

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	16/08/2018
Site:	Longmoor MOD site, Greatham
Proposal:	N/a
Planning reference:	N/a
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold (Chair) Merrick Denton-Thompson Steven Johnson Kay Brown John Hearn Alison Galbraith
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Mark Waller Gutierrez (Design Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead) Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager) Natacha Bricks-Yonow (Support Services Officer) Sergio Chapman-Salas (Apprentice Planner)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	Barbara Holyome (Authority member) Richard Sandiford (Senior Committee and Member Services Officer)
Item presented by:	V. Marden (DIO) Chris Knott (Whitehill Bordon Regeneration Company) Ravail Marwaha (Whitehill Bordon Regeneration Company) Laurence Holmes (GVA) James Gross (Urban Place Lab) David Jobbins (Luken Beck) Andrew Smith (Fabrik)
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel asked about the floor space and noted that it seems to replicate the layout of buildings / rebuilt. The Applicant explained that its strategy is to keep some buildings and to subdivide them in a range of units required, principally small units of 5, 10, 15 and 20, 000 square feet. They said that the current buildings on the site demonstrated a site capacity of 350,000 sq feet in total 2. The Panel asked if the big buildings on site replicated the current floorspace. The Applicant answered yes. 3. The Panel asked about parking and the effect of cars on the landscape. The Applicant answered that within the 8.4 hectare site there will be enough space for the parking required for the proposed development but they would also look at promoting non-vehicular access and sustainable transport (bus). The impact of car parking would be reduced by the surrounding vegetated boundary treatment as well as breaking up bays with planting 4. The Panel asked about the conventional type of frontage and the applicant's strategy to deal with it and with the landscape within the site. The Applicant said they're hoping to take ideas from this session, they are at an early stage. There is an existing vegetated enclosure form. It would be a combined response. 5. This is a prominent site, set within an existing woodland framework. The panel expressed concern about the red line and the scheme's reliance upon its woodland setting (outside of their control) to make it acceptable. They noted the client had a choice; to either extend the red line to encompass this woodland, or to have a less ambitious plan within the currently proposed red line. There is only a hedge proposed to the site boundary, without its wooded context this would represent a very fragile buffer. From the applicant point of view, the first point is the most important: this is a different vision which is regarding land that is in separate ownership. The red line represents the MOD/DIO area, in yellow is an area able to make a contribution but it belongs to a different client. 6. The panel noted that ultimately the land and its surrounding woodland was public land. The applicant answered that they can only work with what they have. 7. The Panel continued, saying that no reference to the National Park Management Plan or to Brexit has been made. The SDNPA should be concerned about the

	<p>National Park and its assets (e.g. farming, which largely manages this landscape). It would be pleased to see a vision around agriculture. Central Government are creating a complete transformation of the way land is managed. There are issues around Brexit, trade negotiations which put the landscape in a sensitive and vulnerable position. They are looking at ways to make agriculture resilient to sustain the National Parks driven by the industry (NFU, CLA, big Estates...), to create a resilience in terms of sustainable food production. The applicant should look at how this site could help build resilience too and sustain the National Park's landscapes.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the applicant has taken the National Park management Plan into account and if they had discussion with the farming industry.</p> <p>The applicant said that they have not yet, as it still early days. There will be reference to potential uses that will embrace those points.</p> <p>8. The Panel noted that in terms of proportions of land use it is currently unacceptable. If the site loses its woodland context, remaining vegetation within the site is just a narrow fringe. The applicant needs to take the National Park's landscape-led ambitions seriously, and the National Park cannot allow the MOD to restrict the red line area. This is a Government project not a corporate scheme therefore Government are responsible.</p> <p>The applicant answered that yes, they could lose the woodland context but they have no control over it, they cannot secure it. They admitted this is something they need to work on further and provide reassurances about the wider management</p> <p>9. The project (in terms of both layout/design and types of businesses they are encouraging) should be landscape-led. If purely market led and if it produces enormous sheds, how will the applicant stop massive companies moving in (e.g. Amazon)? The Panel also asked if the landscape could be brought into the site from the surroundings. The Panel asked about the possibility to loosen up the layout, the applicant could plan on increasing the height of the buildings as the surrounding trees are already mature and provide that scale.</p> <p>The Applicant stated their current approach is based around market research evidence, therefore the scheme has been market-led as opposed to landscape-led. They understood the comments and would re-consider this as part of the development of the scheme.</p> <p>10. The Panel asked if the applicant could consider smaller units set within woodland glades. The woodland setting is exciting and drives the character of the site. Brexit could mean that there will be a reduced need for large spaces</p>
--	--

