

## DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

### NOTES OF MEETING Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2010

---

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)
- David Breen
- Tim Day
- Tony Edwards (absent for Item 1)
- Gary Elliott (absent for Item 2)
- Tony Michael
- Nicola Theron
- David Whitestone

#### Apologies

- Marcus Beale (presenting Item 2)
- Alistair Huggett
- John Priestland

Note: Due to conflicts of interest Tony Edwards absented himself from Item 1 and Gary Elliott absented himself from Item 2. Marcus Beale also absented himself from reviewing Items 1, 3 and 4, as he was attending as an applicant presenting Item 2.

#### Council Officers Present:

- Paul Garrett: Regeneration Team
  - Sue Wright: Development Control, North Team Leader
  - Sabah Halli, Development Control, Planning Officer, North Team
- 

#### **Item 1: 10/P0055/NEW, PRE-APPLICATION, Atkinson Morley Hospital**

#### **Pre-Application – notes confidential**

---

**Item 2: 10/P2316, APPLICATION, 120-122 Home Park Road**

The Panel spent much time discussing the architectural approach to this building, and how the three elements of it related to each other. In general it was felt that the rear of the building worked much better than the front, though it was acknowledged that the stepping back of the elevation and slope of the site, as well as the frontage vegetation meant there would be no single view of the whole elevation.

Whilst the applicant described the approach as two book-ends (with pitched roofs) framing a more modern central section that was the focal point of the house (internally and externally), the Panel felt that it was perhaps more like a press, with the ends squeezing the central section, and thereby undermining its ability to be read as the main part of the house. It was also felt that the two gable ends facing each other across the centre did not link too well with each other.

A number of suggestions were made regarding the relationship between the three elements of the house and how it could be addressed, including roof forms, internal arrangements, position of the entrance and main staircase, materials and the roof forms. The relationship between the three elements of the house was the crux of the success of the house and what essentially determined the verdict. It was felt that this required further thought and that the concept needed to either be developed and strengthened, or perhaps re-thought. Given the nature of these discussions, there was however, no inherent criticism of the architecture or its quality.

Regarding other aspects of the scheme, the Panel noted the level of thought and detailed design that had gone into the setting of the house, the landscaping and the design of the gardens and were supportive of this approach with only a few minor comments. A range of sustainability measures were noted and welcomed, but it was felt that these really needed to be distilled into clear figures for CO2 reduction and which Code Level would be achieved.

**VERDICT: AMBER**

---

**Item 3: 09/P0827/NEW, PRE-APPLICATION, 77-91 Hartfield Road**

**Pre-Application – notes confidential**

---

**Item 4: 10/P2037/NEW, PRE-APPLICATION, 108 Home Park Road**

**Pre-Application – notes confidential**