

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	20/04/18
Site:	Garden Street
Proposal:	Ten new homes
Planning reference:	SDNP/18/00653/PRE
Panel members sitting:	David Hares (Chair) Chris Blandford Kay Brown Steven Johnson Lap Chan Paul Fender
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Mark Waller Gutierrez (Design Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) David Cranmer (Case Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	Tom Jones
Item presented by:	David Cranmer (Case Officer on behalf of applicant) Scott Curie
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 if the Applicant was aware that the site was on a flood plain. The Applicant said that they are aware of this. 2. The Panel noted that the design concepts seemed to begin with a set of sketch studies showing traditional gable forms, but the plan then shifts to ovoid structures with no clear reason. The Applicant said that the 'leaf fall' building footprint was just another concept idea that they were considering but that there was no fixed design proposal yet 3. The Panel noted that the roof is the fifth elevation. The Applicant noted that there's a comfortable Lewes vernacular but they thought that a contemporary scheme would also be appropriate here 4. The Panel asked whether the Applicant had analysed the townscape. The Applicant noted that Southover used to sit outside of Lewes proper. They then went on to note some of the key features in the local area, such as the train station and the residential terraces, before saying that there are a wide range of different characters in the area and no single overarching theme. 5. The Panel noted that the railway runs past one side of the site and asked if there was going to be any response to the railway; how will it be addressed from the site? The Applicant noted that the railway can be a key landmark and suggested that it should be treated in the same way as the Grange. 6. The Panel asked how much lower the three houses at the bottom of the site would be compared to Southover Road. The Applicant said that it would be two metres from Southover road to the base. The Panel observed that this seemed unlikely and that it was surely a larger dimension. 7. The Panel asked if a topographical survey was available. The Applicant said that they hadn't produced one yet. 8. The Panel noted that the proposed houses would feature large areas of glazing and asked how that would impact the night sky. The Applicant acknowledged that there would be a substantial glow and that they are considering ways to deal with it, but it hasn't been resolved yet. 9. The Panel asked whether there would be more research available as this scheme is brought forward. The Applicant said that there would; the current scheme is just trying to confirm the principle of development.

	<p>10. The Panel noted the need for topographical details and suggested that creating a 3d model will be important for this site.</p> <p>11. The Panel asked about car parking on site. The Applicant said that the parking for occupants will be situated underneath the houses; there will also be a small number of parking spaces on site above ground as overflow/visitor parking.</p> <p>12. The Panel asked about bin and emergency vehicle access. The Applicant said that there was space for turning but this was a point they'd need to consider further going forwards.</p> <p>13. The Panel noted that all the houses as proposed are single units. They suggested that it could be interesting to bring some of them together, creating some overlap, although they'd need to consider careful where the gap would be. The Applicant noted that individual units are more desirable.</p> <p>14. The Panel asked about the roofs, and whether they'd be accessible. The Applicant said that the roofs would be sedum and that they could potentially be accessible, but they hadn't been considering that.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel all agree that this site could take a modern design. 2. The Panel observed that this is a relatively unique site. The sheds that currently occupy it are only there because they fit conveniently. The site itself is very nodal and a substantial pivot point within Lewes. 3. The panel agreed that this might result in a 'sculptural' building design and as such this would greatly benefit from a 3d model to demonstrate how this would work from several angles. 4. The Panel noted that the Downs made for a striking backdrop when looking east from the site but that views of and from the railway station were also important. Much more analysis of key views is needed. 5. The Panel suggested that this site can probably take a contemporary development, but suggested that the Applicants consider a more thorough townscape analysis of surrounding streets, put more consideration in to the views and highlighted that the way the development turns the corner will be crucial. 6. The panel noted that the large amounts of glazing and the 'see through building' concept could in effect result in views of a great deal of internal clutter 7. The Panel suggested a figure ground analysis and that they need to see more working out. They suggested considering the similar site at the south end of Garden Street; ideas need to be ruled out as much as they need to be presented to demonstrate that all possibilities have been considered. 8. The Panel raised a concern that this is a very nodal site,

	<p>but they do not address the corner well. They suggested it might be worth doing a study of locations in Lewes where developments turn a corner.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. The Panel noted that, due to the railway running alongside the site there are effectively streets on all sides of the site, so to the development should address all sides accordingly. 10. The Panel noted that the landscape here is largely a townscape, (although neighbouring mature trees also important landscape elements) but wondered whether there could be potential to put in some landscape elements like a skygarden. 11. The walls to the site and opposite the site along Southover Grange Gardens are key landscape elements that should be respected and referenced 12. The Panel noted that, due to its close proximity to the centre of Lewes and easy access to the Lewes train station, this site could have the potential to be a cars free development. 13. The Panel suggested that moving away from the concept of 9 or 10 separate buildings and merging units would create more opportunities for choosing where to create gaps in response to important views.
--	--