

Agenda Item 9

Development Management Committee



Design Review Panel: Rousdon Estate, Rousdon

Projects

Land at Home Farm North
Old Home Farm and the Kennels
Home Farm North and South and the Bothy
Byways (Land adjoining Rooks Acre)
8-14 The Gardens
The Walled Garden

Panel Members

Cllr Andrew Dinnis (chaired the meeting)
Cllr Paul Diviani
Cllr Ian Thomas, Ward Member
Cllr Ian Chubb, Acting Ward Member
Cllr Geoff Chamberlain
Sandra Stride, Rousdon Residents and Owners Association
Peter Lacey, External Design Reviewer
Jonathan Burns, External Design Reviewer
Tim Woolgar, Lay Member
Stephen Belli, Development Manager
Andy Carmichael, Assistant Development Manager
Kate Baxter-Hunter, Conservation Officer
Rod Harrington, Senior Planning Officer
Nigel Barrett, Senior Planning Officer
Samantha Thomas, Senior Planning Officer
Hal Johnson, Planning Officer
Paul Golding, Planning Officer
Ben Chesters, Technical Officer

Circulation

All of the above.
EDDC (Councillors & Development Control Officers)
Combyne Rousdon Parish Council

Meeting Date

Friday 6th November, 2009

Venue

Blue Ball Inn, Sidford

Summary

Overarching Themes

All of the schemes considered by the panel occupied sites located on the Rousdon Estate which was deliberately selected in view of its considerable sensitivity in both historic building and landscape setting terms, as reflected in the number of designations and constraints to which the area is subject. As such, the principal issue for consideration related to the extent to which the various schemes appropriately and sensitively paid regard to this highly important and locally unique environment. However the quality and character of the area, taken together with the nature, type and amount of development that has taken place on the estate during the past decade, also demanded that this assessment look at various forms of development. The panel therefore viewed schemes involving the conversion of existing buildings of historic and architectural importance in addition to new build projects. Furthermore the importance of boundary treatments and their contribution to the character of the estate and its historic development justified the viewing of more recent examples.

Conditions

The success of a scheme can often be partially attributed to the detail of the scheme. Such details can either be obtained as part of the initial planning application process or secured by condition to be submitted at a later date. There was acceptance that there are limits to what can be controlled through the planning process but the panel did note on some developments that the positioning of meter boxes, alarm boxes, flues/vents etc. could individually and as a whole detract from the overall aesthetic of the development. Greater control of detailed design would also extend to the detailing of eaves and ridge lines and window detail.

Monitoring

Hand in hand with imposing stricter control through conditions comes the requirement for effective monitoring of schemes throughout the development process. The panel felt that on at least one of the schemes that more effective monitoring of conditions (and the development as a whole) would have allowed deviation from the approved plans to have been picked up at an early stage and rectified. There was acknowledgement of the fact that there were limited resources to enable effective monitoring of all schemes and that there is inevitably a certain reliance on members of the public and or parish/town councils to alert the planning authority of such issues.

Boundary Treatments/Landscaping

In most if not all of the schemes considered the panel felt that the developments could have been improved through more appropriate landscaping of the sites and in particular boundary treatment. Appropriate landscaping helps to assimilate a development in its setting whereas inappropriate landscaping can result in a development appearing harsh and out of character with the surrounding area. In the sites considered by the panel it was felt that landscaping could be improved in almost all cases. It was also noted that landscaping was often left unfinished, in some instances, although the dwellings themselves were complete and occupied.

In one case in particular, the overall design of the buildings was considered to have, on the whole, been successful but the harshness of the boundary treatment drew the eye away from the building and significantly detracted from the overall impact of the development. It was considered by the panel that closer attention to and monitoring of landscaping conditions would benefit the overall appearance of schemes.

Recommendation

That the Development Management Committee notes the report.

Introduction

The purpose of this Design Review Panel was to consider a number of comparatively recent residential developments within the Rousdon Estate in addition to schemes involving the provision of new boundary treatment. These comprised a new build scheme for 20 dwellings on the site of a former building that served Allhallows' School at a time when it was housed on the estate, a separate (although related) project involving the erection of three dwellings with one of the units located within a historic kennels development bound by a historic stone wall, the conversion of the former home farm buildings to form 15 residential units, the construction of a dwelling on an infill plot that sought to refer to historic design elements of the estate and two examples of modern boundary treatment that attempted to reflect the quality and character of historic predecessors.

