

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	24/09/2019
Site:	-South Coast Roofing Supplies Daveys Lane Lewes East Sussex BN7 2BQ -Storage Area Davey's Lane Lewes East Sussex
Proposal:	-Construction of 42 new residential units (C3) together with 495m ² of office floorspace (B1a) -Pre-application advice for a mixed use redevelopment comprised of the construction of a ground floor commercial unit (108m ²), 15 residential units (C3) on upper floors and associated parking and landscaping
Planning reference:	-SDNP/18/05183/PRE - SDNP/19/02642/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Kay Brown (Chair) Lap Chan John Hearn Alison Galbraith Oliver Lowenstein
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Mark Waller-Gutierrez (Design Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape officer) Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager) Natacha Bricks-Yonow (Support Services Officer) Tania Hunt (Support Services Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Martin Gray Andy Belcher Carmichael Forest Paul Burgess Paul Fender
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.

	Main Issues
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idea of master planning a good one • Not landscape –led approach to design • Overdevelopment of Hopyard scheme • Poor amenity space and lack of GI strategy • The stream needs to be part of SuDS and GI strategy for site • Brooks Rd site not necessarily the right precedent in design terms
	Summary
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The attempt to approach the redevelopment of these sites using a high level masterplan approach is commendable. The development quantum is driving the proposals and this is not a landscape led approach to design. The Panel has concerns on how it will be delivered. It would be useful to speak to the other neighbouring landowners as there is a need to create a comprehensive design approach especially for green infrastructure. The scheme needs a landscape architect, who would usefully have attended today and facilitated a more landscape led approach to the design. The ditch north of the site needs to be seen as a key landscape element and needs to be brought into the development. It would inform the design for the main site, the GI plan and the SuDS strategy. A SuDS strategy should inform both sites. 2. The Panel is concerned about the commercial and residential viability of the proposals. For the Hopyard site, an isolated commercial use might not be viable. It might be better as a purely housing development (despite the flood risk issue and employment policy). On the Davey’s Lane site, a commercial use could work but the form of the development should be driven by the landscape strategy. 3. Details <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Hopyard:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Panel considers this as overdevelopment. The relationship between the development proposal and the neighbouring housing seems overbearing, and it is probably too high. The building has a slightly awkward cut back on the north elevation. - The applicant should review the landscape, the N/S orientation of the building and consider an East/West alternative. The panel is concerned about the three central south facing flats, their ventilation and the possibility of overheating. - The Panel is concerned about the public and private space and how there could be conflict, particularly the linear route and the building casting excessive shade over the public space. The undercroft space is likely to be abused. - The Dark Night Skies constraint should be considered (Potential roof space windows). - There are concerns about the quality of the space along the long thin access route where there is not sufficient natural surveillance. Cycle storage would not be appropriate here because of the poor surveillance. It might be possible

	<p>to open up the boundary here with the cooperation of neighbouring land owners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The boundary between the site and the flats to the north should be reconsidered. - The panel appreciates the introduction of tree planting to the site but suggests the applicant seeks professional advice on how planting could be integrated as part of the green infrastructure proposal, together with SuDS and ecology strategies. At the moment, trees are planted too close together and too close to boundaries. These are good intentions but it needs a more informed design structure. <p><u>Davey's Yard:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lack of green infrastructure is a major concern as well as the quality of the open spaces that are proposed. The landscape led approach is absent. The ditch (in GI and SuDS terms) should be integrated into the scheme. - The scheme should be future proofed for later phases of green infrastructure. - There are concerns that the site might be overdeveloped. The option studies presented in the proposal had shown a greater distance between the blocks, which now shows a space between them that is too tight and there is now an issue of overshadowing the public space. - There is not enough space to incorporate that much parallel parking along the road which would also be very unattractive in such a quantity. - The Panel is concerned about the quality of spaces proposed and would like to see a master plan approach. A greater analysis of spaces created by larger and smaller buildings in a historic study of Lewes and the site is needed. This could inform a proposal that would show more reference to the historic urban grain and to the distinctiveness of the Lewes townscape. <p>4. The sites are different from the one on Brooks Road referenced by the applicant so that development should not necessarily be used as an appropriate precedent. The applicant needs to look at the two sites on their own merits.</p> <p>5. Architecturally, the design style should not necessarily reference an industrial approach. The neighbourhood is a mix of residential and commercial or industrial uses. The area is in transition and so this is an opportunity to renew the architectural style of the area and to make a positive contribution to Lewes with a landscape led approach taking in consideration the distinctiveness and the more defining characteristics of Lewes.</p> <p>6. This is a good start with the initial masterplan ideas, but the design evolution needs to be rooted in a landscape led approach which speaks of Lewes.</p>
--	---