

Paul Garrett

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 April 2020 14:55
To: Paul Garrett
Subject: 25th March DRP Comments

Hi Paul,
Here are my notes.
Hope all make sense.

London Road -

Much improved on previous pre-app and welcome the changes to the footpath width, entrance and core definition. The naturally lit and ventilated corridors are an asset to the scheme and the treatment of the GF retail unit is successful.

It would still be beneficial to see the design in context with the adjacent proposed development – context elevations would be incredibly helpful and don't think it should be given a final verdict until these have been shared as there is so much change occurring along this stretch of road that the schemes should be assessed in a cumulative way.

- At GF the access to the end unit around the accessible bays is awkward so perhaps could be re-explored.
- The relationship of the westerly unit/s and how they relate to the garden of the adjacent existing property could also be explored further. Perhaps some screening or a change to the orientation of the small window and large first floor balcony would be beneficial to the scheme.
- The balcony of the 4th floor plan is heavy and perhaps could be stepped in on the Broadway Gardens edge to align with the mass below to reduce the heavy overhang. This comment also applies to the equivalent heavy overhang adjacent to the Peek a Baby party wall.
- It would be an asset to the scheme if it could pick up on some of the datum lines from the adjacent building. The east and south elevations highlight this quite well. The current design floor and window levels understandably sit at different heights but at the same time this could mean that the building appears out of sync with the rest of the street character and could be visually uncomfortable - if the parapet / balcony designs could reflect some of these key lines which define the rest of the streets it would help the architectural language of the scheme knit it in with the existing streetscape in a much more coherent manner.

Hard to review the plans at the scale submitted.

Amber

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Paul Garrett

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 March 2020 18:02
To: Paul Garrett
Subject: DRP 25.03.2020

Hello Paul,

Hope all is well and the IT for remote working is OK. [REDACTED] is a bit patchy but on the whole the IT staff have done some pretty amazing work in getting us all up and running.

A few comments regarding the applications predominantly around the transport issues as others will have more to say about the designs.

360-364 London Road:

- All the previous iterations of this scheme had off road servicing and disabled parking which is preferable. Not sure why they've changed as it doesn't seem to provide any real benefits apart from an extra 37m2 to the retail unit.
- Delivery via a recessed bay on London Road, right by the traffic lights isn't acceptable. Also deliveries here are likely to block what results in a very narrow pavement.
- The two disabled bays ruin the outlook from the wheelchair accessible flats in what should be an area of "defensible space" for these residents. They seem to be squeezed in as an afterthought partially under the balconies above. Also not convinced of the sightlines especially if someone less abled was reversing out of these bays as it's on a corner.
- Unconvincing cycle storage especially off such a mean access to the residential units. The entrance to residential blocks should be celebrated not tucked away, accessed by narrow route ways with no natural surveillance.
- On the design – the move away from deck access seems to have resulted in many more single access flats.
- Balconies should have more solidity rather than railings for both noise attenuation but also to stop people having to put rush matting (or similar) up for privacy especially in such a prominent position.

In summary I think this version of the scheme is a retrograde step - **RED**

[REDACTED]

Paul Garrett

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 March 2020 17:15
To: Paul Garrett
Subject: DRP Comment. 25th March

Application 19/P4072 360-364 London Road

The starting point for the revised design on the restricted urban corner site should be the reconciliation of the critical factors of site servicing and residential amenity. This will also be informed by site aspect, and other site planning and other environmental considerations

As the transport planner has noted “the proposed site is capable of onsite servicing” This will dictate some elements of the ground floor plan. The adjoining Highfield Court on the site boundary already demonstrates on site servicing. The suggested approach is to resolve the ground floor “back of house” functions for the commercial unit, and necessary residential parking, and reconcile these with the urban design considerations of the street façade. The applicant’s site analysis notes the noise emanating from the London Road corner, and it may therefore be better for the commercial unit to fully wrap around the corner, with residential access to upper floors from Broadway Gardens. This can then leave a service yard behind with access from Broadway Gardens with residential units starting at the first floor.

The servicing height requirement on the ground floor will dictate the datum for the first floor but to some extent the first floor can cover the ground floor as required to achieve a logical floor plan,

The proposed elevations are not unattractive but the slightly idiosyncratic geometry has taken over the design logic, and the south balconies are shown in some views as triangles with no access to the far corner (Panel 6) This different in other CG.I As also noted in other comments the ground floor corner at the London Road and Broadway corner is poorly resolved and an upper floor cantilever would avoid the stray column on the corner. The small common rear garden in current proposal will shaded for most of the day and offer poor amenity.

Detailing of balconies, if a similar design is progressed or developed, is critical as visible washing and other domestic features will undermine the quality of the elevations. This may be overcome by management policies preventing such uses, but in the absence of strong enforcement of such policies, a balustrade treatment which screen more of the contents on a balcony would be beneficial .

As also noted by the design officer, the reconciliation of retail signage should be fully considered at an early stage and not be a poorly considered afterthought.

Verdict Red

[REDACTED]

Paul Garrett

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 April 2020 09:47
To: Paul Garrett
Subject: Re: Merton Design Review Panel - Meeting of 25 March 2020 [REDACTED]

1. 360 - 364 London Road Mitcham Surrey CR4 3ND

Observations:

- Good to see a model
- Geometry of turning the corner is good.

