

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	21/05/18
Site:	Lower Yard, Newton Valence
Proposal:	Proposed five dwellings
Planning reference:	SDNP/17/06513/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) Victoria Corrigan (Case Officer) Rob Ainslie (Development Manager)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Ian Ellis Angus Gavin Hamish Jansen
Declarations of interest:	David Hares and Alison Galbraith declared that they had previously worked with Ian Ellis professionally David Edwards declared that he knew the architect (Angus Gavin) in a professional capacity

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 why the Applicant was using a vernacular approach that limited them to using very small windows, when larger windows would help let in more of the valuable local views. The Applicant noted that the site depends heavily on its context and that an existing vernacular would fit more comfortably as a result and they thought that the SDNPA would prefer this approach. They said that were some larger windows facing the fields to the west that will see winter and summer sunsets. They said that a later vernacular with larger, Georgian windows would have been discussed but had been rejected in favour of what is currently proposed.</p> <p>2. The Panel asked if the Applicant has completed a transport/access study. The Applicant said that they'd looked at visibility and sight lines for the site. The Panel asked the Applicant if the central access point was the best option. The Applicant noted that the Highways Authority was insistent that the existing access be avoided and the proposed central access point achieves this and has better visibility splays which will affect hedgerows on either side. The Panel asked if there could be conflict with the driveway opposite the proposed access. The Applicant said that they didn't see potential for conflict, explaining that the driveway opposite only services a single house.</p> <p>3. The Panel asked whether any site sections were available and noted that the Applicant has a contour plan; would it be worth transposing the plan on to that? The Applicant said that they didn't have any site sections yet. They said that they were aware of the rise in level towards Upper Yard. They observed that the site is flat as entered, that the footpath starts to rise and ends about a metre above where it enters the site, although they noted that the bordering hedge is thick enough to prevent views from the footpath across the site. They noted that towards the back of the site is an area of slightly built up land, with a drop of a metre, but generally speaking they don't believe the level changes are very significant.</p> <p>4. The Panel asked how the Applicant sees the development conserving and enhancing the National Park. The Applicant said that it would do so by removing an existing eyesore (the current buildings) and by improving the PROW and enabling the removal of an existing grain store elsewhere on the estate..</p> <p>5. The Panel asked if the Applicant had taken landscape advice.</p>

	<p>The Applicant said that they have. They noted that the alignment of the foot path prevents walkers seeing in to the lower yard, allowing people fantastic views over the meadow but seeing nothing beyond the hedge on blocking views of the yard. They also raised concerns about the barns, noting that, while they didn't have time to mention the WEP, through the WEP they aim to remove things like barns and the grain store to improve views and allow more footpaths to be put in.</p> <p>6. The Panel asked how the Applicant had responded to advice from the planning officers. The Applicant said that they had met with the planning officers and noted that they originally had three developments planned; one has been parked for now, one is for 13 affordable homes and the one being discussed today is the third. Regarding this development specifically, they were advised that there should be smaller houses on this site. They believe that they need the larger houses in order to generate enough capital from this site, but have added a number of smaller houses to the site. They had explored the farmstead concept as a design approach and understood that the scheme needs to be justified in landscape terms but this has not been done yet.</p> <p>7. The Panel asked what the parking provisions would be. The Applicant explained that each house would have an open-fronted "Carriage House" that would accommodate two cars, plus drive space for an additional two cars in front of that.</p> <p>8. The Panel asked about the hatched area in the courtyard. The Applicant explained that it was a space for people living around the courtyard, which was going to be a link between the units, with all four units sharing responsibility for it. They noted that the approach driveway was intended to be wide enough to accommodate informal parking (e.g. by visitors) to prevent parking in the courtyard area. The Panel asked whether the driveway would have a soft verge or would be hardstanding. The Applicant said that it would be a gravel verge and they wanted to make the driveway wide enough to look inviting as space for informal parking.</p> <p>9. The Panel asked how visible the site is and what the existing boundary was. The Applicant explained that it was the limit of the yard and had no specific features that made it obvious. They noted that there will be new planting on the proposed boundary to hide the development from the countryside.</p>
--	--

<p>2.0 Panel Summary</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel opened by saying that they were not sure where the concept of a farmstead had come from. As such they feel the justification for the farmstead character needs to be better represented in future. 2. They noted that they hadn't seen much in the way of workings out in terms of the landscape led approach and the justification for the current layout. 3. They were not convinced by the reasoning for the paddocks, which they are concerned might give rise to equestrian paraphernalia appearing on site with a harmful landscape impact on the South Downs National Park . 4. They respected the decision for the small houses and farmhouse structure to face on to the road. 5. They questioned the vernacular, with the resultant small windows in particular being seen as a negative. 6. They noted the need for site sections, particularly in considering the boundaries. 7. They advised that including contours on the plans would help. <p>Additionally, The Panel raised that how this site fits in with the WEP and the fact it's gone from the originally proposed five dwellings to nine are important points for consideration, but that's not a design issue and outside the Panel's purview.</p> <p>Finally, the applicant noted that Lower Yard was formally part of the farmyard for the farm and that just frontage development would leave a large area unused behind the houses. They pointed out that HCC guidelines encouraged them to look in to farmyard characters, noting that there was a similar application for a farmyard character in Selbourne which got permission. Finally, they noted that farmsteads being developed in to housing was a defining feature of this area, suggesting examples such as Grange Farm in Selbourne.</p>
---------------------------------	---