

**SITE: Bulmer House**

## Design Review Panel Workshop NOTES

DATE: 12<sup>th</sup> March 2020

TIME: 4 – 5pm

VENUE: Ditchling Room, SDC, Midhurst

### Attending DRP:

Mark Penfold (Chair)  
Kay Brown  
Steven Bee  
Merrick Denton-Thompson  
Clare Sutton  
Kim Wilkie

### Attending SDNPA:

Mark Waller-Gutierrez  
Ben Terry  
Richard Fergusson  
Ruth Childs  
Tania Hunt

### Attending Applicants:

Mark Slater - Archadia Architects  
Owen Cheshire - Housing 21  
Katherine Snell - Hampshire  
County Council  
Robyn Butcher - Terra Firma

### Points discussed during the workshop

Points from the presentation:

- Site is difficult to see from viewpoints in the area surrounding Petersfield
- Site is underdeveloped
- The surrounding area has a cemetery that was built in 1857 and Victorian residential houses surrounding it.
- No public rights of way run through the property
- Low density. Most of the properties are three storey up to Churches College.
- For Dark Night Skies in Urban Transition Area and would not look to increase lighting.
- Screening – Good.

### Questions

#### **How many units are there in the existing building?**

36 – The property was built by Hampshire County Council in the late 1970's.

#### **Could the existing building be used rather than rebuilding?**

The rooms are currently 10 sqm – we could create individual spaces in the new building. The floor space was suitable for what was needed in the 1970's, but does not fit with what is desired today. The new build has also been designed to be dementia friendly.

#### **Could the existing access to the cemetery be used?**

Very difficult due to level change. There would also be a conflict between cemetery and refuse trucks and would need to lose large trees which would harm character of cemetery route.

#### **Do the Trees on boundary have a TPO?**

There is an avenue of pollarded limes that line the eastern boundary, which have a TPO. The other half do not have a TPO and are outside the site.

**What visually do the pollarded limes contribute to the site?**

*The trees help locate the site in Petersfield, which is very unique. It is the Landscape Character of the site, but the trees are not typical of Petersfield.*

**2 storeys is typical of this part of Petersfield, so has leaping to 3 storeys compromised the landscape setting? Are 3 storeys critical?**

*With a scheme like this we need to make a minimum number of units to make the scheme viable*

**You already own the site, so if you factor in the cost of the development and not the land cost, in terms of operation, what do you need?**

*60 units – this is 58. In the longer term operation we would require 60 unites to make it viable.*

**Perhaps due to the slowness of this application, it shows that this is the wrong site and that it might be a better option to sell the site for housing and put this development closer to town?**

*The HCC site sustainability tool has been used, which looks at distances to amenities; shops, doctors’ surgeries, churches etc.. This site met the minimum criteria required.*

**Panel Comments**

Perhaps you could look at the levels (It would be helpful to have a plan with the contour lines on them). This could be equivalent to a four storey element in SE corner allowing you to make the most of the different levels.

*A: Priority is to ensure building easy to navigate for residents*

Three storeys is wrong for this site. There is a fragile treescape which should not be relied on to help integrate such a large building visually.

*A: The trees on the boundary have been assessed and are A or B grade – they have longevity and will last a while.*

There is a lot of research about using outside space – it helps to extend lives by using the external environment, i.e: gardening, growing vegetables etc.

The quality of the external environment is critical. This proposal consists of a large building plonked in the middle of the site with only leftover space around it.

*A: applicants have looked at outdoor opportunities, both functionally and visually.*

In St Peters Court they have rooms in the roof on the third floor and it integrates into the town. This is designed really well to achieve a communal area.

Courtyard – corridors are one-sided, making the building too thick. If you make the courtyard four-sided it will give you internal routes and could be only single storey on one side?.

22 of the rooms face north-east – looking out onto a dark sloping area of the site – not good for health and wellbeing of the residents.

The building too large for the site where the existing building is relatively tranquil.

**Recommended Next Steps**

- Reconsider site location
- Development of this scale on this site needs to be rethought.
- Re-profile the road to create a better access.
- Create a landscape with a holistic approach to create good place making for residents with specific needs
- Needs to be a landscape-led approach.

Details for next session	
--------------------------------	--