The importance and sensitivity of the Rousdon Estate in both historic building/landscape and wider landscape quality terms is reflected in the number of designations/constraints that apply to it. In addition to being located within the designated East Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the estate is itself both a Registered Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest and designated as a conservation area. Within it, a number of buildings are specifically listed as being of special architectural or historic interest, either Grade II* or II, whilst the majority of other buildings are 'curtilage listed' on account of their pre-1948 origin and location within the historic estate area. The area is also the subject of Coastal Preservation Area and Heritage Coast designations and the estate is bordered to the south by the Dorset and East Devon World Heritage Site. An 'article 4 direction' removing certain permitted development rights also applies to the estate and the surrounding area.

The principal Victorian Mansion building and the majority of the other buildings on the site were used after 1938 to house Allhallows School which had relocated to Rousdon having outgrown its previous site in Honiton. However, in order to facilitate further expansion, it was necessary to undertake new development amidst the older estate buildings.

Upon the closure of the school for financial reasons in 1999, the site was sold at auction and a Planning and Design Brief prepared by the Council in the light of the subdivision of ownership of the estate and the loss of a single user of the buildings.

Members of the panel were given a briefing paper on each of the developments and these are attached as an appendix to this report. They include a brief historical introduction to the estate. The panel visited each site before having a detailed discussion about each project. The panel's consideration of each scheme is summarised below.

Land at Home Farm North

Introduction

This development replaced a sports hall, tennis courts and ménage that previously existed on the site. These had been constructed to serve the school but had a most unfortunate visual relationship with the surrounding older development and represented an unsympathetic intrusion upon the character of their setting as well as that of the estate as a whole.

The development involved the erection of 20 dwellings in place of this infrastructure and was viewed as an enabling development to secure an overall environmental improvement and to ensure that proper regard was paid to the setting of the adjacent historic buildings. Similar circumstances applied to other sites elsewhere around the estate. Outline planning permission was granted in 2000 for redevelopment of these sites with the details of this particular scheme subsequently approved in 2001.



The Development

The Planning and Design Brief required that the development achieve a courtyard style layout and a quality design to reflect the agricultural character of the estate. It also stipulated that appropriate materials be used, particularly clay roof tiles instead of concrete tiles, and that the layout pay regard to the mature tree belts to either side of the site which formed part of the historic landscaping of the estate.

To this end, the scheme involved the construction of two groups of, variously, terraced and semi-detached dwellings around two central courtyard areas located to the east of an existing central estate road running north/south through the site with the remainder fronting this road in the form of pairs of semi-detached units with one detached dwelling. Externally, the units displayed a uniformity of treatment with rendered and painted walls, plain clay tile roofs and timber fenestration, doors, verges and eaves with exposed rafter feet, all painted in the distinctive dark green colour that is historically characteristic of the Rousdon Estate.

The agricultural character was reflected in the inclusion of elements such as tall openings to off-road parking areas, some of which had been used to provide vehicular access to single garages built at a later stage of the development, a full height glazing treatment to the rounded 'corner' of one of the units, the intimacy of the layout with buildings positioned both close to the estate road and to each other, a mix of hipped and gabled roof forms, lean-to open-sided porch canopies with simple timber support posts in addition to the two courtyard arrangements. The variation in dwelling shape also contributed to a very three-dimensional character throughout the development with no uniformity of building lines present along either the central estate road or elsewhere.

Boundary treatment consisted of a series of flint-faced block walls to try to replicate the historic treatment of boundaries elsewhere throughout the estate, some featuring additional half round ridge tile capping and others with ammonites built in to them, with brick detailing to either side of pedestrian entrance gateways.

The scheme was conceived with a view to seeking to restrict views to the private rear gardens of individual properties and the boundary treatment between them and to reinforce the overall density that might be expected of a complex of buildings of more agricultural character and layout.



Conclusions

The panel were divided to some degree as to whether the scheme represented an overdevelopment of the site with too much uniformity in design and appearance giving rise to a sense of being clinical or whether the character of the development actually stemmed from its density.

Whilst the overall layout, form and design of the buildings was seen as being largely successful in attempting to reflect an agricultural character as sought in the Design Brief, there were elements of the detailing that were considered to be less appropriate. A particular criticism was directed at the size of the majority of the windows which were seen as being alien to the more generous proportions of the traditional fenestration of buildings elsewhere on the estate. It was also thought that the amount of rendering throughout the scheme could

have been reduced and greater use of tile hanging incorporated in the design. There were also some expressions of concern with regard to the size of some of the gables.

