

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	18/06/2019
Site:	Kings Green East, King Edward VII, Easebourne, GU29 0EX
Proposal:	Pre-application advice – design and landscaping information to accompany the previously submitted viability information for Kings Green East and Superintendents Drive
Planning reference:	SDNP/19/00990/PRE
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) Robert Ainslie (Planning Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Nick Baker (Nick Baker Architects) David Webster (Huskisson Brown) Asher Ross (JLL) George MacKinnon (Benson Elliot Capital Partners) Scott Curran (Probitas Developmenmts Ltd) Beatrix Lehnert (Probitas Developmenmts Ltd)
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

	<p>Main Issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need to have a landscape-led approach to layout solution here. 2. Would like to see more hierarchy in space, parking and routes 3. Concentration on defining spaces and routes so there is more clarity in public, semi public and private space. 4. Parking and the width of the road is a concern as this gives a lot of areas of hard surfacing. As well as upon arrival you will be faced with road and long lines of parked cars. Look to see if the parking can be broken up and “hidden”
	<p>Summary</p>
<p>Comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The applicant has gone a long way in demonstrating an understanding of the landscape character of the site and its context. It is positive that the previously proposed typically suburban layout is being challenged. It is good to see that the scheme is not relying on ‘borrowed landscape’ outside the site boundaries. This is an improvement on the previous scheme. 6. The scheme needs refinement and there is still a long way to go to make this a good layout. 7. The panel would like to see more hierarchy of routes as currently all routes appear to be of equal status which is confusing and pedestrian routes need to be better considered. 8. More work is needed on defining spaces, routes and views so there is more clarity around public, semi public and private spaces. 9. Car parking needs to be less visually dominant. The amount of prominent car parking space and the excessive width of the roads is a concern as this gives a lot of areas of hard surfacing. 10. Sense of arrival is not well considered as you will be faced with roads and parked cars. Look to see if the parking can be broken up and better integrated. 11. There is the opportunity to do a parkland scheme within a National Park. Need to look at the scale of the proposed buildings to see if they can be reduced. At the moment they have an office building look with their rectangular footprints and low roof pitches and the layout is rather regimented. A more appropriate domestic scale could be achieved through reducing building sizes or sliding elements of the buildings to create more private/semi-private spaces between them. 12. Although there is a large amount of communal open space, the function of much of it is unexplained, the links between the spaces are unclear and there is a risk that there will not be a good sense of ownership by residents. 13. The emphasis on linking routes to the chapel is difficult to understand given the distance from this site. 14. Sustainable opportunities for the site need to be explored e.g. use of solar panels if not too visually intrusive.
	<p>Notes</p>
<p>Discussion/ Questions with applicants</p>	<p>15. The panel asked how the issue of cars will be dealt with? The applicant answered that the development is C3 and the West Sussex standards require 1 space per 2 units. Will be going for 115 spaces as a hybrid approach as not a pure retirement scheme.</p> <p>16. The panel asked what approach has been taken for car parking? The applicant answered they have gone for street parking approach. Will be going for a landscape-led approach to help break up the rows of parked cars on the street. This will be achieved by using trees at key points. As well as changing the surface material for the</p>

parking areas and the parking will be done in small blocks so there is not rows and rows of parked cars. Looking at other schemes, they found they had all the parking on the south side but for this scheme will be looking at having the parking on the north side as they are not in the position to hide the parking and this is the shady side of the street.

17. The panel asked what was the pitch of the tiled roofs as this looked low?

The applicant answered 22.5° pitch, which is low but plain clay tile systems would work with this pitch.

18. The panel asked what would be the demographic that would live here?

The applicant answered that the demographic for the existing development in the Sanatorium is C3 (open market housing) with 50% of residents retired and 20% second home owners. An inclusive local survey was done to help find out what sort of housing was needed – 10 mile catchment used. The proposal is for age-restricted housing.

19. The panel asked what is the entrance sequence to the site?

The applicant answered that there is a central building where concierge located but they do not want this to compete with the central focus of the chapel. When you arrive on site cars will be seen but the sight of cars will be broken up with landscaping.

20. The panel asked if the road from the previous scheme would be included?

The applicant answered this was not included in the sale of the site.

21. The panel asked if they know of a wider site management plan as this scheme currently depends upon the existing trees.

The applicant answered there has not been a detailed conversation yet but there should be an estate manager. There will be a gradual reduction of non-native trees and rhododendron which already exist but will work closely with C & C as some of the landscaping is outside of the boundary.

22. The panel asked why there was no blue infrastructure as was in the previous scheme?

The applicant said that a system of localised swales and tanks was designed by their civil engineers and would be proposed.

23. The panel asked if the applicants had looked at tracking through the development

The applicant answered that a tracking had been carried out.

24. The panel asked if there was any opportunity to make any connections with other areas of the site, as the site is pretty central.

The applicant answered that they had thought of routes through the site but there are no pavements on the wider development, the roads were also used by people as the pedestrian routes. There will be 3 pedestrian entrances into the site. Trying to connect to wider site and to King's Green but retain enclosure of site. Had also thought of linking to the other adjacent site they own but from a historical point of view a connection across King's Drive was not desirable and there is a significant level change between the two sites.

25. The panel asked why the applicants had not been more literal with the southerly orientation of the site to maximise solar collection?

The applicant answered that they had tried orientating the site north/south but this resulted in parts of the site ending up with very dark streets and dark north-facing rooms. The triangular nature of the site also meant that they would be left with awkward shapes

at the end of the site. By twisting the orientation of building slightly to fit with the site, this is able to provide great sunlight for all the buildings and diagonal views across the site between buildings.

26. The panel asked if the use of solar panels had been thought of – as the panels could be hidden from view on the roofs and so they do not add bulk to the height of the buildings.

Applicant noted and will have to talk to the National Park Authority about solar panels.

27. The panel asked if the blocks could be shifted as currently the footprints of the buildings are very large.

Applicant noted