

Addroddiad Adolygu Dylunio Design Review Report

DATGANIADAU O DDIDDORDEB

Mae gofyn i aelodau o'r panel, arsyllwyr a phartïon perthnasol eraill ddatgan unrhyw ddiddordebau sydd ganddynt **ymlaen llaw** mewn perthynas â'r eitemau Panel Adolygu Dylunio Bydd unrhyw ddatganiadau o'r fath yn cael eu cofnodi yma ac yng nghofnodion canolog Comisiwn Dylunio Cymru.

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Panel members, observers and other relevant parties are required to declare <u>in advance</u> any interests they may have in relation to the Design Review Agenda items. Any such declarations are recorded here and in DCfW's central records.

Statws adolygu/Review status

Dyddiad cyfarfod/meeting date Dyddiad cyhoeddi/issue date Lleoliad y cynllun/scheme location Disgrifiad y cynllun/scheme description Statws cynllunio/planning status

Datganiadau o ddiddordeb/declaration of interests

Public

None

21st September 2011 28th September 2011 Picket Mead, Newton Preswyl/residential Application submitted May 2011

Adran 1/part 1 Cyflwyniad/Presentation

The proposal is for 4 detached houses in the grounds of Picket Mead House and within the Newton conservation area. A previous application for 5 houses on this site was refused in July 2010 and an appeal upheld the committee decision. Since then the number of units has been reduced, building heights reduced and garden space between dwellings increased. The client is committed to a high quality, contemporary design.

The site has a favourable southerly orientation with sea views from some upper floors, and a mature landscape setting. An existing stone boundary wall gives a sense of enclosure. The site layout, with steel railings between various walls and buildings, allows glimpses through the development and fosters a sense of social connectivity and security.

The dwellings will meet the statutory minimum standard of CSH Level 3+, and may exceed it. Passive solar gain and fabric performance will be optimised and special attention paid to air tightness and cold bridging. The houses are designed to allow for future adaptation to suit the changing needs of the occupants. The palette of materials includes timber, stone and 'anthrazinc' sheet cladding. The existing Picket Mead house will be refurbished.

The LPA representative stated that they support the principle of development on this site. Although it is not listed, Picket Mead house is now rightly recognised as the dominant structure. All the mature trees on the site have TPOs. The LPA is content with the contextual response of the proposed built forms, but seeks guidance on the detail and the important view from the common land to the north.

Crynodeb o'r prif bwyntiau a gododd o'r drafodaeth, i'w darllen ochr yn ochr ag Adran 2 yr adroddiad hwn.
Summary of key points arising from discussion, to be read in conjunction with Part 2 of this report.

The Panel thanked the presenters for the comprehensive material provided. We welcomed the architectural language and the contemporary design approach, and we think that minor issues remain to be resolved. In summary:

- The building design and site layout is a good response to the context and respects Picket Mead as the dominant building on the site.
- Landscape and separation distances are well considered, and walls and railings are used intelligently to protect private spaces while encouraging visual connection and social interaction across the site.
- We are pleased to note the retention and reinforcement of the planted boundary, and the maintenance and repair of the existing stone wall.
- We think that the view from the north and the relationship of House 1 with the stone wall has been well justified.
- We have concerns about the impact of Houses 3 and 4, in terms of size, form and materials.
- We think that the use of anthrazinc cladding and its impact on the conservation area context, has not been fully justified and suggest that the LPA be provided with a material sample.
- Issues concerning the internal layout and fenestration need to be reconsidered in terms of consistency across the site and daylighting.
- We thought that a scheme of this status should be setting sustainability standards that are higher than the statutory minimum and we would urge the client to commit to Code Level 4.
- We welcomed the built-in flexibility of the design but urged the developer to ensure that the necessary information was passed on to future residents.
- We suggest that the architects are retained beyond RIBA Stage D, to ensure that the required quality of detailing is realised in the finished buildings.

Adran 2/part 2 Trafodaeth ac Ymateb y Panel yn Llawn Discussion and panel response in full

The Panel appreciated the sensitive landscape treatment, the retention and repair of the existing stone walls, and cultivation of the sense of an 'internal world', which still maximises views to the south and across the site. We think that the general arrangement of the site around two courtyards, and the contemporary design approach, works well in this setting and does not detract from the quality of the conservation area.