The decision to allow garages at the rear of a number of the units, and more particularly where they were visible through the high arched openings that reflected in part the agricultural character of the development, was also seen as being unfortunate insofar as they adversely affected the integrity of the concept for the scheme and were thought likely to be largely impractical for housing vehicles in any event owing to the narrowness of both their widths and that of the openings through which they were accessed.

However, this was balanced by an appreciation of the redeeming features of the scheme, such as the visual interest created by different elements, and in particular the fenestration treatment of the rounded 'corner' referred to above, the mix of roof forms and materials, the use of the half round ridge tile capping to some lengths of boundary walling, the sub-division of rear gardens through the use of metal railings of a design reflective of those used historically throughout the estate.

The lack of chimneys on any of the units was generally not considered to represent a design deficiency owing to the relatively tightly knit layout of the scheme, its more agricultural and less domestic character, the success of the roof forms and the use of good quality clay tiles throughout and the view that there was enough detailing elsewhere such that their omission was not obvious.

Equally, the absence of any 'public' areas of soft landscaping was not thought to be unacceptable given the densely developed character of the scheme. However, the tarmacadam surface treatment of the estate road was considered to be somewhat urban, particularly given the addition of speed humps, deep kerbing and wooden posts to prevent vehicle parking on the adjacent grass verges. It was thought by the panel that this could have been significantly improved through the use of a different surface material, such as setts or a bound material, with the possibility of the roads off the estate road being surfaced differently to the estate road.

This in turn highlighted an issue with regard to the perceived inadequacy of the vehicle parking arrangements around the site for both residents and visitors. It was felt however that the loss to the character and quality of the development that would result from creating a wider estate road would not be acceptable and that a more appropriate solution might be to provide for overflow parking elsewhere.

No specific observations were made by panel members with regard to the quality of the flint boundary walls within the development although it was commonly accepted that the inclusion of the decorative ammonites in their construction was unacceptable.

Notwithstanding the lack of any affordable housing provision as part of the scheme, and therefore the absence of a 'balanced' community, it was reported that residents are largely happy with the environment that it has created and that it works as a successful community.

The feel of the development as being reminiscent of that of a farm complex was acknowledged and considered to have contributed positively to its general success. Whilst there were areas of criticism with regard to specific elements of the development, it was thought overall that it represented a reasonable design solution taking into consideration the many constraints to which the site was subject.

Old Home Farm and the Kennels

Introduction

This scheme involved the construction of a detached dwelling within the wall of the former dog kennels complex on the Estate, including the conversion to ancillary outbuildings of the single storey lean-to kennels buildings themselves, together with the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings on land immediately to the south. The site as a whole was positioned to the south of the part of the development of the 20 units referred to above to the west of the estate road and opposite Old Home Farm house.

It was granted outline planning permission under the same application as the adjacent development with the subsequent approval of the details granted in 2003.



The Development

The development of the semi-detached units took its design lead to some extent from Nos. 1 and 2 Old Home Farm, a pair of semi-detached dwellings located to the south of the site and fronting onto the main estate road that runs east/west through the estate, whilst the kennels scheme sought to reflect the conversion of a nearby forge and joiners shop. Although only ancillary buildings,

the unique features and character of the former kennels buildings were such that it was considered to be important to retain them as part of the proposal.

The result was a handed pair of largely identical dwellings exhibiting full height front projecting gables that were the most prominent features of the development. These were jettied out at both first floor level and attic level with the principal elevation finished from first floor level upwards with plain tile cladding in the form of new and second hand tile banding. The colour difference between the two was more pronounced at first floor level than above. The design showed an area of identical tile cladding along the south elevation return wall of the southern of the two units at first floor level whilst the cladding also extended along part of the front elevation wall of the lean-to garage attached to the side of the northern unit.

The remaining wall areas of the development were finished in a painted smooth render with a band of Bradstone detailing beneath the ground floor sill level whilst the main pitched roof and gables were finished in small plain tiles that matched those used on the main development of 20 units to the north. The central part of the scheme accommodated a pair of monopitch-roofed half dormer elements to either side of a central full height opening. Although less open to view, the rear elevation wall was entirely finished in render.

