

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	24.11.2020
Site:	Land at Greenway Lane Buriton Petersfield Hampshire
Proposal:	The erection of ten residential dwellings with the associated access, parking and landscaping, on land at Greenway Lane, Buriton.
Planning reference:	SDNP/20/04443/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Kay Brown (Chair) Alison Galbraith Clare Sutton Maria Hawton-Mead
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Ben Terry (Design Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) Tania Hunt (Support Services Officer) Lucy Howard (Case Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Kimberley Parry - NOVA Planning Neil Armitage - Re-Format (Architect) Joe Jackson - Lizard Landscapes (Landscape Architect)
Declarations of interest:	None

The South Downs National Park Design Review Panel is an independent assessment of development proposals by a panel of multidisciplinary design professionals and built-environment experts, who aim to inform and improve design quality in new development. It is not intended to replace advice from the planning authority or statutory consultees and advisory bodies, or be a substitute for local authority design and landscape advice and community engagement.

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.

Case Officer Update

- Green field site on the entrance into Buriton Village
- Allocated late in the Local Plan process
- Pre – app for 8-10 houses under SD62 of the South Downs Local Plan
- 4 affordable homes/ 2 homes for rent
- Smaller home concept, which is in line with what is wanted in the SDNP

Things to be aware of and to consider:

- Buriton Village Design Statement
- Eco-System Services
- Movement and Connection
- Landscape (Green Infrastructure and SUDs)
- Creation of a Village Gateway
- Sustainable Construction

Panel Questions:

1. Landscape; could you explain how your Landscape Strategy is going to work? How does the proposal work with the existing Natural Capital of the site to enhance the Eco-System Services? How is your Landscape Strategy going to work with your SUD's Strategy? How do the existing levels of the site work – What are the level changes/ where are the low points of the site? **(it would be useful to see a contour plan of the site).**

The character of Greenway Lane will be a housing development and there will be a highway access, but we would like to retain the native natural character of the lane. To retain the hedge and repair the patches to match with the rest of the character of Greenway Lane. The topography of the site is relatively level, with the bottom southern corner being the lowest point. The intention with surface water drainage is to achieve a SUDs feature in this corner to compliment the landscape scheme and bio-diversity net gain. It is a challenge on the site to achieved bio-diversity net gain, we do have an ecology consultant with the intention to achieve a positive outcome here.

1.1 What is the actual drop of the site?

Around 1.5 meters with the highest point being the top north-west corner and the lowest at the southern tip.

1.2 Is the intention to replace the conifers on the boundary with something native?

That is an option – they are plantation trees but that is the character of the Glebe Road estate, there are a mix of native hedges lines and big willow trees and then garden plantation. The transition between the site and the open countryside; there is local native character that can be instilled into the boundary.

2. The Local Plan Policy SD62 and the Village Design Statement set out certain objectives for the site. Can you explain how these objectives will be achieved

through the open space proposals and how movement and connectivity is enhanced across the site.

Our intention with open space is to use the transitional zone across the northern edge of the site and in terms of connectivity we would like to use the road and hedge frontage. The properties have a natural surveillance and overlooking of the footpath link that runs into the site and up to the northern transitional edge, providing a local connection and connectivity within the site.

2.1 One of the objectives is to connect further north up to the railway. Is this something that has been considered.

We are aware of the policy, but feel it will be difficult. The lane is narrow with a corridor of hedges either side of the lane. The only option being internally within the adjacent arable field, but this comes with logistical obstacles. The problems are not in the site but further north.

2.2 Is the arable field under the same ownership as the field?

Yes.

2.3 Have you looked at the letter from the Parish Council that states the reasons why they would like the footpath?

No, but this strategy is something we would like to address. It is just how it is taken northwards.

3. The site entrance; have you had advice from highways?

We do have a highway engineer on the project and they were clear that this point chosen is the safest place in terms of access on the lane. We think it contradicts the landscape concept as essentially that top corner is the transitional zone. However, in terms of highway design it needs to be here for safe visibility, which is just further north of the field entrance.

4. The proposed layout; there is an awkward back to front setting in the courtyard area. Could this be resolved differently with the mass set further back on the site? Can the boundaries be wider to reduce the negative impact of the site? Have you considered the orientation of the buildings for passive solar gain?

What we have tried to do is have the properties with a road frontage so that you are not faced with rear gardens on the approach to the village. If you leave the village, there is a mix with properties against the road and then slightly set back. We wanted the properties on Greenway Lane to reflect this and be lane fronting and to give the properties the perception of the open land beyond. There is a compromise with this as you have the rear of the properties to deal with but something we can look at.

1, 2 & 3 are orientated towards Greenway Lane and that geometry is reflected in the front 6 houses. The way 2 & 3 are angled onto the flats, and set up a nice relationship as the first floor windows can be controlled and maintain the privacy of the adjoining buildings.

4.1 The Local Plan policy SD48 is quite onerous in its targets, and from experience the orientation of the houses is really important to reach those targets. You

will need to consider passive solar gain and renewable technologies and how these will be applied. At the moment there are not many properties that face south. If you don't have more of the properties facing south, you will not be able to reach the targets that are required.

