



DESIGN  
COMMISSION  
FOR WALES  
COMISIWN  
DYLUNIO  
CYMRU

# Design Review Report

Land north east of Marine Parade,  
Broad Haven

**DCFW Ref: N98**

Meeting of 6<sup>th</sup> August 2020



**Review Status**

Meeting date  
Issue date  
Scheme location  
Scheme description  
Scheme reference number  
Planning status

**PUBLIC**

6<sup>th</sup> August 2020  
10<sup>th</sup> August 2020  
Pembrokeshire  
Residential  
N98  
Pre-application

## Declarations of Interest

---

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

None declared.

## Consultations to Date

---

DCFW were consulted on proposals for this site in February 2016. Since then the site area has changed and a new design team has been appointed.

## The Proposals

---

The proposal is for circa 77 residential dwellings that will form an extension to the east of the settlement of Broad Haven. A new access road is proposed from the B4341 entering the site to the east. Footpaths, swales, and off-site storm water attenuation are also proposed.

## Main Points

---

DCFW welcomed the opportunity for further consultation on this site following previous early engagement. It was positive to see that previous comments regarding the awkward shape of the site have been addressed and the pinch point has been eliminated by extending the land area of the proposal, allowing a much greater opportunity to consider the layout of the site in response to the setting.

The design considerations and development were well presented in the review and provided a much clearer and more comprehensive story as to why the current layout is proposed than the material submitted prior to the review. We encourage the design team to use the diagrams and succinct summary of key points from the presentation in the future design and access statement to convey this process. Overall, the proposals have developed positively, and the layout is beginning to fit well into the landscape, but some aspects, summarised below, need further consideration and resolution.

**Corridors across the site**

Several north-south corridors are currently proposed across the site with different purposes including footpaths, roads and ecological corridors. There would be merit in

reviewing the intended purpose of each of these and ensuring they are required and addressing the needs of the different uses in terms of their priorities. We have concerns about the footpaths running to the rear of properties at the western edge with very little natural surveillance as these could feel unsafe and may attract anti-social behaviour.

Consideration should be given to the routes that people will be walking and the purpose of these journeys (e.g. to get somewhere directly or to walk the dog) to ensure that the footpaths are in the right place and of the right nature. There may be merit in combining the pedestrian routes with the shared space streets which could save some space and allow better resolution of level changes, space for boundary treatments (such as the boundary hedge banks) and the introduction of more soft landscape features in these areas. If the footpath is to be combined into the westerly shared space street it may be appropriate to remove or reorient the property at the north end of the street to allow views and improved pedestrian connectivity through to the open space beyond.

The need for a buffer, a wildlife corridor and some separation from the existing properties to the west could be accommodated without a footpath although access may be required for maintenance of this area.

### **Highways**

We are supportive of the proposed informal nature of the internal streets, using the buildings to define the spaces rather than the carriageway dominating. This must be discussed with the local authority highways department to further develop the design. As an important aspect of the character of the development it is critical that the design intent of these spaces is not eroded. We encourage the Local Planning Authority planning and highways departments to work with the design team to establish a feasible solution for adoption, however, if this proves to be a challenge, a management company may need to be pursued as an alternative to adoption.

Further detail is needed on the shared spaces to ensure that there is sufficient space for parking, movement of cars, bin lorry and delivery access, pedestrian movement and some defensible space or threshold to the front of properties. This may be in the form of small front gardens, planting or a change of material to support a greater sense of ownership and opportunity for community interaction within the street.

In contrast to the shared spaces, the access road is very heavily engineered. Whilst we appreciate the need to address the sloping site, the curved nature of the road does create a series of awkward spaces between the road and houses with back gardens and parking courts. Further work should be undertaken to look at the character and alignment of the route and its relationship to the buildings and spaces.

### **Arrival**

The orientation of properties addresses the streets in most places but the point where the access road meets the spine street should be looked at again as this area has back gardens and parking areas facing on to the street. Reconsidering courtyard one and two and their relationship with the spine road could help with this. Similarly, further detail and sections should be used to test the horizontal and vertical relationship between the access road and the properties in the north east corner of the site.

### **South west corner**

The south west corner of the site needs further consideration to resolve the parking arrangement, footpath connection, public and private spaces, and fronts and backs.

### **House types**

Some positive moves have been made to revise the materials palette, but further rationalisation and simplification would help. We are not convinced by the stone cladding to window surrounds and the two storey grey bays. A more rational approach such as addressing building plinths, associations with level changes, key corners, bin storage, porches (see below) and relationship to boundary hedge banks would be more appropriate.

Further consideration of the environmental performance including renewable energy is needed. Passive House Standard may be an appropriate aim for the properties on this site.

While we did not address the internal layout of properties in detail the plans suggest that many of the units have front doors opening straight into the living area. Given the exposed location of the site a porch or hallway would be more appropriate to help reduce heat loss.

Bin storage and collection should be considered and designed in at this stage. Similarly bike storage either within individual properties or the public realm should be designed in.

### **Management and maintenance**

There is potential for the maintenance of the spaces in the development to become a complicated mix of the local authority highways and SABs, a management company and private individuals. The more this can be simplified and coordinated the better.

### **Affordable housing**

It is encouraging to hear that the affordable housing provision will be tenure blind. It must respond to local housing need and not be concentrated within an enclave within the development.

### **Next Steps**

We encourage the team to undertake further pre-app discussions with the LPA and begin discussions with highways in earnest. When undertaking public consultation, it will be important to explain the vision and development of the design based on the constraints and desired character. The western boundary is a particular area to resolve through discussions with the LPA and through public engagement.

We would welcome a further review of the proposals prior to an application being submitted.

**Comisiwn Dylunio Cymru Design Commission for Wales is the trading name of DCFW LIMITED, a Private Limited Company established under the Companies Act 1985 and 2006, Company No: 04391072 incorporated in England and Wales as a wholly owned subsidiary of the Welsh Government. Registered office: 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Cambrian Buildings, Mount Stuart Square, Cardiff CF10 5FL T: 029 2045 1964 E [connect@dcfw.org](mailto:connect@dcfw.org). 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

---

Client:	Raymond Raymond, Neeb Holdings Roger Raymond, Neeb Holdings
Design team:	Phil Branton, Wincer Kievenaar Staszek Stuart-Thompson, Wincer Kievenaar Miriam Kemp, Landscapes of Change Mike Uruski, UTC Associates
Planning consultant:	Richard Sykes-Popham, Rapleys LLP
Local Planning Authority:	Kate Attrill, Pembrokeshire Coast NPA Sarah Hirst, Pembrokeshire Coast NPA
Chair:	Andrew Linfoot
Lead Panellist:	Jen Heal
Design Review Panel:	Kedrick Davies Jonathan Vernon-Smith Efa Lois, Place Advisor, DCFW