

## DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

### NOTES OF MEETING 4 April 2019

---

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)  
Marcus Beale  
Tony Edwards  
Alistair Huggett  
Shahriar Nasser  
Sophie Medhurst  
Cordula Weisser  
Beatrix Young

#### Council Officers Present:

- Paul Garrett
- Ann Clarke

#### Councillors Present

- Councillor David Dean (Item 1)
- Councillor Rebecca Lanning

#### Members of the Public Present

- Mark Gale (filming Item 2)

#### Declarations of Interest

- Marcus Beale stated he was involved in proposals for the nearby Burn Bullock PH. No objections were raised by panel members.
- Tony Edwards stated he had in the past (6 years ago) worked with one of the scheme architects. No objections were raised by panel members.

Notes:

---

**Item 1:** Pre-Application, 19/P0717, **Former Mitcham Fire Station**, 30 Lower Green West, Mitcham

Pre-Application – Notes Confidential

---

**Item 2:** Application, 18/P2216, White Hart PH, 350 London Road, Mitcham

The panel felt this was a good, well thought through proposal. It was considered an appropriate solution to the site and the panel welcomed its contemporary design and appearance, which it felt was appropriate for its proximity to a listed building. It had its own character but respected what was around it and a good justification was offered for the roof design. It was a good urban infill scheme.

The panel had a number of detailed points but its main concern related to the central space between the pub and new building. It was questioned whether there were any examples of residential buildings that were accessed via a pub garden. Whilst there is another entrance, it was considered this would be the quickest pedestrian route in and out of the site. The panel were concerned about how this space would be managed and whether the proposed residential amenity space and pub garden next to each other were compatible without visually intrusive acoustic screening. The panel felt the 'agent of change' principle was relevant in this respect and may be suitable for a planning condition.

It was felt that the pub garden activities could make the amenity space an unattractive place to use particularly in relation to privacy, noise and smells, and that to fully mitigate this would require a high solid wall, which would then undermine the attractive open feel of the space. There was some suggestion the amenity space would have a civilising effect on the pub garden.

This was an important issue that needed resolving and acoustic advice was needed. An alternative suggestion was to bring the new building closer to the pub to create an urban mews square which was fully public and use space created to the rear of the new building for the communal amenity space for the flats. This would however, alter the relationship with the listed pub building.

Internally it was felt that the entrance in the undercroft felt like an afterthought and it should be much better laid out. This followed through on the upper deck levels where there were bedrooms directly onto decks. It was felt that the decks could be widened to provide some defensible space and that internal arrangements could be improved in a number of respects.

At the top of the building the stairwell and lift shaft punched through the roof form in a rather prominent and brutal way. Although this provided some good juxtaposition to the angled roof form, it was felt that it did need some softening and there was also scope for introducing glazing to bring light into the stairwell.

At the rear of the building it was felt that there needed to be clear and strong management to police the mix of access rights and parking provisions and to demonstrate vehicles could get in and out of the site conveniently and that the pub delivery would work properly.

There was some concern by the panel that the application did not propose anything for the pub and they questioned the applicant on whether they were committed to

reopening the pub, rather than demonstrating its unviability then converting it to residential use at a later date.

VERDICT: **GREEN**

---

**Item 3:** Pre-Application, 19/P0313, **former Kwik-Fit Garage**, 360-364 London Road, Mitcham

Pre-Application – Notes Confidential

---

**Item 4:** Pre-Application, 19/P0227, **Car Wash, 370-374 London Road**, Mitcham

Pre-Application – Notes Confidential