

## **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.

# Design Review Report

## **Review status**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Meeting date	Thursday 6 <sup>th</sup> June 2013
Issue date	Thursday 13 <sup>th</sup> June 2013
Scheme location	Plot L Land at Porth Teigr, Cardiff
Scheme description	Residential Phase 01 (Plot L)
Scheme reference number	78F
Planning status	Pre-planning
Declaration of interests	None recorded

## **Consultations to date**

The developer and team confirmed that two pre application meetings had been held with Cardiff Council officers to discuss the proposals. The developer and two members of the design team had also attended a pre design review meeting with DCfW in early April 2013 as part of the preparation for the June Design Review.

## **Summary**

The Panel thanked the team for the in depth material that was submitted ahead of the review and was very encouraged by the ambition of the scheme, the design detail of which had developed considerably since the pre review meeting in April. The Panel congratulated the client on this bold scheme and their commitment to delivering design quality.

Notwithstanding our support for the scheme, there were some specific points raised by the Panel during the review:

- The design development of two key buildings, the 4 storey corner block overlooking Roath Basin and the 7 – 8 storey block adjacent to the Swing Bridge and their relationship with the ground were now becoming increasingly important to define. Their relationship to the overall development was not yet fixed and design detail for these buildings needs to be as inventive as the emerging design for the proposals for the whole Plot.
- The public spaces within the proposal and their relationship to the developing detailed design of the buildings needs to be reviewed to ensure spaces are maximised, overlooking is adequate and the spaces do not form green areas as they are 'left over' after planning buildings. Of particular concern was the 'pedestrian underpass'

leading to the dock edge from the internal street. Access to the wildflower area proposed adjacent to the swing bridge should be facilitated if possible with Associated British Ports (ABP).

- The Panel acknowledged that the detailed design of the internal layouts was ambitious and still under design development. Whilst the design team reassured the Panel that they complied with Building Regulations, there were a number of detailed issues to be resolved e.g. Bedrooms at ground level abutting shared space, outward opening bedroom doors, sliding doors adjacent to the pavement of a main road etc.
- Whilst understanding that the viability constraints for residential schemes are very challenging in the current economic climate, a move towards a more varied mix of affordable housing should be considered.

### **Discussion and Panel response in full:**

The site forms part of the Porth Teigr Master plan, this plot is the northern area, a rectangular site of 13,000m<sup>2</sup> with a scheme of 117 housing units proposed. The site slopes approximately 2m from the road level to the dock edge and the design team are currently finalising the agreed finished floor levels in discussions with flood levels to be confirmed with the relevant authorities.

The design team outlined their aspiration for this residential development to feel like an urban development and their approach to design development focussing on the importance of the macro (the buildings, public realm, routes and sense of place) and the micro scales (design components, inhabitation and views). The concept strategy had evolved through developing a response to the site and site analysis combined with a density and capacity study for the site.

The proposal is a dense development of townhouses, low rise apartments, affordable homes and community facilities. The height of development has been arranged forming a three and four story perimeter protecting the internal blocks of two storeys. There is a four storey block at the western corner of the development overlooking Roath Basin and a 7 – 8 storey block to the east of the site adjacent to the swing bridge. Parking has been calculated at 1 car space per house. Site circulation has taken people, cycling, cars and parking as the hierarchy with identified zones discretely designed through the use of materials within the public realm.

Responding to the site topography and levels to be manmade to accommodate the proposed flooding level, whilst providing a constraint this has been embraced as an opportunity with an attractive relationship of building to dock edge emerging. The development proposals have also been tested against the microclimatic conditions of the site and have maximised a response to orientation and passive design providing south facing principal glazed spaces.

The energy strategy for the development is a fabric first approach with a highly insulated external envelope, low service requirements and good air tightness. Igloo stated sustainability was an overarching approach to their work of sustainable investment and that they have a Footprint policy of investment. This scheme whilst not 100% 'Passivhaus' will

achieve an AECB Silver Standard and will achieve Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 + Ene1, aspiring to achieve a level 4 with EPC ratings B and Air tightness tests during the course of delivery. Igloo also stated that they were aiming for Building for Life Diamond status.

The public realm is an extension of work already implemented and under implementation within the master plan, providing a combination of specific public spaces (a copse, an orchard and a wildflower area) and a structure of tree planting within the public realm and parking areas. The treatment of the dock edge and highway edges extends the design detail already provided within the master plan. A public art strategy is being incorporated into this work through an integrated strategy

It is envisaged that the community who may inhabit the development will take a lead from the creative industries being encouraged in the master plan and will target 'next steppers' and 'empty nesters'.

The team emphasised that the brief was still fluid and much of the work tabled at the review was diagrammatic with design development ongoing.

Overall the Panel felt the scheme development was very positive and were encouraged that the client was investing in adequate design time to allow the team to develop the richness and complexity of the scheme. The design team acknowledged that the project programme submitted with the review material was overly optimistic in assuming a planning submission in June 2013. It was also useful to understand that the client was already in discussions with agents and contractors to ensure viability and deliverability.

Since the design review preparatory meeting the panel acknowledged that the team had undertaken a comprehensive site analysis including context and environmental aspects in addition to the design development. There was discussion around precedents and both the Accordia scheme in Cambridge and Dutch urban housing were considered as appropriate comparators in terms of quality. Finishes whilst not yet determined were aligned to those demonstrated on these schemes with the use of masonry and brick discussed.

The relationship of the built form to the dockside, views to the corner blocks and the block to the rear of the site adjacent to the swing bridge were considered to be the most important in terms of the next detailed design development to resolve. These important larger blocks were as yet undefined and needed the inventiveness in detail that the more traditional housing proposed had revealed.

The panel were encouraged to hear that the arts strategy was included as an integrated package with the public realm, though there was concern that the green spaces being created in this plot were not adequate in terms of size and planned as they were 'space left over' after planning the buildings. It would be useful to understand how this design development of public realm and open space fitted into the strategy being delivered within the overall master plan to understand the network of green spaces/planting proposed.

The use of district heating was discussed and the team revealed that they were currently exploring options via the Veolia/Eon scheme to see if it was feasible to distribute heat from the adjacent facility in the Docks. They were aware of Eon entering into discussions with

other buildings in Cardiff Bay, but it was not yet clear if there would be enough demand from this first residential plot.

The viability of the overall proposal and the relationship to delivering various Section 106 contributions and affordable housing was discussed. Igloo confirmed that they were currently proposing to become engaged with the new 'Bellerophon' model being piloted by RCT homes to deliver their affordable housing contribution.

**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.**

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

## **Attendees**

Agent/Client/Developer	Mark Hallett Igloo Regeneration
	Chris Loyn – Loyn & Co Victoria Coombs – Loyn & Co Kirsty Barker – LDA Design Richard baker – Bay Associates Tim Crozier Cole – Verco
Design Team	
Planning Authority – Cardiff County Council	Apologies - No attendance
Welsh Government	John Kaseras
<u>Design Review Panel</u>	
Chair	Wendy Richards
Lead Panellist	Michael Griffiths Simon Carne Angela Williams