

Statws/Status:

Cyfrinachol / Confidential



Adroddiad Adolygu Dylunio: 14 November 2006
Design Review Report:

Dyddiad Cyfarfod / Cyflwyno'r Deunydd: 1 November 2006
Meeting Date / Material Submitted:

Lleoliad/Location: Martello Quay, Pembroke Dock

Disgrifiad o'r Cynllun Mixed use
Scheme Description:

Developer/Datblygwr: Martello Quays Ltd
[Keith Williams]
Milford Haven Port Authority
[Andrew Brown]
DEIN, WAG [Peter Kettleby]

Pensaer/Architect: HGP Architects [Peter Warlow]

Cynllunio/ Consultants: Jacobs [David Brett]

Awdurdod Cynllunio: Pembrokeshire County Council
Planning Authority: [John Turbervill, Jane Gibson]

Statws Cynllunio: Pre-application
Planning Status:

Y Panel Adolygu Dylunio/Design Review Panel:
John Punter (cadeirydd/chair) Ewan Jones
Cindy Harris (swyddog/officer) Mike Biddulph
Charlie Deng [swyddog/officer] Douglas Hogg
Michael Griffiths

Lead Panellist: Douglas Hogg

Cyflwyniad/Presentation

In 1995 a report was produced for the Local Authority which indicated the desirability of leisure / commercial uses for this site. However, there was no commercial interest at this time. The joint developers went to the market again in 2002 and, starting from a low base, found sufficient interest to enable the project to proceed. The Authority pointed out that this proposal forms a good fit with the Wales Spatial Plan and would contribute significantly to the regeneration of Pembroke Dock.

The development partners have a vision of a vibrant and sustainable waterfront development with a mix of uses. They insist that it will be socially inclusive and linked to the existing community, with good quality public realm and pedestrianised areas. The intention is to create a robust masterplan, with an urban design code covering issues such as materials use, which they hope will be adopted by the Local Authority, in order to ensure that the desired quality is delivered.

Ymateb y Panel/Panel's Response

In general terms the Panel considered that the proposed use for this site was acceptable. It was confirmed that the Conservation Area boundary shown on the presentation material coincided with the Townscape Area Heritage boundary. The Panel was also informed that the existing port wall was a listed structure and that the extended pier to the west was on land owned by the Port Authority. Reassured by this, the Panel thought it essential that the pedestrian circuit around the development should be completed with a new footbridge across the lock, and connections back to the mainland on the west side of the dock. There are practical problems to be overcome [eg the working slipway to the south of the pier] but the project team stated that they too wished to see such a link and would strive to ensure that it happens.

From studying the presentation material, the Panel formed the impression that a gated community was proposed, but we were informed that this was definitely not the case. The layout will convey an implied privacy at certain points, but there will be full public access throughout.

The Panel welcomed the prospect of a masterplan and design code for this scheme, although it was uncertain how prescriptive the latter could be. The residential units on the waterfront would rise to a maximum of 4 storeys. The sea walls would be constructed from steel and concrete and would reflect the treatment of surrounding waterfronts. We thought that a scheme of this size and prominence would benefit from having more than one designer.

It will be important to ensure a complementarity between the different land uses and the viability of the proposed commercial uses, together with appropriate phasing. We advised that 'pepper potting' of commercial uses was not the best approach and that the main commercial zone to the south east should be strongly and directly linked back to the existing town centre. The creation of an attractive and high quality public realm would encourage year-round use and vitality.

The Panel was not convinced that there were adequate functional links [pedestrian and public transport] to the town centre, and would have liked to see more contextual information. We were told that this information will be included in the full design report to accompany the planning application. The layout of the commercial building is indicative only.

The Panel thought that the proposed new roundabout would not encourage or facilitate pedestrian access. We were told that it would be effective in traffic calming and would not impede pedestrian flow, but we were not convinced that it was the best solution. We advised the designers to consult again with the highways engineers to ensure a pedestrian friendly public realm.

The Panel inquired about the content of the sustainability strategy and was told that it would have to be affordable. However, as the site is remote from many main services and connection costs are very high, there may well be a good commercial argument for energy efficiency and renewable generation. The design team confirmed that they intend to include a BREEAM / EcoHomes standard in the design code. The possibility of a district heating scheme was being considered and Ely Bridge was cited as a precedent, though this remains unbuilt.

The Panel was informed that there was no requirement on the developers for an affordable housing contribution, and that the improvement in mains service provision was seen as an equivalent contribution. It was emphasised that the new waterfront and facilities would be there for the benefit of local people as well as visitors.

Crynodeb/Summary

The Panel was pleased to have the opportunity to review this important scheme. We support the proposed use and the choice of site, and are cautiously optimistic about the potential of the design code for ensuring quality. However, we consider that major issues remain to be resolved before a planning application is submitted. In particular:

- We would like to see more contextual information and more evidence of close links between the town centre and the waterfront commercial. Good accessibility and permeability is important for commercial viability, as well as creating a sense of place, and the highways accessing the site need to be pedestrian friendly and calmed.
- For this scheme to be well integrated into its context it is essential that a new footbridge is provided over the lock and that pedestrian access is secured on the western edge of the site
- We would like to see the commercial development concentrated in the south east block, rather than pepper-potted through the site
- The scale and form of the development needs to be clarified and informed by local examples. The Gunwharf scheme in Portsmouth is not an appropriate precedent.
- The ambition for genuine social inclusion needs to be carefully translated into the masterplan, and local users and residents encouraged to use the facility. All the housing should be designed to have greater pedestrian penetration and attractive through routes that reach the water's edge.
- A coherent sustainability strategy should be presented which goes beyond current statutory provision and incorporates low carbon technologies

We would like to see the scheme again prior to a planning application being submitted.

Diwedd/End

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