

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

NOTES OF MEETING Tuesday 26th May 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:

- Tony Michael
- Matthew Pendleton
- Nicholas Waring

Apologies

- Marcus Beale

Panel Members Not Present*

- Councillor John Bowcott (Chair)
- Terry Pawson
- Tim Snelson
- Nicola Theron

* Due to an administrative error regarding the date of the meeting, four Panel members were not present. The meeting continued with three Panel members and three officers. Due to this, absent Panel members comments have been taken into account following the meeting, and have been incorporated into these notes.

Officers Present:

- Paul Garrett: Physical Regeneration Team
 - Tom Procter: Contracts & School Organisation Team
 - Eben van der Westhuizen: Development Control
-

Item 1: 09/P0653 (OUTLINE), APPLICATION, Wimbledon Chase Primary School

This Item was brought to the Panel to discuss the suitability of the siting of the proposed school extension, prior to a detailed planning application being submitted in June.

There was general support for the chosen location of the extension, which partly replaces existing brick-built single storey temporary classrooms. It was felt that the building was a suitable distance from surrounding housing and the general boundary of the site. There was some discussion on why the building was not proposed to be sited within the existing envelope of the building (i.e. immediately to the west of the existing building). It was explained that was an existing playground that related to the adjacent classroom.

The main concern expressed was that the design and extent of the building footprint should not disturb the symmetry of the western and southern elevations of the current school building. The main drawing (showing indicative internal layouts) showed that the new building did abut the building directly in a way that would disrupt this elevation, however other indicative drawings showed that it did not. It was considered that this needed to be clarified and resolved successfully, with more detail on how the new building would integrate internally, and relate to the overall functioning of the school.

VERDICT: GREEN

Item 2: NO NUMBER ALLOCATED YET, PRE-APPLICATION, 41-47a Wimbledon Hill Road

Pre-Application scheme – minutes confidential

Item 3: NO NUMBER ALLOCATED YET, PRE-APPLICATION, Birches Close, Mitcham Cricket Green

Pre-Application scheme – minutes confidential

Item 4: 09/P0577, APPLICATION, Manor House, 230 London Road, Morden

Proposals for this site were reviewed by the Panel on 28th January 2008 and 19th November 2008. Due to the complex nature of the site, proposals and its constraints, and that the design has been evolving in response to Panel advice, it was appropriate to review the proposals for a third time.

The main recommendation of the Panel previously was to relocate the sunken garden away from the original house. This has been done in the new proposals and was welcomed by the Panel members as a significant improvement that greatly improved the setting of the original locally listed building. Some concern was still expressed about the amenity quality of the basement rooms, despite their being south facing and that further work needed to be done to show that this was an acceptable approach in terms of the way in which the rooms were to be used and how much freedom residents would have to spend time in other parts of the home.

It was felt that the detailed design of the roof garden needed a little further work to ensure it related better to the formal elevation of the original building and that the new western wing may benefit from some minor alteration to better relate it to the formal garden.

Some concern was expressed that the generally pastiche approach to the extensions, though not objected to in principle, could appear bland if not detailed to a high quality. However it was felt that issues such as brickwork detailing, window reveals and designs, roof materials, decorative features etc. could and should be of a high quality and dealt with by planning conditions. There was some concern about the massing of the new roof forms and that this would benefit from further refinement, possibly by constructing a model. The importance of high quality landscaping was stressed as being integral to the development as a whole and that this also needed some further specialist work and should be subject to planning conditions.

Overall the Panel were supportive of the proposals.

VERDICT: GREEN