The house on plot 1 sets the architectural language and dominates the important view from the north across the common. We had some initial concern about the height of this elevation and the impact of the dark coloured cladding on the north and east elevations. After some discussion we accepted that, with the width of the building reduced, the extent of metal cladding limited, and the development of a more layered facade with some vertical timber elements, these elevations were appropriate.

With regard to houses 3 and 4 to the east of the site, these appear as very large blocks and the Panel thought that their impact would be increased by the proposed dull black finish and the monopitch roofs. It was accepted that the dark cladding on the long elevations was generally used in conjunction with large expanses of glass and/or timber, allowing the elevations to become lighter and more transparent. The architect stated that they have used the anthrazinc material previously, on Pennard House, and were very satisfied. Although we acknowledged that views into the site from the south and east were very limited, and that planting on the south boundary would be reinforced, any deciduous screening would be much less effective in the winter.

The Panel questioned the arrangement and relationship of the master bedroom with windows and corridors, which established a certain pattern for the first two plots, but was not carried through to plots 3 and 4. In some places this leads to rather narrow corridors. The architect explained their aim was to create 'accidental' undetermined spaces, such as window seats within corridors, and to establish different identities for each of the bespoke dwellings. Nevertheless, we thought that for houses of this size and prestige, all WCs should have openable windows and we noted that the study/office area was not well daylit.

The view out of the master bedroom appeared to be obstructed by the raised upstand which provides a greater height internally and facilitates future flexibility. In fact this upstand will be obscured by an opaque wall at lower level.

The Panel welcomed the passive approach to low carbon design, and the commitment to maximise fabric performance. We thought that insulation levels could be enhanced even further, and urged the team to consider the space implications of a Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) system. The

Panel urged the client to commit to achieving Code Level 4, which we thought would enhance the market value of the properties.

Provision should be made for future renewable installations such as solar thermal or electric panels, but these would be unlikely to be building-mounted given that the monopitch roofs all face north. The architect explained the intention to open up the building to the south and lower the roofs to respect the existing house and public open space to the north. The LPA officer pointed out that in view of the nature of the site, permitted development rights for micro-generation would be removed.

Fenestration to the north is very limited and, given the current availability of very energy-efficient glazing systems, it will be important to optimise daylighting for north facing rooms, particularly the office space.

In terms of the potential for future adaptation of the houses, which is presented as a major design driver and presumably a marketing benefit, it will be important to ensure that sufficient and accurate information is provided to occupiers in such a way that it will be available and understandable to future inhabitants.

The Panel suggested that alternatives to grasscrete should be explored, as a permeable surface treatment.

Mae Panel Adolygu Dylunio Comisiwn Dylunio Cymru a'r staff yn croesawu rhagor o ymgynghoriad, a bydd yn hapus i ddarparu rhagor o adborth am yr adroddiad yma a/neu lle bo'n briodol, dderbyn cyflwyniadau pellach. Diolch am ymgynghori â'r Comisiwn a chadwch mewn cysylltiad â ni os gwelwch yn dda ynglŷn â hynt eich prosiect. A fyddech gystal â'n hysbysu o ddatblygiad eich prosiect. Diolch yn fawr am ymgynghori â'r Comisiwn.

The Design Commission for Wales Design Review Panel welcomes further consultation and we will be happy to provide further feedback on this report and/or where appropriate, to receive further presentations. Please keep us informed of the progress of your project. Thank you for consulting the Commission.

Mae copi iath Gymraeg o'r adroddiad hwn ar gael ar ofyn. A Welsh language copy of this report is available upon request.

Atodiad 1/appendix 1 Mynychwyr/attendees

Asiant/Client/Datblygwr Agent/Client/Developer Carrington Moore Estates

Pensaer/Dylunydd Trefol

Hyde + Hyde Architects (Kay Hyde,

Architectural/Urban Designer Kristian Hyde, David Schnabel)

Ymgynghorwyr/Consultants n/a

Trydydd Parti/Third Party n/a

Y Panel Adolygu Dylunio/ Design Review Panel

Cadeirydd/Chair Wendy Richards
Swydog/Officer Cindy Harris
Prif Banelydd/Lead Panellist Chris Jones
Michael Griffiths

Ashley Bateson

Sylwedyddion/Observers Richard Wood (Newport CC)

Laura Costa (Newport CC)