5. The Panel asked whether closing the route running through the site past Dragon Court would detract from this. The Applicant said that it would, as they wanted to encourage pedestrian traffic through this space to create a lively courtyard; they also noted that there are shops that front on to that route that would suffer if the route was closed off at one end. 6. The Panel asked about the floor space of the shop in the courtyard block. The Applicant said that it was approximately 200m² and that the Dragon Street shop was approximately 300m². 7. The Panel asked about the paving material. The Applicant said that this hadn't been confirmed yet but would like be brick pavers, with bound gravel around the trees. 8. The Panel asked why the lift core is so tall in the rear block, noting that it was taller than needed. The Applicant suggested that it looked right and allowed for room to house the lift motor. 9. The Panel asked what was being done with the wall-mounted mosaic. The Applicant said that the mosaic was going to be retained but moved to the bus shelter further along

	<p>Dragon Street.</p> <p>10. The Panels asked about the gables and wall projections, noting that Dragon Street has projecting eaves, and asked if the Applicant is happy with the overall consistency of the design.</p> <p>The Applicant said that the scheme wasn't purist in that sense. They noted that they needed to work around some differing heights and that there needed to be areas of flat roof that they would struggle to create if they had projecting gables; this solution was more consistent and they're happy with it. They also noted that the treatment along the Dragon St frontage was a late change and did that because it was considered more appropriate to the conservation area and consistent with high street detailing.</p> <p>11. The Panel asked how the retail units would be serviced.</p> <p>The Applicant said that they'd be serviced from Dragon Street or via the parking area to the rear, noting that the parking area has been tracked for refuse vehicles and so should be able to accommodate service vehicles for the retail units.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by raising concern about the footfall through the proposed courtyard and whether the retail units in the rear building would be viable. The Panel asked whether the courtyard could be better used by making it private, reducing the rear building to a two-storey Mews-style build. 2. Additional to this suggestion, the Panel proposed keeping the wall featuring the mosaic and simply installing a small archway in to the courtyard, to provide passers-by with only brief glimpses of the courtyard, a concept that is prevalent and characterful of Petersfield. 3. The Panel suggested that reducing the size of the rear building would help to make the courtyard space feel more open, as it stands to be heavily overshadowed at present, as well as opening up views of the nearby church tower. 4. The Panel reiterated that the front block should have a lift installed for accessibility reasons, regardless of the expected residents. 5. The Panel noted that residential tends to draw higher rent than retail and, given the concerns about the viability of the shops, giving up some of the shop space to create a more desirable residential scheme might bring a better return. 6. The Panel suggested that the scheme could calm down a bit; with a well-designed private courtyard, it could be a delightful little bastion of calm within the heart of Petersfield.