

Queens – Design, Landscape and Heritage Meeting (15/04/21)

Attendees

- Graeme Felstead –GF – (SDNPA)
- Richard Ferguson – RF – (EHDC)
- Ruth Childs –RC – (Landscape Officer - SDNPA)
- Mark Waller-Gutierrez –MWG – (Design Officer –SDNPA)
- David Boyson – DB – (Historic Environment Officer –SDNPA)
- Guy Macklin – GM – (Derek Warwick Developments)
- Nick Birch – NB – (Birch Architects)
- Jim Beavan – JB – (Savills)

(NB - meeting notes to be read alongside Savills summary response email dated 14/04)

*Applicant action

Discussion

GM summarised the background to the scheme and explained the rationale for the exact mix of uses and the ongoing partnership with Gilbert Whites.

Accommodation Block

- RC - Characteristically the National Park's lane are enclosed by buildings – asked whether the accommodation block could be brought up to front Huckers Lane.
- DB – Agreed that from a HE perspective the building should front Huckers Lane if at all possible.
- RC – reference should be taken from 'Roads in the South Downs' (June 2015)
- MWG – happy for the building to front Huckers Lane from a Design standpoint. Didn't agree that it was necessarily too long as currently shown. The key consideration will be maintaining the established hierarchy of streets i.e. Huckers Lane being subsidiary to High Street.
- RC – suggested that we should study the local character- what is the grain of buildings, what size of buildings typify the Park's rural roads.
- DB – an assessment of local character will be key. You do get longer outbuildings – are there any helpful precedents in the village?
- DB – purely from a design standpoint the brick course is too high. Would prefer to see a simpler form to reflect its appearance as an outbuilding i.e. full timber or fully brick. The brick plinth should be kept to a minimum.
- RC – applicant should pursue a landscape-led approach – what is the vision for the site and how is this being achieved.

*Undertake an assessment of local character to determine an appropriate size/siting of the accommodation block

*Confirm with ecologist that the hedge can be removed

Huckers Lane

- RC – what is the necessity for the widening questioned whether it was required to facilitate a rear access.
 - o JB – confirmed that the rear access was existing

- MWG – the hierarchy of streets should be maintained wherever possible.

*Savills to confirm with SMA that the highways improvements can be reduced

Car Parking (Rear)

- RC – introduction of the landscape/tree buffer to eastern boundary and retention of the mature trees within the site is a positive. The loss of the internal green space is the tradeoff which will need to be balanced against the scheme as a whole.
- RC – will need to look carefully at landscape design to determine how you create a positive central space

*Applicant to revisit soft landscaping

Car Parking (Front)

- MWG – there is an opportunity to do something a bit more adventurous in the front car park
- DB – some form of enclosure would be a positive. A dwarf wall would appear suitable – something akin to what the Gilbert Whites have across the road
- MWG – Some boundary planting/review of materiality would be a desirable objective
- RC – a review of this area could deliver multiple benefits i.e. air quality, wildlife connectivity, SuDS

*Applicant to extend the local character assessment to include boundary treatments/means of enclosure to determine an appropriate treatment for the front car park

Landscaping

- RC – the visioning for the site needs to be clearer – what purpose does each element of the landscaping serve - why is it here? Does it:
 - o Improve the setting of the building?
 - o Improve drainage?
 - o Add to green infrastructure/biodiversity net gain?
- MWG – bike store next to accommodation block should be revisited
- RC – can stores be better integrated into the scheme? i.e. at the eastern end of the accommodation block
- RC – can the site be made more efficient – maximize the efficiency of all site interventions wherever possible i.e. multiple benefits
- DB – hedges up against the building are not acceptable in HE terms.

Barn Conversion

- JB outlined that we are retaining the barn on HE advice
- MWG – questioned whether the resi garden will have adequate light
 - o NB confirmed that the garden would receive adequate light – directed MWG to Design and Access Statement sub diagram (Page 18)

Misc

- DB – rendering/painting of the Queens could be a historic attempt to damp proof the building OR an attempt to provide a uniform appearance to what is likely a combination of materials
- JB – applicant will commissions SuDS and Sustainability reports to inform revised scheme.

*Applicant to assess selected patches of the building for analysis

*Applicant to commission SuDS and Sustainability Reports