

Statws/Status:

Cyfrinachol / Confidential



Adroddiad Adolygu Dylunio: Design Review Report:	13 December 2007
Dyddiad Cyfarfod / Cyflwyno'r Deunydd: Meeting Date/Material Submitted:	28 November 2007
Lleoliad/Location:	Pencoed
Disgrifiad o'r Cynllun Scheme Description:	Primary Care Development
Cleient/Asiant: Client/Agent:	Bridgend LHB [Rosemary Fletcher] Pencoed Surgery [Paul Thomas]
Developer/Datblygwr:	Matrix Medical [Alistair Black]
Pensaer/Architect:	Bundred & Goode [James Bundred]
Awdurdod Cynllunio: Planning Authority:	Bridgend CBC [Graeme Oram]
Statws Cynllunio: Planning Status:	Pre-application
Y Panel Adolygu Dylunio/ Design Review Panel: Wendy Richards (cadeirydd/chair) Cindy Harris (swyddog/officer) Charlie Deng (swyddog/officer) Carole-Anne Davies [CEO]	Jonathan Hines Ed Colgan Jonathan Adams Phil Roberts

Lead Panellist:

Ed Colgan

Sylwedyddion/Observers:

Mallory Armstrong, Welsh Health Estates

Cyflwyniad/Presentation

Since the last Design Review [September 2006] much work has been done and the team have taken a fresh look at the design. This scheme has the highest priority in the LHB's estate strategy, especially as the GP practice is currently in temporary accommodation.

The site lies adjacent to the newly built Hendre relief road, close to the town centre. An existing footpath and culverted stream run across the site. Vehicular access is fixed at the site's south east corner.

Our previous recommendations have driven the re-design of the scheme, along with a decision to de-culvert the stream bed and open it up as a natural wetland feature, with a new footbridge across it linking the main entrance of the building with the main road. The existing public footpath has been reinstated to run around the curved front wall of the building. The building itself is split into two parts with a glazed link between the two wings and deep overhangs on the south elevation. The roof of the rear wing is further split to allow daylight into internal corridors. There is a single entrance at the front of the building and the rear door into the pharmacy is for emergency use only. Elevational materials are predominantly local stone and render.

Although this is still at pre-application stage, the Local Authority view this proposal favourably. They welcome the strong civic presence, the front door facing the road, and the sustainability elements. They will be concerned with details such as signage, railings and soffits at a later stage.

Ymateb y Panel/Panel's Response

The Panel appreciated the project team's positive response to our previous comments. We were informed that the town council office building, originally proposed for the south western corner of the site, would hopefully still go ahead in the longer term. However, because of the urgency of re-housing the medical practice, it was decided to progress the Primary Care Centre independently. The Panel was concerned that any additional building on the site should complement the new primary care centre, and avoid a domestic architectural style. The allotment building adjacent to the south eastern corner of the site, but outside the site boundary, will remain.

It was confirmed that the main bus routes are currently located on the other side of the railway, but a new bus route running along the relief road is

proposed, along with conveniently located bus stop and pedestrian crossings. The Panel queried the location of disabled parking bays to the rear of the building. We were told that there was a level accessway to the front door of 25 metres, and that the location had been approved by user groups.

The Panel questioned whether the large areas of stone walling were appropriate given the limited budget. The team stated that they had been costed and were deemed viable. Nevertheless, we thought that the money could be better spent elsewhere in the design to ensure quality. Where stone is to be used it would be very important to assess the type, quality and colour of the proposed material, to ensure it was sympathetic to its context, and that the quality and quantity were readily available and locally sourced. Roof materials would be standing seam metal on the pitched roofs, and membrane on the flat roof. A green roof had been considered for the flat roof, but it was decided that environmental and aesthetic benefits would be marginal, given the extra cost. We urged the team to specify one of the more environmentally benign, PVC-free membranes. There will be planar glazing on the front elevation, and window frames will be timber faced with aluminium.

The Panel welcomed the efforts that had been made to introduce daylight into internal corridors. We would like to see this extended to include the ground floor corridor in the south wing, using end windows or sunpipes. The proposed heating system will be gas fired, ground source heat pumps and biomass having been ruled out. The Panel strongly urged the team to reconsider the use of biomass, especially as there was a local source of fuel supply close by. We pointed out that the fuel container could be stored underground, in a similar way to a septic tank, and the fuel pumped into the boiler as required. In our experience the costs of biomass technology are falling rapidly and the efficiencies are increasing. It was clarified that solar water heating panels only are included [not solar electric] and we supported that choice. We pointed out that the east and west facing windows, as well as the ground floor south facing windows, may need protection from overheating and glare.

The Panel welcomed the decision to open up the culverted stream, and create an attractive 'naturalistic' public space in front of the building. We thought the new bridge could be an attractive focal point and should be enhanced with appropriate planting. Care should be taken to ensure that any railings on the bridge were well designed and not visually intrusive. It was confirmed that rainwater collection from the building will be routed to the wetland area rather than the main drainage system. The team stated that landscape architects would be brought into the team to help develop the strategy.

The Panel was concerned that the location of consulting rooms directly adjacent to the approach to the main entrance might give rise to privacy issues, if the windows were opened for ventilation. The team acknowledged

that this could be a problem and planned to use planting outside the windows to protect patient privacy.

The Panel thought that there was still work to be done on simplifying the two main forms and making them read better together. We observed that the relationship between the internal plan and the external form was not fully resolved. In particular, the structural steelwork required within the reception space is not yet detailed and will have a major contribution to the visual appearance of the space. The effect of this structure on the space below is likely to be negative unless the opportunity is taken to maximise lightness and openness, and deliver the design concept in a pure form. We noticed a similar lack of detail in the ventilation strategy, for example how and where the intake air would enter the building.

The Panel asked the team at what stage in the project development they had been informed of the requirement to consult DCFW. The developer stated that this had happened relatively late in the process, but he thought they had achieved a better building as a result. There were also problems with site acquisition that had caused delay.

Crynodeb/Summary

The Panel thanked the team for their positive and constructive response to our previous comments. We think that the resulting design development has improved the scheme, and that relatively minor issues remain to be resolved:

- We would like to see all internal corridors well daylit, preferably by windows in end walls, but failing that by using sunpipes.
- The impact of structural elements on the atrium space needs to be resolved.
- We support the sustainability strategy, including solar thermal panels and sustainable drainage. However, we strongly urge the team to reconsider the advantages of installing a biomass boiler.
- We think that the whole elevational treatment, especially the areas of stone walling, should be re-evaluated in terms of the cost plan and the importance of ensuring quality of materials and detailing throughout.
- Any stone used should be compatible with existing stone used in the locality.
- We support the reinstatement of the wetland and the 'naturalistic' landscaped public space. However, it is important that a landscape architect is involved as soon as possible to develop the design, and this should include the resolution of public/private space outside ground floor consulting rooms.

Diwedd/End

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