

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	20/04/18
Site:	Streat Hill Farmhouse
Proposal:	Replacement dwelling, guest house and garden studio.
Planning reference:	SDNP/18/00393/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) Christopher Wright (Case Officer, Lewes District Council)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Duncan Baker-Brown Stephen Belcher
Declarations of interest:	Duncan Baker-Brown 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	<p>1. The Panel asked whether the guest house was intended to be private. The Applicant said yes; while they acknowledge that there is a tourism option, this is not what the landowner wants. The Panel asked if it, therefore, is better described as an annex. The Applicant agreed, it is functionally an annex.</p> <p>2. The Panel asked the applicant to run through the palette of materials. The Applicant explained that it would mostly be brick, but they were considering using timber for the guest house and above-ground elements of the main house.</p> <p>3. The Panel asked if there would be a balustrade running around the roof. The Applicant said there would be a planter at the front.</p> <p>4. The Panel noted that the ground appears to run in to the green roof on the plan, and asked the Applicant to confirm. The Applicant confirmed that this was the case. The Panel asked whether the Applicant was going to smooth out the transitions between each of the terraces. The Applicant said no, they wouldn't. The Panel asked whether this is where the existing terraces are. The Applicant said that it is. The Panel asked if this was ultimately going to appear as a series of terraces. The Applicant noted that they had considered dropping the front accommodation.</p> <p>5. The Panel asked if the ridge height would be the same as the previous dwelling. The Applicant said that they expect it to be, but it hasn't been confirmed yet.</p> <p>6. The Panel noted that the ethos of the National Park prioritises conservation and enhancement of the park. They therefore asked how this scheme was going to enhance the landscape. The Applicant explained that the building would be lowered overall and the massing of it would be shifted. The Panel suggested that the Applicant could face difficulty in persuading the committee to approve the construction of a replacement dwelling that's bigger than the previous one. The Applicants acknowledged this but expressed that the previous building was poorly designed and didn't consider the landscape or the park; their option, while larger, both provide the owner with what they want while reducing the overall impact of the building.</p> <p>7. The Panel asked if the Applicant has had any input from a landscape architect.</p>

	<p>The Applicant said that there was a landscape architect on standby and ready to contribute.</p> <p>8. The Panel asked if the red line would go beyond the crescent of trees on site. The Applicant said that it would. The Panel asked whether the area between the building and the crescent of trees would be a garden. The Applicant said that it wouldn't; it would just be downland turf.</p> <p>9. The Panel asked about the pitched roofs on the above-ground elements. The Applicant said that the pitched roof was designed to maximise solar gain for the PV panels to be installed on the roof. The Panel noted that PV panels can be mounted on a flat roof. The Applicant acknowledged that they could, but said this doesn't seem like a suitable design solution.</p> <p>10. The Panel asked if the site could be seen from South Downs Way . The Applicant said no.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by saying that they were positive about the approach, with the single-story design set in to the ground. 2. The Panel noted, however, that they have yet to be convinced that this application is landscape led. This site is one of the most prominent, and as such sensitive, sites on the Downs and the sooner a landscape architect is brought on board, the better. 3. The Panel noted that the design features a lot of strong, straight lines, which aren't very characteristic of the Downs. 4. The Panel asked whether the coniferous trees were appropriate – Noting that they give an effect that seems more suited to a Tuscan farm, which isn't what they'd expect to find on the South Downs. 5. The Panel praised the Applicants on the resource map that they produced, which helps to embed the development in the downs and create a really powerful narrative. They also noted the use of recycled materials, which is a very admirable effort towards sustainability. 6. The Panel noted that a good 3D model of the scheme could be extremely helpful, to better display the topography of the site. 7. The Panel suggested that more consideration needs to be put in to the South Downs Way; despite the applicants claim that it's not visible from the site, the Panel believe that the site will still impact on views from the South Downs Way. 8. The Panel raised some concerns about the guest house and the risk of residential creep if the guest house is ultimately sold as a separate house on the site and in addition the studio spreads the proposed development across the site to an unacceptable degree

	<p>9. The Panel spoke about the palette and advised that the proposed clay tiles might stand out substantially; they encouraged the applicants to put more thought in to how the materials mesh with the landscape. Further to that, the Panel suggested that timber would be a better solution for the guest house and above-ground elements of the main house as this is a more discreet natural material.</p> <p>10. The Panel recommended that any PV panels should be fully integrated in to the roofs, to reduce their visual impact.</p>
--	---