

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
NOTES OF MEETING - 29 May 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:

- Marcus Beale
- Sir Duncan Michael
- Tony Michael
- Clare Murray
- Shahriar Nasser
- Michael Whitwell
- Beatrix Young

Council Officers Present:

- Paul Garrett
- Paul McGarry (Chair)

Councillors Present

- Simon McGrath
- Hayley Ormrod
- David Dean

Members of the Public Present (item 2 only)

- Mike Holloway
- Sara Sharpe
- Eve Cohen
- Tara O'Connor

Declarations of Interest

- Marcus Beale declared that for Item 3, he lived close to the application site. This was declared to Panel members and the applicant. No objections were raised.

Notes:

Item 1: Pre-Application, 17/P4234, YMCA, The Broadway, Wimbledon

Item 2: Application, 17/P1957, **188-194 The Broadway**, Wimbledon

The Panel noted that there had been some changes since the previous review. They felt that 6 storeys was appropriate and welcomed the set-back in the elevation at ground and first floor. The building appearance however, did not have any contextual relevance to Wimbledon. The panel recommended that applicant look to older buildings in Wimbledon where there was more consistency in materials and forms to provide meaningful design cues for new development. Given that this was at application stage, the Panel were particularly concerned that, when questioned, the applicant seemed to have little idea of what materials were to be used and how they were to be composed, and that the building was very poor in its basic architecture.

The Panel noted that the front of the building was mostly glass and south facing, and that the rear was north facing yet had extensive privacy screening. This suggested a confused approach to solar shading and lighting. This was so to the extent that the deep plan ground and first floors were almost totally reliant on natural light only from the south elevation. Generally the office plan was quite deep. This created increased reliance on mechanical lighting and ventilation and was a direct consequence of the design decision to build across the whole site. The panel felt that there was an over reliance on mechanical loading and that as a consequence the G-value of the glazing was not as low as it ought to be.

There was particular concern from the Panel regarding daylight and sunlight issues, overshadowing of adjacent sites and the building relationship to the neighbouring YMCA site. It was noted that the applicant had been encouraged to work with the YMCA and the Panel also endorsed this. It was felt by the Panel that the building design was so uninformed by its context with regard to these issues that the neighbour could have a legal case to prevent it being implemented. These issues needed to be clarified and resolved outside the planning process. The Panel also noted that the building still had one core only and that there needed to be an appropriate evacuation and firefighting plan.

The Panel felt that the changes made were quite minor in respect of the range of key issues that remained to be resolved. It was suggested that setting the building back from the rear boundary, by just 2m would enable a far better design to be evolved, but this opportunity had not been taken. The Panel felt that the design was not sufficiently developed to be viable and showed little chance of having any elegance.

VERDICT: **RED**

Item 3: Pre-Application, no number yet, **27-39 Hartfield Road**, Wimbledon