The fenestration design consisted of timber side-hung casements of, variously, two, three and four lights, all with glazing bars creating four panes to each light. All were painted in the traditional green colour characteristic of the Rousdon estate. The doors and eaves and verge details, also in timber, were similarly painted. The otherwise symmetrical form of both

dwelling was interrupted by the catslide roof arrangement over the garage of the northern unit.

The front boundary treatment took the form of a flint wall of curved head design with metal 'estate' five-bar gate and adjacent pedestrian gate flanked by brick detailing at the end of each length of wall. The wall thickness was greater than that of those constructed as part of the neighbouring development to the north and of more similar design to the older walls flanking the main estate road nearby.



The development within the wall of the former kennels complex was less visible from view from outside of the site owing to the entrance gates being closed. As a consequence, it did not form part of the panel's detailed deliberations on this scheme.

Conclusions

In general, the panel considered that the overall size and scale of the two units was reasonable, although some concern was

expressed with regard to the proportions of the gables. However, the balance of solid to void was thought to be incorrect and the windows too small as a result, although they were acknowledged to represent an improvement upon the windows in the neighbouring 20-dwelling development to the north.

The striped effect of the tile cladding was thought to be unacceptably strong and alien to the character of the development, and indeed the wider estate, with very little idea as to why it had been introduced and/or from where it had taken reference. It was considered that decorative tiles might have represented a more appropriate treatment. Moreover, some concern was expressed at the validity of the jettying effect as a design element together with the strength of this feature.

The introduction of Bradstone detailing was thought to be inappropriate whilst the render wall finish was considered to be incongruous along with the section of the tile cladding along the return south elevation wall.

The overall view amongst the panel members was that although the development was broadly acceptable within its context an opportunity had been missed to achieve a really high quality development for the site. The design represented an overdone pastiche of a building and was deemed to be of poor quality by comparison with the remainder of the estate.

On a more positive note however, there was a broad consensus view that the boundary walling along the main frontage of the site was acceptable and certainly superior to that constructed on the residential development site to the north. Equally, it was generally held that the degree to which the building had been set back from the estate road provided it with an appropriate setting whilst reducing any potential parking problems.

Comments relating to the development within the former Kennels site to the north were favourable with regard to the principle of the erection of a dwelling in view of the integration with the surrounding development that had been achieved.

Home Farm North and South and The Bothy

Introduction

This scheme involved the conversion to a total of 15 residential units of the northern and southern ranges of the former farm buildings serving Home Farm and the Bothy building to their east. The buildings were located immediately to the north of the main estate road. Both the southern range and the Bothy comprised a single storey range whilst the northern range mainly consisted of single storey accommodation with additional first floor level accommodation within the roof space of a steeply pitched roof over the central section, the buildings forming in effect three sides around a central courtyard with the southern range forming the fourth side although detached from the northern range.

The scheme for the conversion of these former estate farm buildings was granted in 2001.



The Development

The development involved the conversion of the southern range to form a terrace of four single storey residential units, the conversion of the Bothy to form a terrace of four small dwellings and the northern range to seven properties in total.

Particular attention was paid to the retention of the linear form and character of the southern range and the Bothy together with sympathetic adaptation of the majority of the door and window openings in each of the buildings. It was especially important, above all, to ensure that the historic agricultural character of each of the range of buildings was maintained as far as possible. Of equal significance was the retention of boundary walls abutting the estate road to the south of the southern range.

The landscape treatment of the central space between the two 'arms' of the Home Farm North buildings was also seen as being important. Although prior to the development being carried out it was essentially an open area surfaced in a manner similar to the adjacent private ways around this part of the estate, the scheme involved the subdivision and soft landscaping of the space in order to create private garden areas, together with provision of metal railings and the erection of a boundary wall to demarcate the southern boundary of the space.

The scheme did not specifically provide for identifiable parking areas within any of the modest curtilage areas attached to each unit nor facilities, either individual or communal, for bin/recycling storage.



Conclusions

Views expressed by members of the panel centred on the use and treatment of the spaces around the development as much as the character and quality of the conversion scheme itself.

Taking the latter first, there was a consensus view that the lack of provision for waste disposal/recycling storage noticeably spoilt the appearance of the external spaces between the three building ranges. It was considered that this may have been significantly improved through the provision of some form of dedicated communal facility for residents appropriately and discreetly located within the area.

