

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	18/06/2019
Site:	Tews Engineering site, Petersfield
Proposal:	Erection of 30 apartments and approximately 272 square metres of employment floor space
Planning reference:	SDNP/18/05862/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) Richard Ferguson (Planning Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Alistair Harris (Metis Homes) Adam O'Brian (Metis Homes) Denis Priestley (Architect) Tom Jenner (Terra Firma)
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. Is the density appropriate? 2. Public realm is very important as there is not much scope in this scheme for private amenity space; Design should focus on creating a successful street and courtyard space. 3. Active frontages – how is this dealt with, together with undercroft parking, and ensure these do not become dead spaces? 4. The architectural style of the proposal and the transition from traditional to contemporary. Ensure this speaks of Petersfield, as Petersfield has a strong character. 5. This is a gateway site into the National Park as it is next to the station.
	<p>Summary</p>
<p>Comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. It was agreed that the session would run more like a workshop as the site had already come to DRP – agreed by all in attendance. 7. The panel acknowledged that it was good to see the car parking had been considered and much of it was hidden. What needs to be explored now is how the urban landscape works, the response to the topography of the site and how the transition from modern to traditionally-inspired architectural styles work. 8. There is an opportunity here to frame the views of the Downs with the new arrangement of built form. This needs to be evidenced using key vantage points, including from railway bridge. 9. The traditional/contemporary transition could work really well. You will need to think about the form and scale characteristic of Petersfield 10. You will need to look at appropriate styles for the corner building facing Lavant Street and the station. And to try and get the right balance of enhancing what is already there (in Petersfield) but by creating something of its time. 11. The contemporary style could be carried through but should provide some animation on the elevation facing the station. This could be achieved by adding in some balconies. 12. Think about ways of animating the ground floor elevations where there are undercoat car spaces e.g. through use of stairs.
	<p>Notes</p>
<p>Discussion/ Questions with applicants</p>	<p>13. The panel asked how the public/private realm would be working? The applicant answered that the western edge of the site was clearly an access route with courts that help provide some amenity. These more private areas could be for playing, sitting or access space. The key area for the scheme is in the centre. Some units will have direct access through front doors. The distance that emergency services need to travel has been minimised. Need to remember that the site is a brownfield site therefore a minimum number of units are needed along with parking</p>

for them. They do not want to create any dead end spaces but want to ensure they are creating natural routes.

14. The panel asked if the space and elevations could be better activated? as this risks ending up as dead space

The applicant takes note of this point

15. The panel asked if parking spaces 7 and 27 were tight or if these could be driven through with ease? Or would it be better to have a looser layout?

The applicant answered that for these parking spaces some skill would be required as they are tight. On the site there will be one or two areas where there will be some difficulty.

16. The panel asked if the site surface materials would be similar or different in materiality to the proposed Lavant Street pedestrian priority zone works as they are faced with a golden opportunity to coordinate them.

The applicant answered that it is a long term aspiration (within the neighbourhood plan) to have a better pedestrian priority zone to the station (along Lavant Street). If in Lavant Street pedestrian and car routes or shared surfaces use the same materials this approach could be continued on this site?

17. The panel asked for the thoughts on how the area around the water course could be improved?

The applicant answered the proposals here will be ecologically driven to help with enhancement of biodiversity. Once the ecological reports are done they will know how to drive the landscape design in this area.

18. The panel suggested that the current layout was not making the most of the water course with cycle store facing it. There is potential for opening up access to the water space and the aim should be to allow people to get closer to the water.

The applicant noted this.

19. The panel asked if the space could be rethought to make much better use of the water course – this could make a nice community space.

The applicant answered that the water course is the other side of the bank and this is not within their ownership. The housing associations owns the land the other side of the bank.

20. The panel asked if they had looked at trying to make taller and denser buildings which would provide a similar number of units while releasing more land for external space?

The applicant answered there is possibility for some of the buildings to be made taller. But they still need to recognise that when people come out of the station that they still need to be able to see the Downs as this is a gateway into the Park.

21. The panel suggested that taller buildings might still be able to frame glimpsed views from the station area.