	<p>but require more flexibility and be focused upon specific industries, e.g. wine-making, wood/timber industries. The applicant noted this comment.</p> <p>11. The Panel continued to press the applicant on what is really needed in this region. The Panel said that the market is hard to predict. The Applicant answered that on the report (university survey) from their consultant, Mark Selby, part of the evidence was based on discussion across the agricultural sector and they have engaged with that sector. The industries presented to the Panel were all sectors identified in the survey.</p> <p>12. The panel noted that the typology does not seem to represent the young, tech and modern user groups identified in the applicant's vision document. The Panel asked the applicant to explore the design to accommodate those exciting new industries instead of having standard warehouses. The Applicant answered that their ambition was better than this and the project being at early stages, they are still exploring the potential industry uses and their requirements. The applicant said that they have deliberately not taken things any further. They need something modular, a big format that could be subdivided. They accepted it is still a bit clumsy at this stage.</p> <p>13. The Panel said that this design needs to come out from a more landscape-led approach. The surroundings are rich, with a mosaic of landscapes including broadleaf woodland, pines and heathland. This richness should be expressed in the site layout and design. The applicant should see the site as <i>part of</i> the woodland and the special qualities of the landscape should be expressed in the design and can be used to attract potential occupants. The applicant emphasised the proposed edges of the site, and will see what more can be done in the rest of the site, by investigating the central corridor in recognition of this.</p> <p>14. The Panel said that something more radical was needed in terms of identifying uses for the site. The Panel has difficulty understanding why the applicant started with solely employment use. Perhaps there should have been more analysis for other or mixed uses that could benefit local communities and the wider National Park landscapes, perhaps more consultations to consider leisure or agricultural uses. The applicant answered that they started with the market research, but appreciate more work is needed. The Applicant said that the uses could be more diverse than the ones shown. In their work (the research), for example on the gaming aspect, that answers to an economic and a leisure aspect. In a European Union context, Guildford is a game centre for UK and EU, it is more than just programming. There is opportunity for events (Virtual reality, conferences...). For agriculture, it not simply a conventional approach. The applicant has in mind a "dream team" to occupy the</p>
--	---

	<p>site but it goes beyond any market plan to look for good and strong fit for the National Park.</p> <p>15. The Panel asked if employment was needed in this part of the National Park. The applicant answered that it was, for the uses identified and possibly for others.</p> <p>16. The Panel expressed surprise that there has not been more community consultation. There has not been a consultation with the local Greatham community, but it could be done as a consequence of this process. The applicant is open to change, they don't want the perception that this is just about employment. A public consultation is planned in the initial programme.</p> <p>17. The Panel wants to be assured that the principles of National Park would be promoted on this site. The Panel stated everything within the red line, amounts to 35,000m², and asked how many people would be employed. The Applicants said that numbers could vary. It is difficult to quantify, but probably around 500 jobs.</p> <p>18. The Panel noted that the MOD owns the surrounding land. They said that if 500 people were employed on the site, there would be a need to provide cycle ways, buses, roads and the presentation has so far not covered these points. The Applicant is trying to offer a mix of employers on site. They suggested their ambition was to create a hub with additional facilities, this is what smaller businesses want and particularly younger workers. This could be a part of the development that is open to the public. It could be a resource for the local community as the site will be open to the wider public. There are buses running on the A235, Longmoor. This could also be considered a destination on the Shipwright's Way.</p> <p>19. The Panel asked about the classification of what is described, if it would be B1 The Applicant answered that it would primarily be B1 use.</p> <p>20. The Panel said they are there to ensure that the National Park gets the level of quality it needs. The Panel talked about place-making and questioned if the middle is the right location for the creation of a hub. If the public is allowed in, shouldn't that hub be closer to the entrance? The Applicant noted this point.</p> <p>21. On the masterplan and the design principles, the question of sustainability and resilience should be addressed. There is the question of how to get the employees on site, and</p>
--	---

