

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

NOTES OF MEETING Tuesday 27th November 2012

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 John Bowcott (Chair)
- Marcus Beale
- Tim Day
- Tony Edwards
- Sir Duncan Michael
- Tony Michael
- Terry Pawson

Council Officers Present:

- Paul Garrett

Apologies

- Jon Herbert
- Andre Sutherland
- Nicola Theron

Declarations of Interest

- Marcus Beale declared an interest in that he had previously bid for the work being considered at Item 1. Both the Panel and the applicant did not consider this warranted his absence from the meeting.
 - Tony Edwards declared an interest in that he was currently bidding for work for Kings College School, and absented himself from Item 1.
-

Item 1: 12/P0856/NEW, Pre-Application, **Kings College School – Science Block**

Pre-Application – Notes Confidential

Item 2: 11/P3437, Application, **153-161 The Broadway**

The mood of the Panel was generally very positive towards the proposal and the way the applicant had responded positively and constructively towards previous advice from the Panel. As a result it felt that there had been a number of distinct improvements to the proposal.

A question was raised about how the various elements of the façade related to each other. It was noted that these elements worked better. An example was how the hotel entrance had been simplified and its glass front related well to the glazed stairwell and glazed first floor restaurant elements. The changes created a better distinction between the uses – the circulation, ground floor bar and accommodation parts of the building.

It was noted that to successfully place a hotel next to offices was challenging in achieving an interesting façade. However the cladding was much improved and a subtle busyness had been captured in the façade with the recent changes. The way depth had been added to the main elevation was applauded. This was in particular contrast to the original very monolithic design.

Whilst the glazing element turned the corner well at the eastern end, it was felt that floor to ceiling glazing might raise privacy issues and that there was some scope for continuing the front elevation design around the corner, particularly as the adjacent building may remain undeveloped for some time. The rear elevation was also considered much improved, with the revised stairwell design and the landscaped entrance to the car park.

A point was raised regarding the mis-match in the blue/green coloured accent cladding. It appeared green on the sample but blue on the drawings. The Panel responded positively to the blue on the drawings but was not opposed to the green. It felt that the final decision on the actual accent colour should be taken on-site and it was therefore important to condition any planning approval accordingly. The Panel was unanimous in its verdict.

VERDICT: **GREEN**