

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

Date of meeting:	18/06/2019
Site:	Soldiers Field House, Findon
Proposal:	Demolition of existing dwellings and construction of 12 affordable dwellings with associated works including public open space, access, parking and landscaping
Planning reference:	SDNP/19/01876/FUL
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold (Chair) Steven Johnson David Edwards Paul Phasey David Hares Andrew Smith
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Mark Waller-Gutierrez (Design Officer) Louise Hughes (Development Management Support Technician) Sarah Nelson (Planning Officer) Stella New (Planning Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Neil Armitage Anna Gillings Philip Rupert Stephens
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

	<b>Main Issues</b>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Look at other development typologies other than a suburban style cul-de-sac – such as a farmstead as this is typology relates better to the landscape character on the edge of Findon.</li> <li>2. Think about ways to solve parking so rows of cars are not seen. This could be solved by the use of car barns or being hidden by buildings.</li> <li>3. Find a way not to suburbanise the site as the site is on the settlement edge. Will need to transition to the countryside and help enhance the landscape.</li> </ol>
	<b>Summary</b>
<b>Comments</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. It was agreed that the session would run more like a workshop/review as the site had already come to DRP – agreed by all in attendance.</li> <li>5. The panel suggested that the applicant looks at a different typology for the built form and layout, inspired by agricultural buildings found on the settlement edge, such as equestrian barn style buildings for housing and to accommodate car parking. This approach will give it a more appropriate transition to the countryside, as agricultural forms are more locally characteristic of settlement edge in this area.</li> <li>6. The need for smaller dwellings is important for the National Park – have a look to see if the need for 4 bedroom dwellings is a major requirement. The loss of the 4 bedroom dwellings could help with the layout.</li> </ol>
	Notes
<b>Discussion/ Questions with applicants</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. <b>The panel asked what was the reasoning for going towards a cul-de-sac typology rather than one that relates better to the landscape character of the edge of countryside/settlement.</b> The applicant answered that the big driver for the scheme was to have a landscape buffer as this was the policy. They are trying to provide a softer edge to the village with planting. Had looked at more historical rural layouts but felt this did not work for the scheme and number of dwellings.</li> <li>8. <b>The panel asked what the policy driver was?</b> The applicant answered that the policy sought to take out the beech hedge and to add in some more natural planting. The depth of planting is not specified but there is scope to go out into the paddock land as this is within the ownership.</li> <li>9. <b>The panel asked if a farmstead or equestrian stable typology had been looked at – creating longer lower buildings with the courtyard for cars to turn in and with the possibility of green fingers of green infrastructure penetrating the development..</b> The applicant answered that it would not be possible to break this up into sub courtyards with the numbers and there was the issue of overlooking.</li> <li>10. <b>The panel asked what size are the houses? Attached dwellings could work as part of a more clustered farmstead typology.</b> The applicant answered they are worried about bin and cycle access to the rear of properties if the houses become terraced. So the semi-detached housing works better as you can get access to the rear as well as all rooms within the house get a lot of natural lighting.</li> </ol>

**11. The panel suggested that a buffer was still possible with a different internal layout/character to that currently proposed.**

The applicant responded that the site was too tight to allow for a road around the edge allowing homes to front onto the buffer and the countryside.

**12. The panel asked why the drainage attenuation tank was to go where currently proposed?**

The applicant answered that they had spoken to their drainage officer and they had been informed it would work going there.

**13. The panel asked if the applicants were aware that Findon is the horse racing area of the South and that this should therefore be identified as part of the site's landscape character?**

The applicant answered yes they are aware of this and that the owners of Soldiers Field are trainers. However the site is not a gallop but they do understand that reference to the equestrian background.

**14. The panel asked if it would be possible to change the building and layout typology and number of dwellings?**

The applicant answered that this would be possible but as long as it still led to a viable development.

**15. The panel asked what was the level drop of the site and whether retaining structures would be needed?**

The applicant answered there is about a 1.5m drop and no, no retaining structures proposed.

**16. The panel suggested that there is enough space for homes using the barn typology with access to the rears of those properties and that buildings visible in the landscape are part of the National Park character on the settlement edge and suburbia needs to be avoided.**

The applicant suggested that there would be space for two rows of terraced buildings with an internal finger of green infrastructure.

**17. The panel responded that terraces were not essential per se but perhaps buildings that are clustered together and that an urban style cul-de-sac arrangement was not appropriate here.**

**18. The panel asked what sustainability measures had be taken into consideration?**

The applicant answered this had been thought of and the process is for a fabric first approach to building efficiency and then to use roof integrated PVs. No PVs will be visible from the wider views.

**19. The panel asked how the proposed chalk grass land would be looked after as this typically needs to be grazed.**

The applicant answered that the paddock land is still within the ownership and the grass chalk land is currently grazed by sheep.

**20. The panel asked if there would be any issue losing the 4 bedroom dwellings?**

The applicant answered that this was not a major concern and would in fact give them more room to play with the formation of the site.

21. The applicant's architect asked the Design Officer if the approach the panel was suggesting (low clustered agricultural typology buildings with green infrastructure links to countryside) was one that he supported.  
He answered that yes this was the same (landscape-led) approach that the Authority favoured.