5. Scale; has there been much thought with regard to the scale of the properties? There are some bungalows further down the lane and if you were looking at a continuous elevation along the lane the relationship between the two is very important.

We are not looking to reference the properties along the lane as our architectural interest lies with the older properties in the centre of the village.

- 5.1 Our question was more in relation to the scale and the mass of the development and how this relates to these properties.

We will pick up on street views further into the process.

6. What is the strategy for energy efficiency and achieving the CO2 reduction of 20%?

We are leading with landscape and strategy of how to develop the site. The detailed energy proposals will follow.

- 6.1 With a development of 10 houses, you would need to identify at least 1 house as a passive house standard.

No thoughts on this yet.

7. Architectural style – Some detail given for using a contemporary vernacular style – Can you expand on this?

Traditional materials with clay tiles and some timber boarding, as seen on outlying agricultural buildings around the site. With some inset and projecting porches with a contemporary vernacular that would inform on the area. Happy to have input on this.

- 7.1 There are quite a few flat roofs and parapets in the indicative sketch, can you explain how that would complement the local vernacular?

We were picking up on the policy of 10% of green roofs and here I wanted to integrate it more with the architecture.

- 7.2 Could the green roofs be pitched?

There could be a gentle pitch, probably less contextual than the flat roof. Easier to integrate a pitch, or a flat roof element, rather than a traditional pitch or shallow slopes.

- 7.3 Would the flat roofs be used as amenity space, or are they purely a green roof?

Flat roofs will be green roofs not for walking on.

8. Gateway site – to what extent do you feel that the buildings should be prominent in forming the gateway, or subservient to the landscape?

Our whole design strategy is to create a new edge of village to Buriton. Units 1 & 2 are to start a gradual build up the structure and the fabric of the village.

- 8.1 Bin/ Cycle storage, how would they integrate into the design?

I have laid the design out to create convenient access to back gardens so that sheds and bins are accessed easily from the front. There will probably be a bin collection point on the site. I have integrated the bin stores into the architecture and they are very accessible.

9. Access; bin collection and emergency services to the site?

Once in the site the main hammerhead is in front of unit 7. Keen not to end up with adoptable highway layout. So we will integrate the turning circles where we can and keep it to a minimum.

10. Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; you are proposing some non-native species on the northern boundary. What is the strategy for this?

The document gives a brief overview of a planting palette across the site. Some of the existing planting is plantation garden planting that is associated with the paddock. The traditional zone should be as native and natural as possible. As you move into the housing area it becomes a different zone in terms of planting so we would like to keep it as native as possible on the northern edge.

11. Permeable surfaces; what are you intending on using for surfaces for the road and how is that integrated into the SUDs strategy?

It will need the civil engineer to look at the ground conditions and how this works on the site. As a design team we are all for these sustainable techniques but it does have to work in terms of below ground conditions and so this is something to work on in more detail.

Summary:

Main issues;

- **Concept Design**
- **Layout**
- **Option I**
- **Gateway**
- **Landscape**
- **Access**
- **Orientation of Houses**
- **Flat Roofs**
- **Community Heating**
- **Architecture**

Concept Design – it is important to build upon on the work you have already undertaken but equally, to work up your landscape strategy alongside your concept plan, especially if you want to incorporate landscape planting as a ‘component’ of integration (as an idea and as a design principle), and other multiple benefits, including water management.

(Post-meeting note: a further exploration into the possibility of providing footpath access to the north of the site as far as the railway bridge should be undertaken.)

Layout - Implementing your landscape strategy might require rearranging the buildings; and it could be with a wider landscape buffer along the northern boundary, you are unable to deliver ten dwellings. The Panel feel that the arrangement of buildings and spaces in Option I could be developed to address some of those concerns.

Gateway – The Panel discussed whether buildings should be prominent or discreetly positioned in the landscape. It was thought that perhaps pushing the development further into the site and having two clusters built-form might improve how buildings are positioned in the landscape. This would combine the larger houses to the east side of the site with the smaller/affordable housing to the south. Those clusters could be designed as buildings around a shared courtyard. The gateway feature itself might just be two or three houses clustered around the entrance, side on facing the road.

Landscape – The Panel strongly feel that conifers along the northern boundary should be replaced with native planting. The hedgerow on Greenway Lane needs to be thickened up and gaps infilled with native species and consider native hedgerow trees.

Access - Although the Highway Engineer has identified the proposed vehicular access as the safest option, we wondered if they could review those requirements, in line with Roads in The South Downs? There would be a significant loss of hedgerow otherwise. Would the existing field access be a better option? (if widened slightly). This would also provide more room for a landscape buffer along the northern boundary.

The orientation of the Houses – The Panel advise you to consider the orientation of buildings to maximise solar gain and PV potential.

Flat Roofs – The indicative sketch shows several two-storey flat roofs, which we feel are not acceptable in this location. However, single-storey flat roofs might be. They could be used with a green roof system and they can, sometimes, accommodate PV: although their visual impact would need to be carefully considered.

Community Heating System – The Panel recommend you consider using a community heating system.

Architecture – This has not been discussed at length because our focus has been on the site wide issues. Therefore, we recommend your project is reviewed again by The Design Review Panel in the future. The Panel also advise you to develop a specification for locally sourced building materials, especially the use of locally sourced timber.