

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

Date of meeting:	20/06/18
Site:	Goslings Croft, Selborne, Alton, Hampshire
Proposal:	Proposed thirteen dwellings
Planning reference:	SDNP/17/06460/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold (Chair) Andrew Smith John Starling John Hearn Lap Chan
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Mark Waller Gutierrez (Design Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Natacha Bricks-Yonow (Support Services Officer) Victoria Corrigan (Case Officer) Michael Scammell (Conservation Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Ian Ellis Angus Gavin Hamish Janson
Declarations of interest:	None

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
<b>1.0 Discussion/Questions with applicants</b>	<p><b>1. The Panel asked who did the Applicant's landscape visual assessment</b> The Case Officer said it was Tylor Grange <b>The Panel asked what conclusions the Applicants reached through their landscape visual assessment.</b> The Case Officer said that the Applicant had concluded that the site was not visible due to foliage surrounding the site.</p> <p><b>2. The Panel asked what the scale of the single story dwellings could be.</b> The Case Officer said that this was currently unknown.</p> <p><b>3. The Panel asked whether Selborne had seen any infill development.</b> The Case Officer noted that the Doone has seen recent development.</p> <p><b>4. The Panel asked whether the site could be entered without crossing the existing PROW.</b> The Case Officer said that you cannot without going through land in the ownership of existing dwellings on Goslings Croft.</p> <p><b>5. The Panel asked whether the Applicant had done a heritage statement and, if not, why not.</b> The Case Officer explained that the applicants had not done a heritage statement. The applicant said that if the PROW has historic associations then a heritage statement might be appropriate.</p> <hr/> <p><b>6. The Panel asked whether alternative means of access have been considered.</b> The Applicant noted that one alternative was to share the route of the historic footpath, but this was deemed to be unacceptable. They also noted that some of the houses in Gosling's Croft are privately owned. <b>The Panel asked if the Applicant had spoken to the RSL</b> The Applicant said that Drum Housing Association own the residue of social housing and they had spoken to Drum and Radian.</p> <p><b>7. The Panel asked if the Applicant had any historic maps to refer to.</b> The Applicant said that they had made no heritage assessment, but they are happy to consider creating one. (The Applicant's Agent subsequently found and provided a 1842 Tithe Map and a map of "traditional sunken lanes" produced for the Village Design Guide)</p> <p><b>8. The Panel noted that there were two different red lines used in separate plans when referring to the site in the Tyler Grange Landscape Assessment and asked why this was the case.</b> The Applicant said that they didn't know why.</p>

	<p><b>The Panel asked if the visual assessment is based on the larger red line area.</b> The Applicant said that it is.</p> <p><b>9. The Panel asked which boundary would be reinforced to the adjacent field.</b> The Applicant said that they would reinforce the North-East boundary. <b>The Panel suggested this could be included in the red line.</b> The Applicant said that it could, noting that they can implement planting anywhere within the Blue Line and they're willing to extend the red line if the NPA requests it.</p>
<b>2.0 Panel Summary</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Panel concluded that this was not a landscape led development proposal as landscape information that has been collated and that that has yet to be collated does not form an analysis which leads to a landscape strategy dictating the development design as it should. In particular the Panel fail to see how a successful development proposal is possible without an alternative means of vehicular access which does not cause harm to the historic PROW.</li> <li>2. The Panel noted that the information provided isn't particularly easy to understand, but it appears to be thorough in some areas but also missing vital information (e.g. contour plans and sections, confused red line boundaries, no heritage assessment, no arboriculture assessment).</li> <li>3. The Panel said that the Applicants had clearly noted a sensitive edge on the site, which they've named "Phase one habitat", but the plans appear to show them puncturing this edge. If it is a sensitive habitat then it should not be punctured and should have a design solution to ensure there are no negative effects, e.g. a clear buffer around it.</li> <li>4. The Panel noted that the landscape constraints and opportunities do not appear to have been properly considered in creating the proposal. Any evidence produced for the site needs to be drawn on in the creation of the design, so that the proposals support the information gathered, ensuring the scheme conserves and enhances the National Park. A landscape character analysis should include full landscape &amp; visual constraints and opportunities, tree and ecological assessments, topography, arboriculture and historical evidence and possibly archaeology. To be landscape-led this must be used to inform the layout and design.</li> <li>5. The Panel felt that the historic PROW through the site doesn't appear to have been appropriately considered. The character analysis should consider: its sense of being a continuation of the sunken lane the other side of the B3006; its historical importance; its rural character, its perceptual quality; its ecological value needs to be seen; it needs to be recognised as a 'sensitive edge'; its status as a 'sensitive edge' might require a buffer of say 15m either</li> </ol>

	<p>side which constraint would necessarily have a significant impact on the developable area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The Panel noted that trees and root protection areas don't appear to have been included on any of the plans, noting that these features could reduce the total amount of space available, and therefore affect the layout.</li> <li>7. The Panel believe the site design has not been landscaped. The Landscape Study records key evidence but there has been no analysis or interpretation of this to inform the scheme. In particular, the Panel raised serious concerns about the access to the site; bisecting a historic and characteristic PRow is unacceptable and without a feasible alternative the Panel are unconvinced that this site is developable.</li> <li>8. The Panel felt that it was not acceptable to say that you could not see the site, as the site would be clearly visible from the PRow and from more distant views from the tops of the surrounding hangers. Glimpses of the new development (with associated noise and lighting) would change the rural nature of the PRow and it would be very prominent in the winter months when the deciduous vegetation loses its foliage - more reason for an appropriate and sensitive design solution here. .</li> <li>9. The proposed access on the B3006 would require the removal of substantial amounts of existing hedgerow to facilitate sightlines.</li> <li>10. The Panel raised the concern that the application shows no signs of variety or character. Development needs to enhance the landscape</li> <li>11. The Panel suggested that it would be helpful for the plans to include contour lines to give a clearer idea of how the application responds to topography.</li> <li>12. The Panel highlighted that any development on site should conserve and enhance the National Park, and the buildings must sit well within the landscape; all design within the National Park should be landscape led, but this hasn't been demonstrated with this scheme.</li> <li>13. Post review, some additional documents were submitted by the Applicant (Question 7), which the Panel would need to be incorporated within the justifications for the proposals should an application be submitted, but were not able to comment further.</li> </ol>
--	---