

South Cambridgeshire District Council

Design Enabling Panel

PANEL MEETING REPORT – FOLLOW-UP DESKTOP REVIEW BY DEP MEMBERS*

Scheme:	Construction of a new dwelling in the open countryside outside the village development framework. A "Paragraph 79 dwelling" under the ' <i>National Planning Policy Framework</i> ' (2019)
Site address:	Land adjacent to Mill Farm, Fowlmere Road, Melbourn, SG8 6EZ
Status:	Full planning application ref: 20/03105/FUL
Date:	Thursday 17 December 2020
Venue:	The DEP meeting was conducted online via Microsoft TEAMS due to Covid-19
Time:	15:30 – 17:00

***This desktop review focused on the '*DESIGN REPORT Volume 4 STAGE 1 DOCUMENTATION*' submitted by the applicant on 14 December 2020 in response to the comments raised at the last DEP meeting on 19 November 2020.**

Panel Members

Simon Carne (Chair) – Director, Simon Carne Architect
 David Gibson – Director, David Gibson Architects
 David Gunn – Senior Architect, Adamson Associates (Submitted written comments prior to the desktop review as he was unavailable for the meeting)
 Nicolas Tye – Director, Tye Architects Ltd

Local Authority attendees

Dr. Bonnie Kwok, Principal Urban Designer & DEP Manager
 Tom Davies – Urban Design Officer (Urban Design)
 Jane Rodens – Senior Planning Officer (Case Officer)
 Dean Scrivener – Senior Planning Officer (Case Officer)

Background information

Timothy Poulson is client and architect for the proposed NPPF Paragraph 79 house located on a site that is part of a site that adjoins his house. The architect has lived on the site since it was purchased in the 1990s. The site contained a number of buildings, one of which has been converted and sold. The Mill Farm itself consists of the remains of original agricultural buildings, greatly enlarged with a steel framed extension designed by Timothy and constructed in 2005. The proposed NPPF Paragraph 79 house was reviewed by the DEP on:

- 27 September 2018

CONFIDENTIAL

- 28 February 2019
- 8 August 2019
- 19 November 2020

At the DEP meeting on 19 November 2020 (4th independent design review), there was general agreement amongst the Panel that the scheme was close to an endorsement, but it had not cleared that bar yet. The applicant was asked to provide further information in relation to the construction details of the proposed dwelling focusing on the following areas:

- 1) Sensitivity to the site topography
- 2) Element of surprise and theatre
- 3) Orientation and shading
- 4) Rigour, symmetry and simplicity
- 5) The winter garden and circulation
- 6) Mobility and Lifetime homes
- 7) Corten steel justification
- 8) Integration of water elements

This fifth DEP meeting is carried out in the form on a desktop review with the aim of assessing the additional information submitted by the applicant in response to the above areas raised by the Panel.

Summary

In summary, the Panel believe that the design now reaches the standard required to satisfy Paragraph 79 (e) of the '*National Planning Policy Framework*' (2019).

Detailed comments

Minor issues of detail discussed included:

- Access for maintenance of the roof areas
- Ventilation of void under suspended concrete floor
- Airtightness generally in relation to windows doors and rooflight
- Surface water drainage interception and filtration (Corten panel run-off and vehicles)
- Cold bridging from rainscreen through to metal frame wall system
- Location of penetrations through walls
- Access covers on horizontal surfaces

The design seeks precision and rigour which must be carried through to the details. The Panel are confident that the architect/client will seek and can deliver the highest standards of design detail.

One important aspect of the design is the intention to provide a continuous CorTen surface as described on Page 11 - Drawing MH208. Whilst none of the Panel are expert in the detailing of

CONFIDENTIAL

CorTen and Panel Members acknowledge that the proposed use of specialist suppliers and fabricators, there are concerns that the very tight tolerance of 1-2mm to accelerate the fusion process may prove problematic should fusing lead to further movement of the panels. The Panel believe it would be preferable to express the junctions to allow for movement between panels. On the very large freestanding panels, the Panel would prefer to see two joints rather than one.

The well-researched system of assembly will be critical to the successful delivery of the concept. The Panel recommend that a full-size trial panel should be erected with the complete external wall build up detailing to demonstrate the robustness of the concept. This could be imposed as a condition on a planning approval.

Ends

Note: *Please note that these comments are informal opinion of the Council's Design Enabling Panel and relate to the design aspects of the proposals. The comments are produced for discussion purposes only with the applicant. The views expressed will not bind the decision of Council members should a planning application be submitted, nor prejudice the formal decision-making process of the Council.*