The importance of the central space and its landscape treatment was highlighted by panel members with varying views as to its merits. The lack of legibility, in terms of the position of entrances to each of the seven units formed from the conversion of the northern range, was raised as an issue together with the suggestion that the subdivision of the space, widely acknowledged as being a key part of the site, could have been achieved through the construction of high walls to ensure privacy and a better level of amenity for residents given the modest sizes of the garden areas. This was reinforced by a view to the effect that the layout of the separate garden areas and boundary treatments appeared unduly complicated and lacking in coherence.

Equally, the absence of dedicated vehicle parking areas was also identified by the panel. However, this was considered by some members to have been exaggerated as a criticism of the scheme bearing in mind the more damaging impact that might have been created in the event of parking facilities being provided within the landscaped central space and the desire to try and create some amenity space for each of the units.

Turning to the buildings themselves, the view was generally held that their reuse was welcome although reference was made to the modest size of a number of the units and the likelihood that they were only likely to be used/occupied as holiday properties rather than as permanent dwellings. This was not held to be a positive factor in terms of seeking to create a proper community on the estate.

The inclusion of traditional detailing was viewed favourably along with the design of the wrought iron railings within the central space. Overall, the conclusion reached was that this was a reasonable quality scheme that was marred to some degree by certain elements such as the gable extension on the 'front' of the central section of the northern range which was

thought to be excessive in scale and which compromised the linear character of the buildings to which it was attached, the false half timber treatment of a number of gables, the poor manner in which the covered walkway had been carried forward and the inconsistency in some of the fenestration detailing.

It was accepted that many of the properties could not readily be extended without adversely affecting their character, appearance or integrity or the character or appearance of the surrounding areas which, although private, were important in order to facilitate vehicular access and general permeability through the site. However, there were considered to be potential opportunities for internal expansion through the conversion of the roof spaces, and in particular that of the central section which displayed a higher roof. This had already happened to some degree as evidenced by the number of roof lights that were visible. At the same time though, due cognisance was given to the need to ensure that rigorous control be applied to the future installation of stove pipes and flues within these buildings so as not to harm their appearance and character.

Byways (Land adjoining Rooks Acre)

Introduction

This development comprised the erection of a detached dwelling on an infill plot of approximately 0.2 hectares in area located between Rooks Acre, itself a more modern property than the predominantly Victorian buildings throughout the estate, and the tree screen that separates it from Nos. 1 and 2 Old Home Farm.

Detailed planning permission was granted for its construction in 2003.

The Development

The dwelling was designed with a mix of two and single storey elements and a pitched roof of 45 degrees incorporating dormer windows and roof lights. The form was essentially based upon a pair of gabled building forms with one at 90 degrees to the other, with a hip-roofed double garage attached to one side of the building, a catslide roof arrangement on the other and a lean-to canopy attached to the front.

Externally, the principal building was finished primarily with magnolia painted render walls on a brick plinth with tile cladding to the gables in the form of bands of plain and patterned tiling (Redland Club Ornamental Manor House Mix) and plain tiles of two colours (Redland Downland Hedgerow Brown and Manor House Mix) used on the main roof with a zigzag pattern created between the two different colours. The more lightly coloured tile (the Redland Downland Manor House Mix) was used on the remaining roof areas.

The fenestration comprised simple timber casements of variously single, two and three lights with no glazing bars to each light and the finish consisting of a dark brown stain. A similar finish was applied to the doors, including the garage doors.

The design featured a brick chimney on the west elevation.

Access was taken from the main estate road with the driveway and parking/turning area finished with a gravel surface.

Boundary treatment consisted of a mix of estate railings and timber shiplap fencing with some planting along the principal estate road frontage in front of the railings.



Conclusions

Although there was general agreement amongst panel members that the site itself represented an acceptable infill plot and that the actual siting of the building fitted in well with the mature tree belt to the east, there was otherwise almost universal condemnation of the design merits of the development.

The general consensus view was that the scheme was disappointing in respect to almost all aspects, namely the construction, design, form, selection of materials, poor window alignment and the use of close boarded fencing as a boundary treatment. It was thought that the design represented little more than an attempt to dress up a modern dwelling form, typical of that constructed by a volume house builder, with poor quality detailing. As such, it manifestly failed and, as a result, achieved an unacceptable separation from its sensitive historic context.

It was thought that the building was likely to have been initially laid out internally with little consideration given as to the external design and appearance resulting from the layout rather than the other way around. A view was also expressed to the effect that the scheme may have been improved slightly had the garage been detached from the main dwelling.

The question as to whether the scheme might have worked better had the building been positioned nearer to the main site frontage was also raised. It was considered that by potentially reflecting more the character of frontage development, and allowing a more open vista to be maintained from side views of the development, a more successful outcome could have been achieved in design terms.

