

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



**Adroddiad Adolygu Dylunio:**  
**Design Review Report:** 15 July 2005

**Dyddiad Cyfarfod / Cyflwyno'r Deunydd:**  
**Meeting Date / Material Submitted:** 6 July 2005

**Lleoliad/Location:** Bryngwyn Road, Newport

**Disgrifiad o'r Cynllun**  
**Scheme Description:** Residential

**Ymgynghorwyr Cynllunio:**  
**Planning Consultants:** RPS [Kate Gapper]

**Cleient/Asiant:**  
**Client/Agent:** Lakefield Developments Ltd  
[Craig Sugar, Nathan Blake]

**Pensaer/Architect:** Boyes Rees [Gary Loo]

**Awdurdod Cynllunio:**  
**Planning Authority:** Newport CC

**Statws Cynllunio:**  
**Planning Status:** Revised planning application  
pending

**Y Panel Adolygu Dylunio/Design Review Panel:**

Alan Francis (cadeirydd/chair) Ed Colgan  
Cindy Harris (swyddog/officer) Jonathan Adams  
Douglas Hogg

**Lead Panellist:** Jonathan Adams

**Sylwedyddion/Observers:** Peter Roberts

## **Cyflwyniad/Presentation**

The site is in a transitional location between residential and educational/religious buildings. Previous proposals for this site were reviewed by DCfW in October 2004 and rejected by Planning Committee [against the recommendation of officers] in November 2004, on the grounds of overdevelopment and inappropriate design. A subsequent appeal hearing upheld the committee's decision and dismissed the application.

The developer has accepted the objections that the original scale was excessive and out-of-context, and that the resulting footprint worked against the fine urban grain of the area. The roof design was acknowledged to be inappropriate as was the loss of amenity for some neighbouring properties. It was also accepted that this scheme did not constitute infill development. Therefore the design concept was re-evaluated, with a reduced scale and apparent bulk of the elevations. A reduced standard of parking has been approved, from 31 to 25 spaces for 19 apartments. All privacy distances have been dealt with.

The new proposal splits the scheme into two blocks with the main access road in between them, leading to a rear parking court. The roof line steps down from 4 to 3 storeys following the contour of the road and the ground floor level is set below street level by half to one storey height. Two options were presented for comment, option 1 being the more traditional design with pitched roofs and dormer windows; option 2 being more contemporary with a gull-wing roof and cedar boarding to the top floor elevation.

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

The designers have attempted to meet the objections to the earlier scheme, and make a future consent more likely by breaking up the elevation, protecting privacy limits and addressing all the technical issues outlined in the appeal decision dated 06/05/05. Nevertheless, they anticipate a further refusal and appeal. The developers themselves prefer option 2.

The Panel did not favour the approach of locating apartments behind dormer windows, as shown in option 1. We thought that there was an opportunity to do something much more contemporary and innovative, and supported the idea of developing option 2 into a design more specific to its location. At the moment it is a safe option, but not adventurous, and the treatment of the top floor with its false balconies, is awkward. The location and expression of the top floor apartments suggest a penthouse and this interpretation could be developed further with full height glazing behind a real balcony.

In general the fenestration in option 2 was preferred. The view along the roofscape from higher up the street, which would show the lift overrun in the middle of the gull wing roof, caused us some concern.

Although the previous design review report recommended locating the main entrance on the front of the building facing the street, access to the building is from the rear parking area. The Panel would still prefer the option of a front entrance, even if this is at first floor level, on the basis that pedestrian access should be given equal if not greater priority than vehicular access.

The south facing rear facade has not been developed and there were no drawings presented of this elevation. The Panel repeated our earlier recommendation that the south façade should be enlivened with larger windows, maximising solar gain, and that balcony provision need not mean a greater physical proximity to existing buildings.

The Panel encouraged the developer to include a commitment to sustainability measures, and in particular to the use of local, sustainable materials. We do not accept that the specification of uPVC windows and doors is appropriate in this context.

The Panel were please to note that all mature trees on the site woud be retained and protected.

If a further application is to succeed, we advised that it should be based on a bold, imaginative, contemporary design approach, including a credible sustainable development strategy, and be supported by adequate visual material including more detailed drawings of all elevations, sections, and photomontage views from either end of the road.

### **Crynodeb/Summary**

The Panel was pleased to see the revised proposals for this site, which attempt to meet the objections raised against the original scheme. We suggest the following points be addressed to improve the chances of success of any future application:

- The Panel supports the reduced parking requirement and urges that the space released be used to provide good amenity space for residents
- We endorse the breaking up of the blocks and would support a more adventurous contemporary scheme, especially with regard to the roof treatment
- We would prefer to see the main pedestrian access directly off the street and more attention given to railing details
- The south facing elevation needs to be part of the overall architectural language, while exploiting the potential for passive solar design, and the whole elevational treatment needs to be properly thought through
- We would like to see more sustainability measures incorporated and in particular an alternative to uPVC windows.
- A more convincing quality and quantity of supportive material will be necessary to accompany any future application.

### **Diwedd/End**

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