

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	19/09/2018
Site:	Garden Hill Ashford Lane Steep Petersfield GU32 1AD
Proposal:	Demolition of existing dwelling, garage and garden room, and erection of replacement dwelling with associated garaging, parking and turning space (following withdrawal of SDNP/18/02282/FUL)
Planning reference:	SDNP/18/04137/FUL
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold (Chair) Paul Fender Merrick Denton-Thompson Lap Chan James Fox
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Mark Waller Gutierrez (Design Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) Sabah Halli (EHDC – Case Officer) Jessica Hill (EHDC – Conservation Officer) Natacha Bricks-Yonow (Support Services Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	Ian Philips (Authority member)
Item presented by:	Mike Fowler (Project Director)
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
<p>Discussion/ Questions with applicants</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel noted that the landscape & visual assessment was not provided in the planning application. The Applicant stated that to his knowledge all the documents had been provided. 2. The Panel asked if the applicant had considered any other matters in the design of the building to make it more efficient. The Applicant answered that they had focussed upon energy consumption. 3. The Panel asked what windows are proposed. The Applicant answered that it will be painted timber soft wood and that they will be double-glazed. 4. The Panel asked if the building could achieve an energy standard better than building standards. The Applicant answered that it will. 5. The Panel asked about the way the design is influenced by the energy performance. The Applicant answered that most of the energy issue has been seen in the presentation. He said they originally had proposed solar panels in the grounds, but these had been removed from this current application. They also intend to use a Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP) with a backup oil burning boiler. 6. The Panel asked about the future location of the GSHP. The Applicant answered that their intent is to sink it as a borehole, therefore it could go anywhere. It doesn't have a large diameter and will be sunk into the ground as it is not a major structure. 7. The Panel asked about the size of the proposed building footprint compared with the existing houses. The Applicant answered that in 1979, the area was 404 square metres for the current house. The Panel noted that it said 446 square metres in the plan. The Applicant answered that the current house has an area of 404 sqm and the proposal of 870 sqm (including the basement). 8. The Panel asked about the scale of the new building would be relatively to the existing one. The Applicant answered that the SDNPA landscape officer had no objection to the previous proposal and it was much larger. <i>[As a point of clarification the SDNPA Landscape Officer was not consulted on the previous proposal].</i> The proposed ridge height was said by the applicant to be only about 0.5m higher than that of the existing building. 9. The Panel asked about the existing building, its relationship with the landscape and noted that showing the difference of scale, the profile of the existing against the one of the proposal would have been really useful from a design point of view and for the landscape.

The Applicant answered that an analysis was done in the landscape & visual impact assessment.

10. The Panel noted that neither them, nor the case officers have seen the landscape & visual assessment.

The Applicant assured the panel that the impact on the landscape has been considered for the withdrawn application.

11. The Panel noted that the document should relate to the current application, not the withdrawn one.

The Applicant said that he does not understand why it was not available.

12. The Panel asked if there was a landscape masterplan as part of the application and went on to express an interest in the client. Is the client someone who would be prepared to sit down and come to a compromise?

The Applicant said that the client would be willing to discuss and is seeking feedback on the proposals.

13. The Panel said that it would be useful and that normally, applications are seen through a pre-application process. The Panel is a critical friend in order to get the best result, for the applicant, SDNPA and for the landscape. They reinforced that pre-app through DRP is a consultation process that takes place in reviews or workshops.

The Applicant answered that pre-applications in their experience are not worth the time and could take up to 6 months.

The Panel said that EHDC is generally a good process, and pre-apps can be undertaken in 3 weeks.

The Applicant answered that if a response in writing is received is negative, it is difficult to move from that position. There is a risk of having a 13 week application, and often they are asked to submit more and more information in a pre-application.

The Panel reiterated that the process of pre-application is the best way. It gives feedback and helps applicants develop a robust scheme that will have an easier ride through the process.

The case officer specified that there has been no pre-application for the current or the previous application. It would have been beneficial as the pre-application process is there to tell the applicant the issues that can or cannot be resolved.

The Panel said that they are trying to be positive but if an application is started, the officers have less opportunities to improve a scheme and address difficult issues.

The Applicant said that an application takes 21 weeks and that studies such as the visual impact assessment cost money. If a planning application is refused, there is a remedy: an appeal, while there is no remedy for a pre-application.

14. The Panel asked what the architectural style was

The Applicant described it as a domestic revival, Arts and Crafts style.. A kind of Sussex farm house in this particular part of Hampshire. They have tried to design something of a more contemporary design using this traditional style and tried to

	<p>incorporate both sets of elements, such as the offset front door, the type of windows etc. The architects are trying to create a style which incorporates the wishes of the client.</p> <p>15. The Panel noted that the application brief did not mention the style of the door. The Applicant answered that it was mentioned in the first application.</p>
<p>Summary</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel has a few concerns about the process the application has followed. The lack of a pre-application has failed to provide the Planning Authority with the opportunity to inform the applicant and client of their expectations and advice. 2. The landscape is key, so the relationship between the house and the garden and their location in the landscape must be fully considered. The proposal must be part of an overall landscape strategy that should also include the garden. It needs to be based upon robust evidence showing how the landscape and its sensitivities has informed the proposal and subsequently the design rationale for the building and grounds. 3. The Panel expressed serious concerns about the scheme. The existing building has horizontal emphasis and is soft in the landscape, designed to address both the wider landscape and the gardens. Contrary to this character, the scale and vertical qualities of the proposed building raises concerns. The Panel is not convinced that it really is only 0.5m higher than the existing 4. The existing building has soft horizontal emphasis but the proposed verticality of the proposed building does not sit comfortably in the landscape. The Panel considers a compromise may be possible but it would need to reflect the scale of the building and be designed to set-off the landscape. . 5. The Applicant needs to consider as part of the sustainability strategy that the energy used to demolish the existing house and rebuild it, will be greater than reusing the existing building. 6. The Panel considers that a holistic approach is required. The proposal should be sensitive and related to the landscape. A contemporary building could work there but it would need to respond to the qualities of the existing building and its horizontal landscape setting. 7. The Panel reiterated that following the pre-application process would have benefitted this application. Supporting the applicant in generating the evidence needed to understand the value of the current house and garden and investigating opportunities and constraints resulting from this evidence could have led to a scheme developed holistically and sensitively in this landscape. 8. The Panel suggested the proposal could be pared back, retaining the original house and garden with an addition that would fit softly in the landscape. Ultimately, the decision if it is acceptable or not stays with the Planning Committee.

	<p>9. The Panel felt that the original house and its garden are inherently linked, built together and with a clear and sensitive response to its landscape context.</p>
--	--

	<p>10. There is a route to try to make this proposal acceptable.</p>
--	---