

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	18/08/17
Site:	Station House, Nyewood Road, Nyewood, GU31 5HX
Proposal:	Development of five dwellings for low cost rental and intermediate housing and four sustainable market houses.
Planning reference:	SDNP/16/01864/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Graham Morrison (CHAIR) James Fox Andrew Smith Lap Chan
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Luke Smith (Senior DM Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Richard Ferguson (Case Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Martin Herd Paul Archer Alfredo Fornieles
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"> The Panel asked whether the Applicants could elaborate on the plans for gables and the proposed projecting bay. The Applicant explained that the only prominent surviving feature of the original station building are some similarly designed projecting bays and they felt that installing similar bays on the houses would show a strong connection to the historical context. The Panel noted that the natural landscape character of this site would be one of a railway yard. They asked whether the Applicant had considered a more robust, industrial character for the site. The Applicant said that they felt that achieving that sort of character was more an architectural matter than a landscape one, with railway yards dominated by large, blocky buildings. They further noted that their brief was not to replicate what was there previous but rather to regenerate the site. The Panel asked if there were any TPOs on the site and whether realigning the railway would affect any trees. The Applicant said that there were no TPOs on the site and that there was going to be very little realignment of the railway. The Panel asked about the communal agricultural spaces. The Applicant said that they hadn't done much work on these spaces, they were just trying to bring a more rural setting to the site. The Panel asked if there were any diagrams that compared the footprint of the original plan for two offices against the new plans. The Applicant said that there wasn't a diagram like that available.
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel opened by noting that there is a mix of good and bad in their response to this application. Starting with the good, the Panel noted that adjusting the plan to accommodate the path running along the old railway line benefited the plan, noting that effective use of the landscape is key. The Panel felt that the retention and conversion of station buildings is straight forward and uncontroversial. The Panel noted that the three buildings that are located where the two office buildings were originally proposed are stronger compositionally and could be very positive. The Panel agreed with the plan to retain the platform, which they thought would help connect the site with its history. The allotments and orchard situated on the other side of the road were considered to be a good idea.

	<p>7. However, the Panel were concerned that something that could be simple was now starting to become overcomplicated. They noted that the path running along the route of the railway was the dominant feature of the site, polarising the entire proposal. While the Panel said that segmenting this line might not necessarily be wrong, it is presently too strong a component; the Panel feel that it should be subservient to the path.</p> <p>8. Regarding the buildings proposed, the Panel believes the form and plan to be fine, but have concerns about the design details. They noted that all of the facades of pre-existing buildings other than the station were very flat, industrial and simple. In the proposed new builds, the projecting bay and the gables disrupt this straight line. The end result is that the dominant wall becomes a blind gable.</p> <p>9. The Panel suggested that making the housing on this site seem to be part of one whole group would strengthen it.</p> <p>10. The gardens close slat fencing was noted and it was suggested that hedges or post and rail fencing would produce a better result.</p> <p>11. The Panel suggested more consideration goes in to the rear elevations, particularly thinking about matters of glare, windows and Photo-voltaic power.</p> <p>12. Finally, the Panel noted that the proposal as a whole seems to work in principle, but needs to undergo some clarification and the industrial and agricultural landscapes need to be related to each other.</p>
--	---