



**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

**SECTION 78 PLANNING APPEAL**

Local Planning Authority Reference:

SDNP/20/04118/FUL

(Appeal case ref: SDNP/21/00069/REF)

Appeal Reference:

APP/Y9507/W/21/3289423

**SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE**

**LUCIE TUSHINGHAM**

**BA Hons Dip Planning MSc Historic Cons MRTPI IHBC RHS Level 2**

**CONSERVATION OFFICER**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. MAIN ISSUES- REASONS FOR REFUSAL</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. OTHER MATTERS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>6</b>

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

- I.1 My name is Lucie Tushingam. I hold a Bachelor of Arts degree (with Honours) in Geography from Portsmouth University, a Diploma in Planning and a Masters in Conservation; both from Oxford Brookes University. I have a Royal Horticulture Society (RHS) Level 2. I have worked as a Planner and Conservation Officer for 24 years, both in the public and private sectors and I am a full member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation and a Chartered Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.
- I.2 My Proof of Evidence, as the conservation witness for the Authority, is in addition to those of Ms Childs and Mr Ferguson. It outlines the relevant Development Plan policies and material planning considerations for the purposes of assessing the key considerations in the planning balance, in support of the Authority's reasons for the second reason for refusal relating to:
- (2) The appeal proposals, would amount to an overdevelopment of the site and, therefore, have an unacceptable impact on the landscape character of the area and Selborne Conservation Area.

## **2. MAIN ISSUES - REASONS FOR REFUSAL**

- (2) The appeal proposals, would amount to an overdevelopment of the site and, therefore, have an unacceptable impact on the landscape character of the area and Selborne Conservation Area.
- 2.1 My evidence and the evidence of other SDNPA witnesses, which I defer to, considers that the proposals would result in harm to the heritage and landscape character of Selborne.
- 2.2 The proposals, effectively, do not take account of the surrounding context and my evidence raises the following issues in relation to reason for refusal (2):
- 1) The proposed scale of new buildings and built form is considered to result in a cramped, crowded form of development on the site. The layout and scale of the proposed new uses results in an intensification of the built form and a

reduction in the existing more spacious nature of the site. In particular, the former historic pub garden would be completely lost in order to provide a parking area.

- 2) The views into the site from Huckers Lane would change from the open spacious 'green' character and appearance that the site currently has when viewed from the Lane and access track. This more intense form of development fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- 3) The scale, layout and design of the scheme represents an uncharacteristic form of development; extensions and development are not sufficiently subordinate or ancillary to the existing buildings and have overly domestic features such as rooflights on the west elevation of the barn and hips, porches, windows and doors design on the apartment building, as well as urban features; kerbs on the Huckers Lane.
- 4) The building on Huckers Lane is not of a sufficiently ancillary in scale, or design features, regarding its relationship with The Queens Hotel extensions.
- 5) The extension to the barn is not sufficiently subordinate to the existing barns scale, which has a historic relationship with The Queens Hotel as an ancillary structure.
- 6) The relationship between The Queens Hotel and its garden space would be eroded and the intensification of the new development, the historic open space and community status of this site would be lost.
- 7) As a result of the above, the proposals would not be characteristic to the surroundings and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

### **3. OTHER MATTERS**

3.1 No further substantive issues are raised in the main Proof of Evidence and other matters are addressed in the agreed Statements of Common Ground.

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

4.1 In conclusion, the site has the capacity to receive some new development, however in light of the considerations raised in my main Proof of Evidence and those of Ms Childs and Mr Ferguson, the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss the Appeal for the reasons outlined.