

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

NOTES OF MEETING 22 November 2018

Agenda and notes (where appropriate) can be viewed at the Council's website at:

<http://www.merton.gov.uk/living/designandconservation/designreviewpanel.htm>

Panel Members Present:

- Councillor Linda Kirby (Chair)
- Jon Herbert
- Tim Long
- Tony Michael
- Shahriar Nasser
- Juliette Scalbert
- Michael Whitwell

Apologies

- Cordula Weisser
- Vinita Dhume

Council Officers Present:

- Paul Garrett

Councillors Present

- Councillor David Dean
- Councillor Simon McGrath
- Councillor Nigel Benbow

Members of the Public Present

- Eve Cohen (Item 1)

Declarations of Interest

- None

Notes:

Item 1: Application, 18/P3787, **271-273 The Broadway**, Wimbledon

The Panel noted that the proposal was clearly an intensification of the site, but that it was exhibiting a number of signs of over development, where the design was showing signs of not working as well as it should, with detrimental effects on quality. In terms of massing, the panel felt that a consistent 4-storeys across the majority of the site would have an over-developed feel from the surroundings. It was suggested that 4 storeys were appropriate for the frontage but that it should perhaps be lower, further back into the site.

The building was sited close to the south boundary and would have an impact on the development potential of this site. The panel were concerned this may be contrary to the council's planning policy. To the east there were a number of issues the panel felt needed to be better resolved. The most important was the character and security of the access alley. This had a multitude of access needs, including to the rear of the properties on Merton Road, two parking spaces, the need for a refuse vehicle to enter as well as the retail servicing and main residential entrance.

The Panel felt that the eastern boundary was quite complex in form and appearance and did not present a very coherent form. Also, that it did not necessarily need to follow the alignment of the existing building. This was seen as constraining the design and also not allowing a more relaxed and responsive form to be developed. The Panel did also discuss the relative merits of whether the building should be set back from the existing footway edge to make the building feel less overbearing on the street.

None of these issues it seemed, had been satisfactorily resolved to create an attractive entrance to the new flats. Issues included whether there was sufficient space to accommodate a refuse vehicle below the overhanging oblique windows and the fact that the bin store entrance was visible from the street but the main residential entrance was not. It was suggested these were swapped to make a better, clearer entrance. There was also no landscaping scheme for this important space. The Panel suggested it should be security gated. It may also be necessary to obtain consent from the landowners for permission to build the projecting oblique windows of the communal yard.

Internally the panel were concerned about a number of issues. All entrances to the flats needed a 300mm leading edge yet none were provided – this could significantly impact on internal layouts. There were some units that had bedrooms accessed from living rooms which was not a good layout. There were north-facing recessed balconies that could lead to poor levels of internal light and a number of the canted windows were small and would let in poor levels of light.

The residential core was deep in the building and could be quite dark and a means of getting light in here was recommended. It was also noted there was no communal amenity space and it was felt that roof space could be used for this, possibly in the centre of the building. The location of the cycle parking in the basement was questioned as being not very convenient and it was suggested they could either be on the ground floor or accommodated in the flats. It was suggested that the basement could provide storage for the residential units as well as the shops.

The Panel also asked about the number of wheelchair accessible units there were, whether they required parking spaces and how the dwelling size mix reflected the councils housing policy. The Panel were generally happy with the materials palette and welcomed the local contextual analysis. They felt that the variety of lintels was interesting but perhaps unnecessarily varied and that the adjacent William Morris building provided a number of design cues.

Overall, there were a number of issues that suggested the building needed to be reconfigured in order to 'relax' the design and ensure it related more comfortably to its neighbours.

VERDICT: **AMBER**

Item 2: Pre-Application, 18/P3571, **33-39 Upper Green East**, Mitcham

Pre-Application – Notes Confidential

Item 3: Pre-Application, 18/P2998, **265 Burlington Road**, Shannon Corner

Pre-Application – Notes Confidential