

NB. This report was confidential when it was seen at pre-application stage and relates only to the version seen at that stage. It has been made public since press and media coverage in March 2012

Addroddiad Adolygu Dylunio Design Review Report

DATGANIADAU O DDIDDORDEB

Mae gofyn i aelodau o'r panel, arsyllwyr a phartion perthnasol eraill ddatgan unrhyw ddi-ddordebau 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 declarations are recorded here and in DCfW's central records.

Statws adolygu/Review status

Cyfrinachol/Confidential

Dyddiad cyfarfod/meeting date	March 14th 2012
Dyddiad cyhoeddi/issue date	March 27th 2012
Lleoliad y cynllun/scheme location	Cardiff Pointe, Cardiff Bay
Disgrifiad y cynllun/scheme description	Preswyl/residential
Statws cynllunio/planning status	Cyn gwneud cais/ pre-application
Datganiadau o ddi-ddordeb/declaration of interests:	Glen Dyke declared that his employer Davis Langdon tendered unsuccessfully for the project management of this scheme. He remained in the review as an observer only.

Adran 1/part 1

Cyflwyniad/Presentation

The proposal is for a residential development of 560 units on the site of the International Sports Village (ISV) in Cardiff Bay. The grid layout has been designed to be visually porous and physically permeable, with views protected across the peninsula. Houses are used to define streets, and apartment blocks signify nodes and corner points. The main spine road runs east/west and a broad green avenue runs north/south. The intention is to create a calm, rhythmic and measured architecture, with brick, zinc and glass as the only facade materials.

The local authority representative stated that their initial response to this proposal was generally positive. Several issues remain to be finalised such as affordable housing and public open space. A full, detailed application is expected within the next month.

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 hear that this proposal will be submitted as a full planning application, but we thought that much more detailed information would therefore be necessary. While we support the high level of ambition for this project and the grid layout in general, we think that major issues remain to be resolved. In summary:

- A detailed planning application should include more substantial information on the public realm strategy as a whole including parking, street frontages and public spaces. The nature and quality of the public realm should be fixed at this stage.
- A landscape architect should be appointed as soon as possible.
- An alternative parking strategy should be explored which builds in flexibility and variety of provision, makes better use of the streets as public spaces, and reduces the degree of integral garages and gated rear courts.
- We would like to see more small scale commercial/retail uses included, and we think that the River Ely frontage could constitute a different 'offer' from the ISV.
- A 5 metre minimum width should be maintained for the waterfront promenade wherever possible, and any balustrading should be as unobtrusive as possible.
- We have no objections to the two tall buildings, provided that the ground floor relationships are well resolved and that the height and massing works with the rest of the ISV to deliver a coherent skyline.
- Further work is needed on the street layout to the south west to provide good enclosure, and on the way end buildings 'turn the corner' and meet other blocks.
- The green avenue should accommodate a direct route along its length, as part of the route round the whole Bay. A pedestrian crossing at the junction with the spine road should ensure that pedestrians and cyclists have priority.
- The sustainability targets are welcomed along with the proposal for a central district heating system to serve the whole site.
- It will be important to maintain design quality in changing and challenging circumstances, to ensure that the proposed mix of uses remains viable, and to build in future flexibility for changes of use.

Adran 2/part 2

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

The Panel was surprised but reassured to learn that the forthcoming application would be detailed, rather than outline as suggested in the pre-review material. We were informed that a public realm strategy will be included with the planning

application and we expect this to demonstrate a clear street hierarchy, as well as more information on the character, quality and use of spaces. The nature of the Central Square and how this will function as a successful public space also needs to be clearly demonstrated, especially if residents' privacy at ground floor is respected. In our view the fundamentally important aspects of this proposal relate to the public realm and include street frontages, active ground floor uses, and parking.

The architect stated that the only non-residential uses would be located in the plaza between the two tower blocks. Given the context of the ISV and the number of large supermarkets close by, these might include a gym facility, cafe/bar, and small retail units. The Panel suggested that other locations might be viable, such as the River Ely frontage, which would have a different offer to the ISV. In any event, ground floor units should be built with generous floor to ceiling heights to allow for future conversion to commercial use.

The Panel questioned what the character of the rear parking courts would be like and how they would interface with adjacent rear gardens. Although there was some natural surveillance from adjoining houses, these parking areas would only be used by residents of the corner apartment blocks. The multi storey car park is reserved for residents of the two towers and the Panel questioned whether this would be acceptable to prospective residents.

