

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

NOTES OF MEETING Wednesday 22nd July 2009

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:

David Breen
Councillor John Bowcott (Chair)
Tony Cain
Tony Edwards
John Fyfield
Terry Pawson
Sally Warren*

* Did not attend item 1 due to declared conflict of interest

Apologies

- Tony Michael

Panel Members Not Present*

- Marcus Beale
- Kirsten Jeske

Officers Present:

- Paul Garrett: Physical Regeneration Team
 - Paul McGarry: Physical Regeneration Team (item 1 only)
-

Item 1: 08/P2315/NEW PRE-APPLICATION, Brenley Playing Field

Pre-Application scheme – notes confidential

Item 2: 09/P1330 APPLICATION, Spur House, 14 Morden Road

The Panel had no issue with the broad approach taken to redeveloping the site and the general layout and design and architecture, as well as form and

massing, which they generally supported. Comment and discussion centred mainly on a few issues of more detailed design, detailed below.

The Panel noted how the service bay had been designed to incorporate the existing roof profile, with a drum for the turntable area, but asked whether this could be reduced in height. Whilst it was noted that the servicing arrangements were an improvement on the current situation, the Panel were concerned that there may be no compulsion to use the turntable and that vehicles may choose simply to use the street. It was felt that there needed to be suitable controls to prevent this, either through suitable means such as through S106, planning conditions or legal agreements.

Whilst the Panel appreciated that the increase in height took the building to a similar height as existing communications equipment on the roof, and that the proposal included a GRP enclosure for new equipment, they were concerned that adequate measures were put in place to prevent proliferation outside this enclosure such as through S106, planning conditions or legal agreements.

There was general discussion on the architectural approach to the main building, the Panel agreeing that the detailing was an improvement on the existing building. The only point on which the Panel took issue on the design was with regard to the balconies on the east (main road) elevation. The architectural approach meant that the arrangement of the balconies could make the otherwise disciplined elevation look 'messy'. It was also considered that due to the unpleasant and noisy environment caused by the busy road, that balconies would become unused by people and simply get used for washing, cycles and other detritus, and that this could severely undermine the appearance of the building. It was recommended that the applicant investigate both how this issue could be addressed and the potential for putting balconies on the west elevation as well.

Regarding the rear, Milner road element to the scheme, the Panel noted how elements of the design related to the adjacent houses. However, they felt that the two residential entrances were rather lost in the elevation of other more utilitarian elements and should be made more attractive and prominent. The Panel also felt that, when viewed from along Milner Road, the flank wall of the proposed three-storey building made a stark and abrupt contrast with the two-storey and pitched roof form of the existing adjacent house. It was felt that this transition had not been thought out well and that windows on this elevation had simply been 'plonked there' to add interest. This part of the proposals needed further work to manage this transition better.

Whilst there were not in-principle objections to the scheme, the Panel felt there were a few issues that needed addressing before it warranted a green verdict, but that these should be able to be satisfactorily addressed.

VERDICT: AMBER

Item 3: 08/P1256/NEW, PRE-APPLICATION, 85-86 High Street, Wimbledon Village

Pre-Application scheme – notes confidential