

**Statws/Status:**  
**Cyfrinachol / Confidential**



<b>Adroddiad Adolygu Dylunio: Design Review Report:</b>	<b>19 June 2008</b>
<b>Dyddiad Cyfarfod / Meeting Date:</b>	<b>11 June 2008</b>
<b>Lleoliad/Location:</b>	<b>Benllech, Anglesey</b>
<b>Disgrifiad o'r Cynllun Scheme Description:</b>	<b>Primary Care Centre</b>
<b>Cleient/Asiant: Client/Agent:</b>	<b>Anglesey LHB [Alyson Constantine, Gerafon Surgery [Alex Gordon-Clark]</b>
<b>Developer/Datblygwr:</b>	<b>GPI [Mike Moran, Andrew Caldwell]</b>
<b>Pensaer/Architect:</b>	<b>Bournville Architects [Christine Foster]</b>
<b>Ymgynghorwyr Cynllunio: Planning Consultants:</b>	<b>Asbri Planning [Robin Williams]</b>
<b>Awdurdod Cynllunio: Planning Authority:</b>	<b>Anglesey CC</b>
<b>Statws Cynllunio: Planning Status:</b>	<b>Pre-application</b>
<b>Y Panel Adolygu Dylunio/ Design Review Panel: Alan Francis (cadeirydd/chair) Cindy Harris (swyddog/officer)</b>	<b>Kieren Morgan Jonathan Hines</b>

**Charlie Deng (swyddog/officer)**  
**Phil Roberts**

**Howard Wainwright**  
**Ben Sibert**

**Lead Panellist:**

**Jonathan Hines**

**Sylwedyddion/Observers:**

**Andrew Eustace WHE**  
**Lynne Sullivan, Design Review**  
**Panelist**

### **Cyflwyniad/Presentation**

Six alternative sites were considered for the location of this new GP surgery, to accommodate 8 consulting rooms, 3 treatment rooms and associated facilities. The preferred site is central to this small town, and will be integrated with redevelopment of the library. The welcoming front entrance faces the town and will be easily visible from the main street. The rear of the building, facing north east, will be more private and this is where consulting rooms are located at ground floor. There are good views out to sea at first floor level, where a staff balcony will be located.

A shared entrance will link the surgery and library, together with an accessible multi-purpose room which could also be used by the local community. There is independent access to the staff area and undercroft staff car parking, an arrangement which mitigates the flood risk and is facilitated by the slope across the site of about 3 metres. A 5 metre strip along the river to the north will be kept free for access by the Environment Agency. The above site constraints have determined the layout and form of the building.

The original design with flat roof and simple format, had two separate entrances off a common space. This was changed over the consultation process to include low pitched roofs and a single entrance. A central reception hub and waiting area overlook a sunken garden and the elevational treatment is a mix of traditional and contemporary materials such as timber, white render and coloured blockwork with a grey standing seam metal roof and aluminium windows. A row of trees will be planted along the south east boundary to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and patient privacy.

The landscape design follows the site gradient with a paved sunken garden and seating area in the corner of the L shaped plan. The dedicated parking provided on site is well screened and there is a public car park directly across the road, although a drop-off point is provided outside the entrance. The design will achieve a BREEAM Excellent rating. Natural ventilation and daylight are maximised, and night purging will be used to cool the building.

Solar water heating is included, along with improved U-values and air tightness. Materials will be Green Guide A rated as far as possible.

Public consultation events have been well attended and while neighbours have expressed some concerns the response has been mostly positive. We were told that this proposal has the full support of the Local Authority.

### **Ymateb y Panel/Panel's Response**

The Panel welcomed the co-location of the two community facilities and the resulting cross-pollination of uses. However, we thought that the entrance space was too tight and likely to become congested. The draught lobby created a bottleneck which would not be a calm, relaxing or welcoming space. We would like to see a much stronger sense of arrival created, conveying an approach to a civic building, and an open, generous entrance space with sufficient room for prams, wheelchairs etc. This might mean moving or reconfiguring the multi-purpose room. The Panel also felt that the public realm adjacent to the entrance was not sufficiently developed and that the entrance itself was not obvious enough.

In terms of the massing and composition of the building, the Panel preferred the simplicity of the first sketch and thought that much of the increasing complexity was unnecessary. It now has a more domestic appearance than a civic presence, and the multiple roof forms and pitches do not offer a good orientation for solar thermal panels. The elevational treatment is over-complicated and we thought that both form and finish needed calming and simplifying, with a reduced palette of materials, which might make it cheaper to build. However, the quality of detailing should be maintained at all costs and we emphasised that a simpler treatment should not be seen as a cost-cutting exercise.

The Panel noted that the internal plan and layout was efficiently organised, although the distance from the entrance to the reception desk could be a problem for some patients. The double height interior worked well but we would like to see a stronger link between ground and first floor level, possibly by making the staircase part of the double height space, or opening up the first floor more. We thought that the route to the refuse area from the treatment and utility rooms was long and inefficient, and we urged the architect to change the layout so that contaminated waste was not carried through any part of the waiting area.

We would have liked to see more contextual information submitted to justify the design. Ideally, plans and section drawings would extend beyond the boundary. It was confirmed that the flood strategy, of raising the building above ground towards the north, had been approved by the Environment Agency. A lift from the car park into the building was not possible because of

the flood risk, and any disabled staff member would have a dedicated parking space at the front

The Panel welcomed the commitment to achieve an Excellent rating under the new BREEAM Healthcare standard, rather than the NEAT standard. However, we thought it was essential that more daylight was introduced into the ground floor corridors, and to the rear of the reception area. In particular, the layout should be rearranged to allow for a window at the north western end of the corridors at both levels, to allow daylight in and views out. We were told that an M&E consultant was involved, but we thought there was insufficient evidence that sustainability considerations had driven the design solution. We suggested that a structural timber frame be explored, with lower embodied energy than the proposed steel frame with cavity masonry infill. Similarly, composite timber and aluminium windows would be preferable to pure aluminium. With regard to the heating strategy we were told that biomass had been ruled out as an option, but a ground source heat pump was being considered.

The Panel was not convinced about the proposed location of the expansion space. The team stated that they were unlikely to need it in the foreseeable future, and we advised that it should either be designed into the building in a satisfactory way, or abandoned.

We wondered whether anyone would actually use the sunken garden and we would like to see it made more accessible. We thought that there would be huge benefits in enabling access direct from the waiting area. The green triangular space behind the building to the north east has little obvious use, and we suggested that the building footprint could be splayed to align more closely with that boundary and enlarge the usable outdoor space to the front.

### **Crynodb/Summary**

The Panel welcomed the central location for this new primary care centre and the joint use of the site and physical link with the library. The internal layout is generally efficient and we support the raising of the building to respond to the flood risk and provide undercroft parking. We think, however, that major, significant revisions are needed to make this proposal an acceptable response to the site and the brief.

- Our main concern is with the approach to the building and the entrance space which needs much more generous treatment and better legibility.
- The form and massing should be simplified and a more civic presence conferred on the building.
- The attention to high quality detailing in the materials and junctions, is critical to a successful resolution of the design

- We support the target of BREEAM Excellent, although we think that sustainability considerations have not been sufficiently integrated with the design development to date. The heating strategy needs to be resolved as soon as possible and more sustainable materials incorporated.
- Internal corridors should be better daylit and windows should be introduced at the north western end of corridors.
- Expansion space should either be designed in or left out.
- The link to the refuse area should be rethought and the route should certainly not pass through any public area.
- We would like to see direct access from the waiting area onto the garden.

**Diwedd/End**

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