	<p>what would they do on their break time? Depending on the offer, there is a need to provide facilities (café/walking routes/outdoor gym) so they don't have to keep going off site. Minimising vehicle numbers and movements on site will be key. The Panel encouraged the applicant to consider parking at an early stage.</p> <p>The Applicant plans to respond to these questions.</p> <p>The Panel talked about place-making and landscape. The site offers a unique opportunity, but key strategic concepts fundamental to place and landscape got lost by the end of the presentation. The central link was significantly weakened and the Panel felt there was a need for another one further east.</p> <p>The applicant answered that the wider area is being looked at, there is a vertical layer. They are thinking about the place making, and it will be better at the next stage. Today's session has started a debate, and which is appreciated.</p> <p>22. The Panel asked if the woodland in the western end within the red line would be lost and why it was in the red line in the first place. The applicant should look at linking the broadleaved woodland to the A3.</p> <p>The applicant said that is where the fencing defines the site and that they will revisit that end of the site.</p> <p>23. The Panel discussed sustainability. Consider landscape-led energy provision and water management. The site should be an example of best practice in the National Park. It should be self-sustaining, paying attention to waste management and drainage, especially as MOD are experts in those aspects. The Panel asked about the woodland in relation to sustainability. An exemplar for sustainability and the landscape-led approach should be created. The Panel also warned that there could be asbestos and possible ground contamination.</p> <p>The applicant is looking at the energy and the impact it could have on the site. For example, using wood fuel would increase traffic.</p> <p>24.</p>
2.0 Landscape led approach	SDNPA Landscape and Design Officers explained the "landscape led approach" required in the National Park
3.0 Discussions (Analysis, Vision and General)	<p>The applicant said that they will take away the comments and adapt the scheme development accordingly.</p> <p>The Panel asked the applicant to consider putting recreation elements on site, such as open spaces, informal pitches or running/walking routes..</p> <p>The applicant said that the landscape is at the door step of the site. They could borrow from the landscape. There is the possibility to</p>

	<p>add elements but equally, the landscape is the attraction. It is mostly about movement networks. .</p> <p>The Panel asked about landscape evidence, people and uses.</p> <p>The applicant answered that the Woolmer Range is adjacent and that, there is a large cycling route (about 7 miles). There is already a number of elements existing but they need to find the connectivity between those elements.</p> <p>The Panel noted that a debate has been brought forward about the layout and the possibility to change the vehicular entrance.</p> <p>The applicant answered that access needs to be examined but primarily, the access will be through the existing points. They need to think carefully about security and the boundary treatment and find a balance between security and open access. All being landscape led.</p> <p>The Panel said that it was a good presentation, but there were real reservations about some aspects of the analysis, including insufficient recognition of the site's location to existing settlements and of potential alternative uses to benefit the existing wider community and the national park in general.</p> <p>The panel had some reservations about the analysis in terms of insufficient recognition of site's location to existing settlements which has pretty poor connections other than roads. Also there had been insufficient analysis of potential alternative uses to benefit the existing wider community and the national park in general. The Panel believes that to support that process the Glover review could be utilised. The applicant could also benefit from thoughts from the Government's 25 year environment plan, particularly from the definition of net gain. The Panel wants the applicant to take away ideas to develop their project according to their programme. It would be interesting to have workshops regarding this project building on today's session.</p> <p>The applicant answered that they will digest all the information received today and will come back to the panel with suggestions for a future workshop date sometime in the next 3-4 weeks.</p>
--	---