

(P81 see history)

(P12 main proof dates)

43

Could we have the elevation of Block B or C, drawing numbers 203 or 205, either will do, but they'll be more useful than the Nutter Lane street scene as they're a larger scale.

Hello Mr Wood. Now it is no secret that the CRA believe that Art Deco isn't appropriate for this site, but I doubt there is anything to be gained from discussing that point, so I would like to ask you about some specific design issues of Blocks B&C please.

Would you agree that the main defining characteristics of Art Deco include:-

- strong vertical and horizontal lines ✓
- a central tower with side wings
- symmetry and repetition of features
- curves, if present, are large radius
- finish is uncluttered, ie large plain areas
- small materials pallet, almost to the point of being minimalist

Good, Google and Wikipedia will be pleased, now is there any other big design element you think I've missed?

OK, so looking at Blocks B and C we see that at first glance they tick many of these boxes. However, some features seem out of place and so I would like you to explain them to me.

Firstly the lift shaft. To me this seems to ruin the symmetry and its penthouse motor room seems out of place. Could you therefore tell me why it wasn't hidden from view at the rear of the staircore?

If we're lucky enough for him to say, "that is the only place it would fit" or something like that, then we can say "it sounds like you would have preferred it located elsewhere, is that true?". If we get nothing useful then we just move on.

Secondly the balconies. Now I realise balconies on Art Deco properties are not impossible, one only has to look at the Shrubberies to see that, but my research shows they are quite rare, <sup>they are certainly not a defining characteristic</sup> they are customarily inset, rather than cantilevered and always of a heavyweight construction, again as with the Shrubberies. <sup>where they are included</sup>

So if balconies are not that common for Art Deco, why have they been included here when they <sup>clearly</sup> obviously complicate the facade?

Again if we're lucky enough for him to say "so we needed less amenity space" or "so we could get more money for the property" or something like that, then we can say "so function outweighed form and you had to compromise the design".

If we do not get a nice answer we move on to say...well I don't agree with that, but I'll move on.

So if balconies had to be incorporated why not follow a more traditional Art Deco look and make them inset or of heavyweight construction, ie why the cantilevered lightweight metalwork approach?

Turning to the linear nature of Art Deco and this comes through quite strongly on the staircore and on the rear facade with four main patio doors per floor. But wouldn't you agree that the horizontal lines on the front facade are quite weak with two different heights for the patio doors and the small windows? What about the vertical lines with the main staircore and entrance door windows not lining up?

I would now like to ask you about curves and Art Deco. Like balconies, curves are not always present in Art Deco buildings, but when they are included, again as with the Shrubberies, they become a consistent theme of the whole building. For instance the buildings corners and even windows are curved. Wouldn't you agree that there is something of a 50/50 approach in these blocks with the curved staircore, but square building corners?

My final issue regarding the blocks relate to the materials proposed. All the Art Deco buildings I have seen often feature just two main materials, ie the glazing and the render. Sometimes decorative lines are introduced into the render, often in a textural sense but sometimes, again as with the Shrubberies, with a painted colour to highlight the horizontal and vertical lines. Either way the materials palette remains tiny. Can you therefore explain how you think your design succeeds when it incorporates brick, render, glass and metalwork?

You'll be glad to know I have no questions regarding Block A, but as Block A is basically the same between Schemes 2 and 3, I am sure I'd get told off if I did. So moving on to the houses, could we have a Gloucester Road plan, preferably one showing the existing houses at No.10 and 12 and the street scene drawing.

37 in DW  
5 in DW

as has been established

~~I believe I am right in saying that~~ whilst the scheme 3 houses are your design, the scheme 2 houses are a legacy from the previous architect, is that correct?

\* mention depth of old houses  
DW said 16m, sketch 21 has 18m

If he mentions that the CRA did the design for scheme 3 in any way, we can say "well thanks for that, but all we did was draw up some sketches, the designs you turned them into are far superior"

✓ spirit of the case  
integral garages

OK, would you agree that the pair of houses on the far left, Houses 1 & 2, presented the greatest problems due to the size of their relative plots?

✓ Do you agree that the position of these houses as close to the road as they are is an effort to maximise the garden space and that as a consequence TPO1 has had to be removed?

✓ Would you also agree that as a consequence of moving the house as a whole forward, the garage section of the house has had to be stepped back to permit sufficient depth for the off street parking space.

✓ OK so we now have a house design compromised by various factors specific to their plots and of course those problems are then multiplied by duplicating the same design for houses 3-6.

✓ We see from the street plan however that houses 3-6 do not line up with houses 1-2 and in fact 3-4 and 5-6 do not line up either. Would you agree that this misalignment is again as a result of TPO trees forcing those houses further back?

X Don't you think it would have been better for the original architect to have initially designed Houses 5-6 where their plots are larger, then duplicated that design down to Houses 1-4 and if necessary have made Houses 1&2 a bit smaller to reflect their smaller plot size? *ie constant plot ratio*

7.1.7  
in proof

Now we've heard throughout this inquiry that Nutter Lane has a somewhat eclectic look as an argument for a contrasting design for Blocks B&C. If that argument is to be accepted, would you agree that the flip-side argument is also true, ie where an existing road has a regimented standard design, then new development should follow that look?

So in addition to it being more appropriate to build in keeping properties, would you also therefore agree that the building line of such a road is more important?

Therefore, would you not agree that the staggered building line presented by the scheme 2 houses, not just as a whole street but also in themselves with the stepped back garages, is not ideal.

To finish off, we heard on Tuesday in Mr Hicks cross examination that he believes the scheme 3 houses are superior to those on scheme 2. So I won't get told off for asking about scheme 3, let me put my question to you in this way, "do you concur with Mr Hicks view that the scheme 2 houses are inferior?"