

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	23/04/2019
Site:	Bulmer House, 4 Ramshill, Petersfield, Hampshire, GU31 4AP
Proposal:	Demolition of existing building and erection of a 56 unit extra care scheme with communal spaces and day centre with associated parking and landscaping.
Planning reference:	SDNP/19/01355/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Kay Brown (Chair) Adam Richards John Hearn Luke Engleback Paul Fender Steven Bee William Hardie
SDNPA officers in attendance:	David Cranmer (Case Officer) Benjamin Terry (Design Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Jean Hanna Mark Slater Mark Ramdehal
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.

	<p>Main Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responding to context • Identifying opportunities and constraints • The adaptability of the existing building • The amount, scale and height of proposed development • The appearance of the proposed building • Circulation of internal spaces • Circulation of external spaces • Relationship with an existing care facility, open spaces and nearby residential properties
<p>Comments</p>	<p>Summary</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On behalf of the South Downs National Park, I would like to thank you for bringing your proposal to the Design Review Panel. The Panel thanked the applicant's design team for their presentation which had generated a great deal of debate amongst members of the Panel. 2. The Panel acknowledge that seeing the requirements of extra care was beneficial, as it helped provide context for the Panel's discussion. 3. We appreciate that the proposal has come to DRP early in the design process. However, we felt that a lack of information and evidence to support your proposal had constrained the panel's ability to contribute to the development of a successful scheme. Our discussion was confined to your approach to the design of a complete redevelopment. Without further justification we cannot not support such an approach. The Panel feels that the current layout is over-developed, acknowledging that the principles Hampshire County Council had imposed may have contributed to that. 4. We appreciate the applicant's design team is working from a development brief, but we would urge them to challenge some of the 'identified' constraints, releasing opportunities to create a more effective and a far better quality of environment and layout for the proposed extra-care accommodation. 5. The Panel suggested that re-using the existing buildings, at least in part and possibly with some vertical and/or lateral extension, would improve the sustainability of the development, and free-up budget for investment in the quality of internal and external spaces, and materials. 6. Whilst we're unable to support the current approach to the design, we would like to engage with the landowner, design team and client. More time should be devoted to achieving a better design solution that reflects a detailed understanding of the site and its context; one that creates a far stronger link to the landscape. The Panel suggests a full context analysis, appraisal of existing buildings, contour mapping and shadow analysis be conducted and used to devise a set of bespoke design principles for the site. 7. If this approach were taken, the Panel would be keen to see the application return to them to work together on developing the design of the proposal.
	<p>Notes</p>

**Discussion/
Questions with
applicants**

- 8. The Panel noted that the landscaping featured winding walking routes, but the internal layout was entirely straight lines and asked why this distinction existed.** The Applicant explained that they have designed the structure to feature single-bank corridors that lead directly to seating areas in order to make the building easier to navigate and to allow people a place to rest when they reach the end of corridors.
- 9. The Panel asked if a shadow analysis had been done.** The Applicant said that they hadn't done a full analysis, but had done an initial sketch-up study.
- 10. The Panel noted that the proposed building will be substantially larger than the existing building, which is likely to result in shading some of the proposed garden spaces.** The Applicant explained that they had tried to keep the main block low in height.
- 11. The Panel asked if other orientations had been considered.** The Applicant said that they had considered other options, but had concerns about the effect this could have on privacy of local residents.
- 12. The Panel asked what the green space at the entrance was going to be?** The Applicant said that it would be open space, with scope for drawing the garden in.
- 13. The Panel asked about how they intended to make the entrance feel welcoming.** The Applicants noted that the entrance steps forward, and features a foyer and seating area.
- 14. The Panel asked about how they would use the space outside the entrance.** The Applicant said that their options for use were limited by the sites topography.
- 15. The Panel noted that therapeutic gardens can be difficult to get right, and asked whether the risk of shading the gardens had been considered.** The Applicant suggested that the residents will not always want to sit directly in the sun, so shaded areas could provide a benefit.
- 16. The Panel acknowledged this but explained that their concerns were about the impact on outlook and the healthy growth of plants, not just the seating for residents.**
- 17. The Panel noted the development principles put forward by Hampshire County Council (HCC) and asked which part of HCC had provided them.** The Applicant said they didn't know and that the principles were received as part of the larger tendering process.
- 18. The Panel asked how the development principles respond to the context of the site.** The Applicant noted the mature trees running along the eastern side of the site and suggested they were a starting point, with protecting the outlook from houses to the east being a key principle.
- 19. The Panel noted the strong lines and the very long, narrow building and said they found it hard to see quite how this was designed.** The Applicant said that they are trying to avoid having any north-facing apartments, while also trying to break up the façade without losing the existing rhythm.

