

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	18/08/17
Site: Proposal:	The Timbers, Sloe Lane, Alfriston, BN26 5UU Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of new replacement dwelling.
Planning reference:	SDNP/17/03451/FUL
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) Emily Anderson (Case Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Stephanie Reed Luke ---
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	<p>1. The Panel asked if the Applicants can explain the roof forms The Applicants said that they started from the central wall and two very simple gable forms. As the building moves eastwards, they wanted to maintain a subservient form. They noted that there are a lot of varied roof forms to the north of the site. The Panel noted that there's a tendency to get very straight, formal frontages on to the street.</p> <p>2. The Panel noted that the house seems like a big house that's been broken down in to multiple smaller houses and asked if this was intentional. The Applicants said that many of the current forms in Alfriston developed organically and they want to replicate that in their own build, creating a structure that looks to have come together over time.</p> <p>3. The Panel asked about visual amenity, noting that they've seen a photo-montage of the site – Was that taken from the drive of the nearby listed building? The Applicant said no. The Panel observed that the primary façade of the listed house relates to the horizon.</p> <p>4. The Panel asked what material would be used for the roof. The Applicant said that they would use slate.</p> <p>5. The Panel suggested that the proposed build has a character more reminiscent of Scotland than Sussex, noting in particular the pronounced gable, and asked what the Applicant thought of that sentiment. The Applicant said that the nearby Rose Cottage featured a very strong gable end. The Panel observed that the parapet gable used in the design is an alien feature in this location. The Applicant agreed, but said that they wanted to give the proposed build a bit more gravitas, something to make it unique. They also noticed that the parapet incorporated drainage. The Panel questioned whether the modern construction of the build already made the structure unique without the need for the parapet gable.</p> <p>6. The Panel noted that the House is going to have an impact on the surrounding buildings. The Applicants agreed that it will, but suggested that any effort to hide the House and mitigate its impact would be disruptive. They felt it was more likely to have a positive impact without mitigation.</p> <p>7. The Panel asked if there was a drawing that looked down on the proposed plan.</p>

	The Applicant said that there is.
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened their summary by saying that they saw nothing objectionable about the principle of a replacement dwelling on this site. 2. The Panel noted that the example of the Wealden House and discussion of the interior of the proposal weren't particularly relevant to the purposes of the DRP. 3. The Panel raised some doubts about the claim that the height would be no greater – they suggested the Applicant double-check this and make it clearer. 4. The Panel questioned the location of soil and vent pipes, which they didn't see on the plans. 5. The Panel suggested that bringing in a model would help. 6. The Panel agreed that a proposed replacement dwelling for this site was both possible and potentially interesting. It also agreed that the basis of the proposals – a fragmented and picturesque composition – had the potential to be more than 'neutral', making a positive contribution to the architecture of the village. 7. The Panel found the two parallel forms, carefully segmented into diminishing roofs, offered a very positive basis for detailed development. It welcomed the limitation on the height of the design as being no greater than the existing building but urged a check on this to ensure this was indeed correct. 8. The Panel's main concerns were about detail. It expressed a concern about the pronounced gable, commenting that it seemed more Scottish than Sussex. This possibly alien detail would need a greater level of justification than has been given for far to determine its appropriateness to both the composition and the village. The Panel understood the wish to make the house be distinctive, but it felt that further investigation into detail might make the house familiar from a distance but interesting closer up. 9. On materials there was no objection to the use of flint – being a common local building material – but it was noted that flint was rarely handled well in modern construction. It is best to avoid certain materials unless the skills are committed and available. The same comment applied to the use of render. It can look cheap if not properly detailed. More is required from the choice of brick. Again the proposed grey brick might work but much would be dependent on the actual brickwork proposed and associated details. 10. The Panel advised that more work needed to be done to make this particular proposal read well. Details will help and the filling of some obvious gaps such as the effect of soil and vent pipes will add confidence. The house shows promise in design terms. It seems appropriate in its form but much depends on its execution.