

## DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

### NOTES OF MEETING Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> September 2013

---

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)
- Tony Edwards
- Alistair Huggett
- Sir Duncan Michael
- Tony Michael
- Nicholas Waring
- Sally Warren

#### Council Officers Present:

- Paul Garrett
- David Leed

#### Apologies

- Andre Sutherland
- Nicola Theron
- Marcus Beale

Notes:

---

#### **Item 1: Pre-Application, Rose Cottage, 101 Hamilton Road**

Pre-Application – Notes Confidential

---

#### **Item 2: 13/P2320, South Park Gardens Pavilion**

The Panel noted the sensitive location and extensive consultation the applicant had undertaken both with the park Friends and local residents. However, it felt that it was important to have a clear vision brief for the site and stick to it, otherwise it could end up being 'designed by committee' to a lowest common denominator, and end up being a disappointing compromise. To this end, the applicant should not be afraid of doing what it feels is right for

the site. Overall, the Panel felt that the park needed the proposed pavilion and welcomed it.

The Panel noted that trees would be lost and that they should be replaced elsewhere in the park. The Panel supported the idea for a kiosk, seating area and bringing all the uses into one building. There was some disappointment that the glazed canopy was no longer proposed over the seating area.

This related to the Panel's main criticism. This was that the seating area was facing east, under a canopy, and there were essentially no windows inside the building other than the frontage when the shutter were up. It was felt that this would lead to a cold and poorly lit area to sit in, and would not take advantage of the summer weather well.

It was strongly recommended that some or all of the seating should have a southerly aspect. This could be done by facing the building further south, but could equally be done by reconfiguring the internal layout of the building as proposed. Potential concerns by residents about noise from café customers needed to be addressed but also be realistic. This was not felt to become a serious issue. Reconfiguring the internal layout for this reason could also lead to general improvements in the internal layout and better surveillance.

Another main issue the Panel noted was the proposed 3-part shutter that would occupy the whole frontage of the building when it was closed. Although it was envisaged the pavilion would be in use during park opening hours, in reality, the kiosk would unlikely be open all the time the park was open. Therefore the closed shutters would be prominent to people using the park and it was important these were visually attractive and not utilitarian.

The Panel were strong in their opinion that this was a critical part of the design that needed to be got right, and certainly needed further design development. It was felt that the shutters must be an integral part of the building design and it was suggested that when shut, they should display some kind of artwork, such as a painting, mural or other similar design.

The Panel noted the design based on a stainless steel frame and welcomed this. It was also sympathetic to the need for a robust and low maintenance design, but not at the expense of quality. To this end it felt that the proposed plastic composite cladding was a very poor choice and strongly recommended against this. It felt that the best alternative was to use brick, possibly in blue. This was cost efficient, robust and could have climbing plants grow up it if desired to deter vandalism and graffiti.

The Panel also felt that it was important that when closed, the pavilion did not sit in darkness. It should be visible to show its attractiveness and it should also be lit to deter anti-social activity. This could be done subtly and not necessarily with floodlighting. Overall the Panel were very pleased to see the proposal for the pavilion.

**VERDICT: AMBER**

---

**Item 3:** Pre-Application, **YMCA, 200 The Broadway**

Item withdrawn at applicant's request.