The soft landscaping at the front of the site was also thought to be of poor quality and the presence of close boarded timber fencing particularly unfortunate. It was however advised that there is a scheme in place and that further planting would be forthcoming.

Members of the panel were advised that the approved scheme followed negotiations to achieve improvements to the original scheme that had been submitted and that attempts to achieve a better design were taken as far as they could reasonably have been with the result that it was not considered to be sufficiently poor to be able to justify refusing permission.

The overall result was considered by the panel to be no better than mediocre and, whilst this did mean that the building did not necessarily stand out as being very obviously of poor design standard, the feeling was very much that the site had offered a considerably greater opportunity for a far superior design approach that had been missed. A possible increase in the use of Members and the Design Champion to support Officers' views regarding design issues was highlighted.

8-14 The Gardens

Introduction

Planning permission was granted in 2003 for the development of 6 new dwellings on land adjacent to the northern side of the Grade II listed walled garden that was originally built to serve the estate and to the east of a series of linked single storey workshops. This area was located to the south of the main estate road from which the development was accessed.

However, in view of the distance that the development was set back from the estate road, its visual prominence from the road and the intervening presence of an open vehicle parking area, it was clearly important to ensure that the landscaping and, in particular, the boundary definition of the small front gardens attached to each of these units was appropriate to its historic context and that of the estate as a whole. The boundary treatment to the front of this development was therefore selected in itself as a case study for the panel.

The Development

The landscaping scheme approved as part of the development incorporated the use of traditional iron estate railings to run along the entire frontage of the six units in order to give definition to the front boundary and to demarcate the boundaries between the formal front garden spaces attached to each property.

These had been used elsewhere on the estate for similar purposes during the course of a number of the more recent developments carried out and replicated railings that had historically been designed and used around the open parkland of the estate previously.

They comprise a simple post and rail design with five horizontal rails interspersed with a number of vertical rails. Each rail is of oblong section.



Gates to each property were designed similarly so as to achieve an overall effect that was reflective of the more agricultural, and therefore less domestic, setting in which the railings were historically more likely to be found.

Conclusions

Although there were significant concerns with regard to the poor condition and unfinished appearance of the surface treatment of the vehicle parking area itself and the lack of storage facilities for the properties, as evidenced by the presence of waste bins adjacent to the entrance from the estate road, the introduction of railings as part of this development was thought to be wholly appropriate.

Whilst it was acknowledged that they did not occupy an open parkland setting consistent with their historical function around the estate, they were considered to represent a valid approach in the context of the residential dwellings and were thought to complement the good quality design of the dwellings themselves.

The Walled Garden

Introduction

Planning permission was granted in 2005 for the erection of 2 dwellings within the old walled garden of the mansion, which due to its impressive size, quality of construction and historic interest is included in the register of Historic Buildings in its own right at Grade II level. Building of the two dwellings was accepted on the condition that a section of wall had been removed previously was rebuilt.

The Development

Whilst the two houses have never been built, the wall was subsequently repaired without materials or a sample panel being approved by officers. The quality of the section repaired was judged to be extremely poor when judged against the original walled garden especially in terms of the low ratio of stone to mortar as shown in the photo below, and the use of flint blocks as opposed to the coursed knapped flint used in the construction of the original wall.



Conclusions

There was some disagreement whether the walls of the garden are the main feature or whether the open space was the most important aspect. Whilst it was agreed that the finish of the repaired section of walls was a poor contrast to the original sections, with the merits of flint block as opposed to individual pieces of stone discussed, the main discussion moved on to what the space in the walled garden should be used for and whether it was appropriate to allow building within the walled garden. There was however no consensus of what should be allowed, or where - with disagreement over the best position of any development within the walls - or how much although it was agreed that development should enable the up keep of the walls.

Members of the panel considered that it would be important for the Council to try and achieve a balance between a commercially viable and marketable scheme which at the same time respected the historic interest and character of the walled garden, enabling its up keep for the future.

Background Papers

- An Introduction to the Rousdon Estate
 - Project Summary - Land at Home Farm North
 - Project Summary - Old Home Farm and the Kennels
 - Project Summary - Home Farm North and South and The Bothy
 - Project Summary - Byways (land adjoining Rooks Acre)
 - Project Summary - 8-14 The Gardens
 - Project Summary – The Walled Garden
-