

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	21/05/18
Site:	Liss Forest Nursery, Greatham
Proposal:	Redevelopment of the site to residential with three options currently under consideration: 39 unit scheme (houses) and care home, 65 unit scheme including flats or 59 unit scheme (all houses). The existing access would be retained and open space would be provided on-site for residents.
Planning reference:	SDNP/17/05087/PRE
Panel members sitting:	David Hares (Chair) David Edwards Kay Brown Adam Richards Alison Galbraith Paul Fender
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Mark Waller Gutierrez (Design Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) Richard Ferguson (Case Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Alison Young Nick Thomas Tony Webber Steve Robbins Chris Crawley
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 noted that the local plan suggests 35-40 homes in its allocation and asked how the applicant decided on 50 homes. The Applicant noted that 50 is given as the upper limit in the allocation. They noted that the density of the developable area of the site at 50 homes would be about 30 homes per hectare, with lower density on the outer edges. They suggested that there is local demand for smaller houses. They suggested that there is local demand for smaller houses and they considered this a 'reasonable density'.</p> <p>The Panel expressed doubt about fitting in 50 homes and asked whether the number could fall if the design necessitated it. The Applicant said that this was possible and noted they weren't yet sure of the mix.</p> <p>2. The Panel noted that the VDS was mentioned in the presentation and asked how that helped the application. The Applicants said that it did, suggesting that some of the unique elements of the scheme were drawn from the VDS (such as : 'hidden village' character; key views to the surrounding landscape). They also said that they would be meeting with the parish for community engagement purposes.</p> <p>3. The Panel asked what the population of Greatham was, and how many households lived in the area. The Applicant said the population was approximately 800, but they weren't sure about the number of households.</p> <p>4. The Panel asked what the density of Bakers Field is. The Applicant said that it was in the associated document and suggested that Bakers Field doesn't really reflect the character of Greatham. [post meeting: the calculation is 26 units in 1.55ha which makes a density of 16.7dph]</p> <p>5. The Panel asked how the Applicant will handle cars. The Applicant said that they will try to avoid parking courts or parking to the front of the sites; parking to the side of houses seems most likely but this has not been worked out yet</p> <p>6. The Panel noted that there is a substantial terrace on site and asked about site contours. The Applicants noted that the terrace is artificial and suggested that they will remove it to create more natural levels. The Panel asked if they'd do this through cut and fill on site. The Applicant said that they're not sure yet but that on site cut and fill seems most likely.</p>

	<p>7. The Panel asked if the houses would be traditional. The Applicant explained that they had evolved some simple palettes and displayed these on slides. They favoured traditional pastiche as that a contemporary style didn't seem the right way to go on this site. They said that features like corbelled chimneys, big porches, use of stone and gables carried through will help it to sit in its location. They also noted that they'd be talking to the parish for guidance.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the Applicant thinks pastiche will work. The Applicant said that they think so, but noted that the palette hasn't been confirmed yet.</p> <p>8. The Panel asked if the Applicant had a standard set of house types that they'd use. The Applicant said that they had no standard products, although it is likely that they'll look at previous work to determine what's practical and has good saleability.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by saying that, generally speaking, they're happy with the landscape analysis, the intent to provide houses in a perimeter block layout with a conventional back-to-back rear garden arrangement, the GI buffer to the countryside and links to existing PROWs although they do feel that more sustainability details need to come forward. 2. The Panel noted that pastiche doesn't tend to be viewed favourably. 3. They observed that, without layout details, it's hard to comment, but it looks like there will be a lot of corner plots. This could present problems with overlooking affecting private amenity and where to fit parking spaces without dominating the public realm. 4. They suggested that the Applicant should display more of the workings out on how they reached the layout that they've got. 5. A sustainability strategy is needed. 6. The Panel noted that there doesn't seem to be much space left for landscape or GI within the developable area, with the exception of one small island in the middle. 7. They noted that seeing how views from the site and to the site work would help. 8. There was concern about the number of cars that might be proposed and how these will be accommodated. 9. Finally, the Panel advised that they're going to need more detail to come forward if they're going to provide a more comprehensive review of the application and be convinced that the kind of housing numbers suggested can actually be achieved successfully.