

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	20/04/18
Site:	North Farm
Proposal:	Redevelopment comprising commercial, winery and tourism (Including overnight accommodation) use.
Planning reference:	SDNP/18/01349/PRE
Panel members sitting:	David Hares (Chair) Chris Blandford Kay Brown Steven Johnson Lap Chan
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Mark Waller Gutierrez (Design Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) Vicki Colwell (Major Projects Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	Tom Jones
Item presented by:	Stuart Eatock Gary Kelly Paul Fender Chris Batten Dale Mayhew
Declarations of interest:	Paul Fender is a current member of the Panel and as such is known to all other Panel members.

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 noted that there's a bund intended along the front of the site, at what is currently an entrance from the A24, which was noted in the analysis as a potential site for advertising the farm. How would advertising be handled? The Applicants noted that there is only a short window for engagement with Northbound traffic, but Southbound traffic has sight of the farm for longer. How they're going to use this hasn't yet been confirmed; discussions have suggested building signage along one of the existing structures, building it along the top of the bund, or possibly replacing the bund with another building that could be a key marker of the site in itself. These are all things they hope to address going forward. 2. The Panel asked how many visitors the Applicants are expecting. The Applicant didn't have a specific number to hand, but explained that they've analysed the matter and constructed a business plan accordingly; they're confident that the development will be viable. 3. The Panel asked how many parking spaces would be available. The Applicant said that they'd planned 40 formal parking spaces and there would be approximately 30 overflow parking spaces. 4. The Panel noted that the site was a great opportunity for solar collection and asked whether the Applicants had any energy consultants on board. The Applicants said they had a group called Delta Green working on the project. They noted that the shed currently used to store wine has PV panels 5. The Panel asked the Applicant how they saw the development enhancing the National Park or impacting on Conservation. The Applicant noted that the lower valley floor, where the site is located, isn't easily seen from outside the site. They feel that the best use of the site would be to expand construction on existing hard-standing in order to get the most use out of what's there without having to add more. They also noted a number of nearby semi-improved grassland areas that their surveys had highlighted as being of particular value, which they want to conserve, further encouraging a more intensive use of the already existing hardstanding. 6. The Panel asked about the phasing of the development; would all of phase one be handled in one effort? The Applicant noted the phase one was going to be the small commercial development in the east of the site, the

	<p>winery and the changes to the road system, all of which would be done in one effort. Phase two will be the larger commercial elements and the tourism components and will be approached in a more staggered fashion.</p> <p>7. The Panel asked about the Right of Way going through the site.</p> <p>The Applicants displayed the current official and proposed routes and those actually used and noted the need to confront A24 noise; this was what has encouraged them to propose the bund and the associated diversion of the Right of Way in order to get around the bund.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the Right of Way went straight over the A24</p> <p>The Applicant said yes and noted that they wanted to encourage people to cross in the most direct fashion possible, to minimise exposure to the road.</p> <p>The Panel asked the Applicant to confirm that this right of way was not part of the South Downs Way.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that it is not a part of the South Downs Way.</p> <p>8. The Panel asked if the Applicant had looked at the history of the site during their landscape analysis, noting that there's currently a very strong treeline on either side of the development; could those be two parts of an older treeline that used to run across the site?</p> <p>The Applicant said that they hadn't considered that.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by acknowledging that the Applicant had clearly recognised the significance of the existing buildings and that they understood the farmstead character. 2. The Panel accepted that the Applicant had done a fair amount of research for this site, but they didn't feel that this information was sufficiently demonstrated to them; in particular they felt that information was needed on the topography and important views, including from surrounding rights of way. 3. The Panel questioned the method used to determine the sensitivity study. 4. The Panel said that the business plan should have been more developed; they wanted to know specifically how many people and how many cars were expected and were being planned for. Further to this, they noted that the parked cars need to be better addressed – they will be a big eyesore on this site and appropriate steps should be taken to mitigate that. 5. The Panel accepted the reasons for the bund in terms of acoustic mitigation, but feel that putting a building in to that space would be a much better solution, providing a dual use of the space. 6. The large quantities of concrete hard standing on the site were noted as a substantial feature and one of the key issues of this site. The Panel want to hear more about how it will be dealt with (e.g. will any be broken up? Made

	<p>more permeable, or 'covered' in some way?) and what steps will be taken to reduce the impact the current hardstanding has.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. The Panel advised the Applicant that at some points they may need to consider outright demolition of some structures, instead of repurposing them all. The current plans, especially in the second phase, seem like they could be sticking too rigidly to the existing buildings. 8. The Panel advised that lighting needed to be better addressed in both buildings and in relation to car parking, considering the importance of the Dark Night Skies policy in the National Park. 9. The Panel advised that the scale and variation of the sheds in phase 2 needs to refer back to the existing landscape character and should avoid the effect of repetitive 'rubber stamping' standard sheds. 10. The Panel asked whether the Applicant could consider sinking some storage in to the earth. This would help reduce the impact of higher level buildings and help justify in some way the proposal for an extra 2000sqm of floor space. 11. The Panel noted that, if they're going to be selling wine on site, couldn't they plant more vines in the vicinity to refer back to that. 12. Finally, the Panel raised the concern that the plan right now feels more building led than it is landscape led. They accepted that this will need to be demonstrated together with a viable business case, but they think that a landscape led approach won't necessarily cost substantially more; one simple way they suggested would be to show more evidence ('the workings out') of how they reached their various conclusions from a landscape perspective.
--	--