

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	12.04.2021
Site:	King Edward VII Estate. Land at Superintendents Drive and Kings Green East Easebourne, West Sussex GU29 0FB
Proposal:	Proposed 2 phase residential development
Planning reference:	SDNP/20/03357/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold (Chair) – Architecture Adam Richards – Architecture John Hearn – Urban Design Maria Hawton-Mead – Sustainable Consultant Nadim Khattar – Architecture James Fox – Landscape Architecture
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Jody Slater (Consultant Design Officer) Mark Waller – Gutierrez (Specialist Lead) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) Tania Hunt (Support Services Officer) Rob Ainslie (Case Officer) Naomi Langford (Major Projects Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Nick Waring (BE, Client) Annelies Early (HED, Landscape) Matt Cartwright (Twelve, Architect) Rob Shannon (Twelve, Architect) Simon Flatt (Flatt's, Sustainability /Energy) Hanne Puttonen (Chart Plan, Planning) Barry Kitcherside (Chart Plan, Planning) Aloy Vora Mark Curry (Elysian) George Mackinnon (Pinebridge)
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, nor is it a substitute for local authority design, 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.

Summary

On behalf of the South Downs National Park, I would like to thank you for bringing your proposal to the Design Review Panel. We would like to thank you and your design team for their presentation and the supporting information you provided to us; it created numerous points for discussion and generated some interesting ideas during the session. Overall, we support the current approach and the changes you have made since the last workshop and feel that the approach is taking the right direction.

That said, the Panel do ask that you reinforce your design strategy with additional explanation and refine it with some additional elements.

The Panel have questioned the Landscape Strategy during the workshop; how is this demonstrating a landscape led approach to design?

The architecture now needs to be developed to its planning stage in a positive direction.

We have listed some key points from the workshop (below).

Landscape

- Landscape character: elegance, order and rigour is clearly demonstrated in the alignment of the buildings and the spaces. However, the presentation does not demonstrate how this is carried through in the consideration of hard and soft landscape of these external spaces. The areas are filled with different spaces of different identities. The landscape layer of the master plan needs to have a stronger identity. For example: if the intended character type is 'woodland clearing', it should be stated as such and the choice of trees and visuals that are shown should reinforce this type so that it is clearly identified.
- Bin store location could be reconsidered, as it is a south-facing location next to community allotments. This is taking up valuable community space that could be utilised along with the allotments, as a communal area.
- Routing; the design speed of the road needs to be as low as possible. Non-motorised movement networks need to be fully considered, as well as access to buses and for refuse.
- The layout of the bike store is a long way from the residential units and it would be useful to have them closer to better encourage their use.
- The design should also consider storage for electric bikes/ charging areas/ mobility scooters/ garden tools.
- The provision of car parking on the row of terraces should be revisited with the possibility of having double length, double bay car parking areas that are screened with hedges and make the road width smaller, encouraging lower speeds.
- The design should strive to limit the extent of tarmac and create a landscape where the visual impacts of cars and highway infrastructure is minimised.
- **SID-** Permeability to KGE from SID. Could this be reviewed and investigated again with Heritage England? It was thought by the Panel that a better physical connection for residents is an important objective to foster a better sense of joint community between KGE and SID.

Architecture

- Dormers – consider the impact of the dormers. There are a lot of dormers and this currently dominates the roofscape. Could this be reduced to limit this impact?
- Dormers – could cause an overheating issue. Could the applicant provide re-assurance that the development's sustainability performance will not be compromised by the large number of dormers?
- Outbuildings need to be in keeping with the surroundings and need to be well integrated. Consider providing shed/ bike/mobility scooters/ bin stores as part of the architecture over the whole site.
- There are several large expanses of blank walls on the ends of terraces. Corner buildings should normally address both public realm sides (with windows from active rooms) and provide some animation. Green walls could also be considered.
- The Community Centre design is capable of improvement. Perhaps the applicants could consider having a dual character with both leisure and work uses, including servicing the allotments.
- The Panel questioned if the chimneystacks proposed on the KGE site were functional. Applicants could consider using chimneys for ventilation, or as service voids, especially as the material proposed has high-embodied energy.

Materials Palette and Detailing

- Important to have uniformity between structures in terms of materials.
- The recess to the windows and the shutters continues below the window on the first floor of the buildings of SID. This does not seem necessary, or functional. Perhaps consider alternative solar shading.
- There were two approaches to the use of materials discussed; 1. Simple –the overall composition needs to be right, 2. Recess / gridded approach, there is more going on in the detail and therefore can be more forgiving in the composition. The simple approach was thought to be preferable, but needs work to get right.
- Material palette needs to help create a sense of place, which should help to make the development more legible.
- There is a need to be conscious of weathering, staining and moss on the brickwork, considering the scheme is surrounded by trees. Detailing important in terms of how ledges and edges function to limit this.
-

Sustainable construction

- Solar shading – possibility of more for KGE site, to avoid overheating.
- Composting facilities for residents of the flats should be considered.