- 20. The Panel asked them if the fenestration was used to break up the building.** The Applicant confirmed that it was.
- 21. The Panel asked if the Applicant had considered keeping the existing buildings.** The Applicant said they had considered it (briefly), but concluded that doing so wouldn't provide enough apartments to achieve a viable scheme.
- 22. The Panel asked how many people were housed in the existing buildings.** The Applicant said they didn't know.
- 23. The Panel noted that they were unfamiliar with HAPPI principles and asked the Applicant to inform them of them. They also asked if the 2 bed apartments were intended for 3 people, and whether there was a kitchen and the distance to the window from the kitchen.** The Applicant said that the 2 bed apartments would feature a double and a single bed. The Applicant said that it was mostly assumed to be either a single person or a couple but that they could well have a live-in carer. They then went on to explain that the bathrooms would feature Jack and Jill doors. There was a kitchen installed at the back of the apartment, 6-7 metres from the window, but equipped with task lighting.
- 24. The Panel asked if there were any qualities of the existing building that they are interested in; or qualities that are inside the site and around the wider area.** The Applicant said that the building opens up as you approach, noting the entrance is set back but quite obvious, splitting the building up quite well. They suggested that extra care buildings are often big by nature and its size is why they're trying to break it up.
- 25. The Panel asked how experimental the Applicant has been in designing the scheme and whether there was variation in the architectural design.** The Applicant said that they don't have a standard building that they deploy in any development and that they always try to start from the site in their design. They said that their architecture can vary, they are open to adaptation.
- 26. The Panel asked how the scheme responds to the special qualities of the National Park.** The Applicant noted that the scheme was still at the pre-app stage and that these matters will be considered going forward.
- 27. The Panel suggested that this scheme was a large building that was trying to appear smaller.** The Applicant acknowledged this and explained that this is part of the reasoning for the arrangement of windows along the building.
- 28. The Panel noted that the geometry of the site appears to ignore the urban grain and asked why they had designed it in this way.** The Applicant explained that this was primarily due to their efforts to avoid having any north-facing apartments, but said that they felt the proposal wasn't entirely in opposition of the urban grain.
- 29. The Panel asked if there had been a tree survey.** The Applicant explained that there was one done and that they are trying to retain as many trees as possible.
- 30. The Panel noted that they'd examined the trees on site and warned that the ones that seemed to have the most potential were the ones that were being lost.**

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <p>31. The Panel asked what the views out of the site were and what qualities the applicants liked about the site; and whether they had considered how the views could amplify those qualities. The Applicant said that they are aware of the views out, but they are trying to find a balance of qualities.</p> <p>32. The Panel asked about a shadow survey for the pitched roof: would the pitched roof result in more shadowing? Could a flat roof be an alternative, which could also have an additional use as an outside space for residents or a green roof? The Applicant said that quite a lot of the pitched roof is helping to make it look small, closer to a 2 ½ story structure, by accommodating some of the living space in the pitched elements of the roof.</p> <p>33. The Panel noted that sustainability would be an important consideration for their design.</p> <p>34. The panel asked if any consideration had been given to altering the access arrangements to separate that for the adjacent care home and release space at the front of the building for residents</p> |
|--|---|