

Addroddiad Adolygu Dylunio Design Review Report

DATGANIADAU O DDIDDORDEB

Mae gofyn i aelodau o'r panel, arsyllwyr a phartion 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 ***in advance*** any interests they may have in relation to the Design Review Agenda items. Any such declaratons are recorded here and in DCfW's central records.

Statws adolygu/Review status

Public

Dyddiad cyfarfod/meeting date	16th November 2011
Dyddiad cyhoeddi/issue date	23rd November 2011
Lleoliad y cynllun/scheme location	White Lion, Penymynydd
Disgrifiad y cynllun/scheme description	Preswyl/residential
Statws cynllunio/planning status	Planning application submitted
Datganiadau o ddiddordeb/declaration of interests	None

Adran 1/part 1

Cyflwyniad/Presentation

The site is allocated for residential use in the Flintshire draft UDP, which has been approved for development control purposes. A previous application for 115 dwellings was refused in 2005. This application is for 85 mainly detached, 4/5 bed houses.

An existing pond will be retained on the south eastern part of the site within a 1.5ha area for newt mitigation and wildlife habitats. An area of unallocated land to the east is proposed for use as a LEAP, public open space and wetland area. An existing footpath running north/south across the site will be retained but diverted through the scheme and away from the wildlife area. Sandstone from existing walls on site will be re-used as entrance features on the two new vehicular entrances from Mold Road (A5104) and Penymynydd Road.

The local planning authority representative commented that the site topography rises in the centre around some small rock formations and along the line of the

existing footpath. A diversion of this footpath would tend to deny public access to the small wood and wildlife area.

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 was pleased to review this scheme although we would have preferred to see it at pre-application stage. We understand that the proposal is an evolution of previous schemes, which may have influenced its development negatively. We think that major issues remain to be resolved. In summary:

- A more integrated design approach is necessary, which links the landscape with the houses and makes best use of the site assets such as the ecological features, ensuring that the buildings respond to the site and context.
- The site layout lacks a strong rationale and does not respond to solar orientation or to the principles set out in Manual for Streets.
- A more bespoke approach to house design and sustainability performance could add value and help create a distinctive sense of place.
- The site analysis should include more information about the immediate context, connections, and views into and out of the site.
- The straight line of the existing footpath should be retained and public engagement with the wildlife area should be encouraged, even if direct or uncontrolled access is impossible.
- The reference to dual fronted houses facing Mold Road is not appropriate and the existing hedge should be retained.
- Ideally, the position of the access road off Mold Road should be reconsidered as part of a thorough review of the development approach to the site.
- The design of the entranceways should be refined to signal their gateway function and the quality of the development.
- The quality of the public realm should be enhanced, and the nature of external spaces demonstrated through 3D images.

Adran 2/part 2

Trafodaeth ac Ymateb y Panel yn Llawn Discussion and panel response in full

The Panel thought that there was no design rationale for the site layout, which appeared random and arbitrary. There is no particular response to solar orientation and passive gain in the layout of streets and buildings. The dwellings face away from the key landscape features of the site, which we thought should be better exploited as a visual asset as well as a wildlife habitat. The proposed green areas should be integrated within the development as a whole, rather than being treated as a backland area with no public access and therefore vulnerable to neglect and the accumulation of rubbish. If houses could front on to these spaces, they would be

better used and cared for as a valuable asset for the whole site, even if public access had to be limited given the requirements of CCW. This arrangement would also give the buildings a better, south facing orientation.

The Panel understood that site maintenance would be passed to a management company and eventually to the residents. We thought this was all the more reason to ensure that green areas were well integrated and protected, in order that all residents contributing to their upkeep could also benefit from them.

With regard to the line of the footpath, the Panel agreed with the local authority that it should not be diverted through the housing, but should form part of the landscape open space strategy, following the original line past the newt-protected area or in close proximity to it, even if direct access to this area was not possible.

The Panel agreed with the developer that the location of the site, with good links and accessibility, its natural features and views out, made it special and desirable. We thought this distinctiveness should be emphasized in a more bespoke design approach, rather than a reliance on a generic, pattern-book architecture. Similarly, the sustainability standards could be enhanced beyond the statutory minimum, and potential buyers of these properties may well be attracted to the additional environmental benefits and reduced running costs. Although the developer stated that large detached houses were what the market required in this location, we thought that a greater variety of house types and sizes would give more resilience for the future and greater scope for more interesting street scenes.

The proposal for 'dual fronted' houses facing Mold Road is not relevant in this context where there is an existing high hedge in good condition. In this case it should be accepted that back gardens will lie behind the hedge and rear facades will face the road. An enhanced landscape corridor with tree planting abutting Mold Road could form part of the landscape proposals. Effort should be spent on ensuring that the main entrances have a good quality of landscaping and materials, appropriate to their 'gateway' function. The design of the entrances should be refined to avoid garage doors and large areas of hardstanding adjacent to the entry points, and rear vehicular access for houses fronting the entrances should be considered.

The Panel was informed that the position of the main entrance off the A5104 was agreed with highways officers as part of an earlier scheme, and would relieve pressure on the existing Mold Rd/Penymynydd Rd junction. We accepted this but suggested that moving this access point further east would offer the opportunity for a longer and more interesting street scene within the site, whilst still providing safe and acceptable access arrangements.

Although Manual for Streets is referenced in the Design and Access Statement, there is no indication of how the principles in this document have been included and interpreted in this scheme. The predominance of cul-de-sacs does not promote permeability and legibility, and we think that a revised development strategy for the site could avoid their use altogether. Greater clarity is need for the types and nature

of external spaces that are proposed. Streets and squares will require different approaches and surface finishes will affect the overall quality. 3D views of street scenes including parking arrangements would be useful in conveying a sense of place.

In general, the Panel was convinced that the success of the scheme would depend on a sensitive integration of the buildings with the landscape. While the developer viewed the existing ecology as a major constraint, we thought this should be used as an opportunity for developing a distinctive place. The site analysis should extend beyond the site boundaries to show, for example, how footpaths connect to the wider community, and from which point on site the view of the church spire is framed.

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	Redrow Homes NW (Paul Sinclair, Victoria Murray) Elan Homes (Paul Darwin)
Pensaer/Dylunydd Trefol Architectural/Urban Designer	TEP (Graeme Atherton, Narada Haralambous)
Ymgynghorwyr/Consultants	n/a
Trydydd Parti/Third Party	n/a
Awdurdod Cynllunio/Planning Authority	Flintshire CC (Glyn D Jones, Jerry Spencer)

Y Panel Adolygu Dylunio/
Design Review Panel
Cadeirydd/Chair
Swydog/Officer
Prif Banelydd/Lead Panellist

Alan Francis
Cindy Harris
Kedrick Davies
Chris Jones
Jonathan Adams
Jonathan Hines

Sylwedyddion/Observers

Various from Flintshire CC