Turning to Plot 2, the design for this building did at least benefit from being slightly more modest than that for Plot 1, however, ultimately it suffered from similar weaknesses. More specifically, the Panel felt that the design was incoherent and ungraceful, with excessive emphasis placed on the internal arrangement, to the detriment of the overall design. As with Plot 1, the Panel felt that a more refined, sensitive and contextual approach was required.

The criticisms outlined above concerning the design of the two buildings is all the more pertinent when considering the visual relationship between the two, and their interface with the public realm. The Panel felt that the overall effect of the buildings when seen in conjunction would be overpowering, and intensify the weaknesses in the design of each. In addition, their close proximity and the extensive site coverage in the form of ancillary buildings meant that there was virtually no naturally occurring or open space around the buildings. Indeed, the overall site planning involved an excessive emphasis on 'hard' elements, which intensifies the uncompromising appearance of the buildings and the unsympathetic relationship with the public realm.

In the light of the above, the Panel called for a much more refined, coherent and sensitive approach, both in respect of the design of the individual buildings and the visual relationship between the two, but also in terms of their site planning and interaction with the public realm. This needs to involve a more contextual approach, involving a more considered understanding as to how the buildings will relate to important public viewpoints.

WINCHESTER WITH EASTLEIGH DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting: 18.10.2012

Site: Plots 1 and 2, Land to the rear of Nightingale House, Beach Lane, Netley Abbey.

Proposal: Construction of detached three storey dwelling with two storey detached dwelling in each plot, with associated outbuildings.

Planning reference: C/12/71414 and C12/71416

Design Review Panel Members sitting on the Panel: Jeremy Poll (Chairman), Rodney Graham, Gary Seymour, John Hearn.

Council Officers in attendance: Andrew Rushmer (minutes), Gary Osmond, Julian Davies

Item presented by: Representative of Chris Edmond Associates

Declarations of Interest declared: None

Comments:

The Panel have fundamental concerns about the quality of the design of each of the buildings, the amount of development proposed and also the visual interaction between the two buildings as well as their relationships with the public realm.

In relation to the proposed design for Plot 1, the Panel felt that the combination of forms and articulation of the building, combined with the scale and massing resulted in an overpowering, incoherent and inelegant composition. Moreover, the building seemed to be a collision of different architectural ideas, with the result that the building had no overarching design rationale. These problems were exacerbated by the extent of site coverage, and very 'hard' nature of the boundary treatment. Furthermore, the relationship with the public realm was virtually non-existent. As a result, a much more refined, cohesive and contextual approach was required both in terms of the design of the building itself and its relationship with the public realm. The Panel also considered that the site was overdeveloped, and were extremely concerned by the lack of clarity concerning the external finishing materials, as the materials need to be high quality, and ought to be an integral part of the design.