

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

Date of meeting:	20/12/2018
Site:	Land at Elm Rise (Hazeldene), Elm Rise, Findon, West Sussex, BN14 0UP
Proposal:	Conceptual layouts for the erection of between 20- 26 dwellings
Planning reference:	
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold CHAIR Merrick Denton-Thompson Steven Johnson David Hares
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Benjamin Terry (Design Officer) Richard Ferguson (Case Officer) Mark Waller Gutierrez (Design Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) Natacha Bricks-Yonow (Support Services Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	Ian Phillips
Item presented by:	Steve Culpitt Natalie Fellows Tim Dyer Quentin Andrews
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
Discussion/ Questions with applicants	<p><b>1. In terms of views from the West, has the applicant considered breaking up the roofline more as the development risks presenting as a large prominent block?</b> The Applicant answered that there were bungalows, a lower roof form. Maybe could look at barn hips to reduce impact. <b>The panel asked if there was any in the area.</b> The Applicant answered that there is: the Sussex Barn hips. It is a way to create space between roofs.</p> <p><b>2. The Panel asked about the people who are likely to live here, if they would be commuters to Worthing/Horsham and how affordable housing was considered.</b> The Applicant answered that the affordable housing has not been allocated yet. It will probably be in the front. The Applicant explained that this kind of development is generally bought by people coming from a 25 miles radius. There are really good schools around. The question of the commuters is interesting, particularly because of the proximity to the A24. There is a need of a railway station. The Applicant expects a good mixture of people to live here. The site offers mixed housing, more family size, there is only one 4 bedroom house.</p> <p><b>3. The Panel asked if there was any sort of energy scheme like renewable energy considered for the site.</b> The Applicant answered that the site will be compliant to policy and the homes will be heated by gas boilers. <b>The Panel asked if solar panels were considered.</b> The Applicant answered that they do not like them, particularly because of the glare. Also because a lot of consumers do not understand new energy technologies. They will be careful of what is put forward as much for the customers than for the park. They intend to particularly work on limiting heat losses. <b>The Panel noted that it seems there is a lot of potential for generating energy on site.</b></p>
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>The Panel thanked the applicant for their presentation and noted the thorough assessment of the site as well as the response to the previous panel comments which made the current scheme has responded to. It has moved a long way from there but there are still some issues the Panel would like to see addressed:</b></li> <li>- <b>Open spaces need to be designed in their own right.</b> The Panel asked if the applicant has control over the field to the north. The Panel noted that there might be an opportunity there to do some woodland planting and that it could become an area for children to play. The Panel answered yes and that it would add value to the site. The Panel commented that the open space on the site is 'leftover' and has not been actively designed in terms of open space or public realm. The notion of a courtyard typology is not realised in practice, as they are really just areas for car parking they could be enclosed, be made into true courtyards. These spaces need to be designed as places and not just as highway spaces or leftover spaces.</li> <li>- <b>The Panel challenged the applicant over their current uncharacteristic response to the contours in the scheme and to split the houses. There is an opportunity to provide split-level houses and so to play with the roof forms etc... (The panel mentioned the example of a beautiful scheme by Peter Carrington). The applicant could also play with the gardens,</b></li> </ul>

	<p>enclosing spaces and spaces along the road, maybe using sunken lanes and other elements. They could link forms in a much more rural way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Panel commented about the number of houses and suggested these may need to change as the layout evolves.</li> <li>- The Panel asked about water management and why the swale runs down the contours rather than along them as it should to function The Panel noted that there is an opportunity to be much more localised, recommending to the applicant that each house deals with its own water management.</li> <li>- The Panel noted that the open space is around the scheme, it should be more planned and less incidental to the scheme.. A variety of spaces should be introduced.</li> <li>- The Panel said that it would be interesting to put the village figure ground plan next to the scheme figure ground, to see how it works with the proposed density. The Panel requested the applicant better address the relationship between existing and new development using characteristic solutions but that there may also be a question over whether it is possible to accommodate all the number of dwellings proposed successfully in design terms</li> <li>- The Panel noted topography was a big issue. The applicant is talking about terracing a series of buildings down a hillside. Terracing needs a transitional area, it highly engineered and so affects character too. There is a road running up one side, the other location is quite close to a boundary. The applicant is losing space from that transition zone and should think about the contours by orientating the buildings the opposite way. Doing this, it would be less of a problem. It also could be that car barns could step up and close off some areas of courtyards. The Applicant needs to look at how buildings respond to the contours and then how the stepping happens. There might be more opportunity to use split level houses across the slope to reduce the impact of the stepping and use car barns to retain land. .</li> <li>- The Panel said that that no kerbs on the roads and a simple grass edge, would help to produce a more appropriate rural character to the scheme. The Panel said that there are much 'softer' ways of working with the slope (being landscape-led) rather than devising significant engineered solutions.</li> <li>- Use a Landscape Strategy to plan both open and enclosed spaces, so the whole site has purpose.</li> <li>- The Panel welcomes the response of the Applicant regarding the north east corner and the fact that it could be planted. It is a fantastic response, it could be a place where children go and link with the existing plan. In the long term, it will be a prominent woodland. If the development goes to the edge, it grades that edge out and finishes it. These kind of solutions are rarely volunteered. The Applicant explained that it was an ideal solution so why not.</li> <li>- The panel mentioned the parking within the 'yard' spaces and the example of the way French towns have parking areas which also work as spaces for people.</li> <li>- They asked if the applicant was certain about the car parking numbers and to revisit this to ensure sufficient spaces can be incorporated into the scheme.</li> </ul>
--	--