

Statws/Status:

Cyhoeddus / Public



Adroddiad Adolygu Dylunio: Design Review Report:	29 April 2008
Dyddiad Cyfarfod / Meeting Date:	16 April 2008
Lleoliad/Location:	GM2 building, Penarth
Disgrifiad o'r Cynllun Scheme Description:	Residential
Cleient/Asiant: Client/Agent:	Grant Maunder [Beverley Thomas]
Developer/Datblygwr:	As above
Pensaer/Architect:	Loyn & Co Architects [Chris Loyn, David Hill]
Ymgynghorwyr Cynllunio: Planning Consultants:	Arup [Karen Lloyd] Camlin Lonsdale [Huw Morgan]
Awdurdod Cynllunio: Planning Authority:	Vale of Glamorgan Council [Rob Thomas]
Statws Cynllunio: Planning Status:	Full Planning Application Dec 07
Y Panel Adolygu Dylunio/ Design Review Panel: Alan Francis (cadeirydd/chair) Cindy Harris (swyddog/officer) Charlie Deng (swyddog/officer)	Jonathan Adams Ashley Bateson Phil Roberts

Michael Griffiths

Lead Panellist:

Michael Griffiths

Sylwedyddion/Observers:

Mark Hand, Newport CC

Cyflwyniad/Presentation

Proposals for this site, from a different architect, were previously reviewed by DCFW in May 2004 and June 2005. Originally nine storeys, and later reduced to 5.5 storeys containing 25 units, the previous proposal was refused planning permission [against officer recommendation] on grounds of overdevelopment, and the applicant lost at appeal in January 2007. This proposal is for 17 residential units and one commercial space, over 4.5 storeys. The mass of the block is split in two by a central glazed atrium, which allows views through to Cwrt Jubilee to the south. This is an island site on the edge of a conservation area in Penarth and occupying a pivotal position between commercial and residential areas.

External materials are concrete walls, in grey or soft red, covered by climbing plants; and vertical timber louvers with integrated shutters in Thermowood [heat treated and dimensionally stable] with a claimed life of 50 years. Parking is provided at semi-basement level at a ratio of 1:1 and Highways have approved the vehicular access arrangement.

Consultation responses to the planning application have raised similar issues as previously, concerned with scale, materials, context, contemporary style, parking, amenity, privacy and unnecessary demolition. Important issues for the Local Authority include the use of timber, access arrangements, and traffic calming measures immediately to the east but outside the site boundary. They support the full site coverage, the massing and setbacks, and the parking and cycle provision given the sustainable location. They will be looking for standard Section 106 conditions for sustainable transport, public art and public space.

Ymateb y Panel/Panel's Response

The Panel commended the quality of the presentation, including the hand sketches and material samples. We thought that the scale was appropriate in the context and that the splitting device of the atrium worked well to break up the massing and dematerialise the facade. The simple flat roof with a setback was consistent with the

contemporary approach which we supported, although it omits to show the lift over-run. The Panel noted that the illustrations of the atrium did not show any structural support and in reality it would appear much less clear and transparent. We thought the team should retain the option of having no atrium at all, rather than a glass box full of visual intrusions. The aspiration of the design team was to make it a sociable space / street.

We had concerns that the flat glass roof over the atrium was at risk from pooling and algae, and that opening roof lights would be in danger of leaking. We discussed the possibility of an opaque roof, given that the transparency would be compromised anyway, and of ETFE [structural and fire engineering benefits] or a pitched glazed roof, all of which would be more viable. Shading the atrium remained a major problem with a glazed roof, and the proposed solution of laminated PVs was an expensive option. We had concerns that the design did not maximise daylight penetration from the atrium into the rest of the building and we suggested high level lights be used if there were concerns about privacy.

With regard to the apartment layout, we thought that the three north facing units should have additional east facing fenestration into the atrium. We noted that offering 2- bed apartments without an en suite was unusual these days, but agreed that this was a matter for the developer.

Our main concern was with the ground floor access arrangements, and in particular the harshness of the vehicle ramp and shutters on the main frontage facing Plymouth Road, although we agreed this might be acceptable if it was carefully detailed with, for example, sliding timber shutters similar to the vertical louvers. However, the disabled access as proposed was uniquely convoluted and unacceptable. We discussed the possibility of vehicular access from the rear. We were told that Cwrt Jubilee would not allow access from the south east but access from the south west might be possible.

The Panel supported the idea of climbing plants on the facade, as long as suitable species could be found that were tolerant of local conditions. We were told that different species would be selected for the north [ivy] and south [deciduous] facades. The plants would be grown in a 50mm zone between concrete and timber and be allowed to hang down from the roof and possibly over windows. We questioned the use of in situ concrete walls and suggested that a timber frame would be a more sustainable choice. The architect's intention was to reflect the solidity of Penarth and take advantage of the high thermal mass. It was agreed that the consistency of material quality was most important and the Panel sought reassurance that the budget was sufficient to deliver the promised quality.

The Panel was disappointed by the weak sustainability statement and aspirations which appeared to go no further than the legal requirement. We saw no evidence of differential fenestration responding to solar orientation. We were concerned that

measures should be taken to prevent the overheating of the atrium and advised the team to develop an environmental strategy which recognised the the Welsh Assembly Government target for zero carbon buildings by 2011. We would like to see a commitment to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 and to consider the feasibility of a centralised heating system, possibly fuelled by biomass. The quantity of glazing shown on the top floor was in our view unlikely to comply with Part L. It would be important to ensure an airtight fit on the sliding doors in the bedrooms and we advised sourcing these from a quality supplier. In terms of cost-effective carbon saving, we would prefer to see the inclusion of solar water heating rather than solar photovoltaics. We would like to see the cycle storage made more accessible and better integrated with the basement car park. The bin stores also need to be more accessible.

Crynodeb/Summary

The Panel welcomed the opportunity to review new proposals for this important site and commended the quality of the presentation. We support the design approach and the planning application, although we have some significant concerns. In summary:

- We think the scale and architectural treatment is appropriate to the context, and we admire the device of splitting the block and reducing the massing with the atrium.
- We think the ground floor circulation needs revising and we would prefer to see vehicular access from the rear with the main pedestrian access on the main frontage
- We think the detailing of the atrium will require very careful handling to keep it clean and clear. If it can be made to work it should be used as an asset to bring more daylight into the apartments.
- We remain to be convinced by the juxtaposition of timber and plants, and how this will affect the durability of the timber louvers.
- The sustainability statement needs to be developed urgently, with clearly defined aspirations and a strategy for achieving them.

Diwedd/End

NB A Welsh language copy of this report is available upon request.