Typically, garages and parking spaces will dominate street frontages, and so reduce the possibility of street activity. Although the architect stated that planted trees and grilles would deter excessive frontage parking, we thought this would be inevitable given the lack of specific visitor parking. Furthermore we felt that the garage doors would have a deadening effect on the public realm. We would like to see alternative and flexible parking strategies explored, integrating on-street parking with possibilities for more active uses at ground floor level and reducing the degree of rear parking courts.

The client is about to appoint a landscape consultant and we thought this input was urgently needed. In general a lot more detailed information is required on the nature of the proposed public spaces, including the waterfront. For example we questioned the appropriateness of tree planting along the waterfront in terms of character and movement. This would have a minimum width of 3.5m, extending to 5m in places, with predominantly hard landscaping and (hopefully) minimal balustrading. We stated that a minimum 5m width was preferable to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists on a shared path, and we agreed with the architect that balustrading should be avoided if possible. There will be an upstand from external ground level to internal ground floor level, to protect privacy while allowing for some visual relationship between inside and out, and we stressed that this upstand should be no more than 0.5m. The future of the existing projecting boardwalk is uncertain, as it belongs to the local authority and is outside the remit of this development.

Further detailing is needed on how buildings 'turn the corner' to address the public realm on two elevations. For example, the corners on the south eastern side of the green link need to interface with the space whilst emphasising that the main

pedestrian and cycle route runs through this space. It was agreed that the street layout in the south west part of the site was unresolved and needed further work. We suggested that the waterfront at this point could accommodate a proper street with active uses and car access/parking.

The Panel noted that the north/south green avenue will be part of the route round the Bay for pedestrians and cyclists, and should therefore include a direct path and prioritised crossing point with the spine road.

The Panel welcomed the commitment to achieve Code Level 4 for all dwellings, along with the 'fabric first' approach to low carbon development. The proposed central district heating system would be an efficient system for heat generation and distribution, and we were pleased to know that the necessary pipework will be included in the infrastructure phase of works. Affordable housing will be provided off site, at a ratio still to be agreed with the local authority. The developer of this site will contribute towards the funding of the new ice rink.

The two tower blocks are justified partly by reference to the inherited consented scheme. They are seen as appropriate visual markers and as compatible with other developments surrounding the Bay from long distance views. The Panel found the relationship of the proposed new hotel with the north western tower to be problematic. (This was shown for the first time on the day of the review as part of the contextual model). While we accepted that the hotel was part of a separate scheme and was not yet the subject of pre-application discussions, it was nevertheless relevant as the immediate context for the scheme under review. The interface between the two buildings at ground floor is very important and there is no real information on the nature of this relationship. The Panel thought this should be clarified prior to any consent being given and that the two schemes needed to be considered together.

The Panel understood that the developer would be contracting out the construction of the dwellings under licence to residential developers once planning consent had been gained, and we were concerned about how this process might affect design quality. It will be important to identify what is fixed as part of any consent and therefore must be delivered. It was suggested that house types and architectural language would be fixed, and we thought that the public realm strategy should be firmly embedded in any detailed consent. We understood that phasing would begin from the south west (even though this is the least well resolved part of the plan) and finish with the towers. The spine road will be completed at an early stage in order to maintain access to the yacht club.

DCfW is a non-statutory consultee, a private limited company and wholly owned subsidiary of the Welsh Government. The comment recorded in this report, arising from formal Design Review through our Design Review Service, is provided in the public interest for the consideration of local planning authorities as a material consideration, and other users of the Design Review Service. It is not and should not be considered 'advice' and no third party is

bound or required to act upon it. The Design Review Service is delivered in line with DCfW's published protocols, code of conduct and complaints procedure, which should be read and considered by users of the service.

***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	Helium Miracle 101
Pensaer/Dylunydd Trefol Architectural/Urban Designer	Scott Brownrigg (Neil MacComish)
Ymgynghorwyr/Consultants	Neame Sutton (David Neame)
Trydydd Parti/Third Party	n/a
Awdurdod Cynllunio/Planning Authority	Cardiff CC (Lawrence Dowdall)
Y Panel Adolygu Dylunio/ Design Review Panel	
Cadeirydd/Chair	Alan Francis
Swydog/Officer	Cindy Harris
Prif Banelydd/Lead Panellist	Steve Smith Simon Carne David Harvey
Sylwedyddion/Observers	Glen Dyke (DCfW) Kate Cabbage (RSAW) Katie Weston (CC Swansea)

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.