Questions:

- Little mention is made in the design statement about the listed Burn Bullock building diagonally opposite. [It is noted on board 1 with no commentary] The development will affect the setting of the listed building, which is one of the most important historic buildings in Mitcham (and on the Heritage at Risk Register). What is the designed relationship between the development and the listed building?
- No information is given on sustainability and renewable energy. Will there be air source heat pumps? If so where are they proposed to be sited?
- I do not understand the landing to the north fo the lift shaft at upper floors. If this were removed it soul surely improve the privacy of the flat to the north east.
- Is servicing actually resolved? Transport note appears to state no servicing from London Road.

Comments

- Facade treatment on London Road is acceptable.
- No objection to the height, since the top storey is suitably set back.
- Question whether the balconies should have glass balustrades on London Road because of traffic noise.
- 8 flats out of 24, i.e. 1/3 of the flats are single aspect. This is a BIG PROBLEM. London Plan states that single aspect flats should normally be avoided. We should not encourage schemes with such a large proportion of single aspect flats. Or, normally, any.
- No credible energy/sustainability information is given. Extensive use of cast stone is not encouraged.
- Servicing of shop - not sure if what is shown would be acceptable or actually work.
- Defensible space at ground floor on Broadway Gardens does not work well.

Suggested verdict AMBER.

Would be green if all flats were single aspect.

[REDACTED]

> On 30 Mar 2020, at 11:49, Paul Garrett <Paul.Garrxxx@xxxxxx.xxx.xx> wrote:

>

> All,

>

> I hope this e-mail finds you well in these strange and unreal times!

>

> Like most of us I am now working from home, with somewhat erratic IT connectivity, so apologies if my contact is also erratic. I also realise everyone else will have heightened personal concerns as well as also trying to work successfully from home.

>

> That said, we are trying to progress with the DRP and thank you to the three people who have now provided me with comments for the DRP meeting of last week. Please can I remind everyone else to take time out to look at the plans and provide me with comments as outlined below. If you are having difficulties please let me know if you can.

>

> Many thanks,

>

> Paul

>

> From: Paul Garrett

> Sent: 19 March 2020 12:53

> Subject: Merton Design Review Panel - Meeting of 25 March 2020

>

> All,

>

> Please find attached the agenda for the next DRP meeting on 25 March. Plans will be available online by lunchtime tomorrow. Attached is a list of companies and staff involved in the agenda items. Please familiarise yourselves with these and the site locations and let me know if you consider you may have any conflicts of interest.

>

> As you know, we will be undertaking this review by e-mail due to the coronavirus situation. We want to keep this as close to a normal review as possible so I am asking that we do this in two stages.

>

> 1. Review the online documentation as usual.

> 2. Formulate your views and then send them directly to me and do not copy in other panel members (please do this by the end of the evening the review would normally take place i.e. Wednesday 25 March).

> 3. You may raise questions if you wish, and if they are factual questions that I can answer, I will, but the applicant team will not be available to respond to these as it would result in an unduly protracted process.

> 4. I will then assemble your comments verbatim into a word document then circulate to all panel members.

> 5. Panel members can then digest what others have said and then add further comments if they so wish, copying in other panel members.

> 6. I will then summarise the comments overall as a draft set of notes and, with Linda's approval then re-circulate them to Panel members for final comments.

> 7. I will then amend as usual if necessary.

>

> Regards,

>

> <image001.png>

>

> Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

> This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

> This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

> The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

> If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (pxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxv.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

>

> postmaster@merton.gov.uk

> <http://www.merton.gov.uk>

> -----

> <Consultant Project List V2.pdf><1850 Consultants List.pdf><Wimbledon

> Chase Station DRP - Design Review Panel Enclosures and Team.pdf><Mar

> 25 2020 Mtg - Agenda V2 P.pdf>

Paul Garrett

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 March 2020 18:12
To: Paul Garrett
Subject: Re: Merton Design Review Panel - Meeting of 25 March 2020

Hi Paul,

This for the reminder. Please see below.

All the best.



On 30 Mar 2020, at 10:09, Paul Garrett <Paul.Garrett@merton.gov.uk> wrote:

Thanks very much for this [REDACTED]
Please could you just add your indicative RAG verdicts to your comments for me. I am chasing others for their comments. The process is working, albeit slowly as my IT is rather erratic.
Thanks,
Paul

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 March 2020 23:12
To: Paul Garrett <xx@xx>
Subject: Re: Merton Design Review Panel - Meeting of 25 March 2020

Hi Paul,

I hope that you and your family are keeping well. Please find below my comments below:

360 - 364 London Road - Amber

I suggest that the developer consider making a case to Merton that this development is unlikely to be attractive to disabled residents and thus there is unlikely to be a need to provide disabled parking. This will enable the developers to move their building forward on Broadway Gardens so that it and the gardens align with their neighbours so that they better coordinate with each other creating a better development.

I welcome the widened pavement along the London Road and into Broadway Gardens as it is required and will create a better retail environment for any business here, especially as it resolves the substandard pavement on the corner of these roads. I suggest that the developer dedicate this land to Merton Highways so that it does not have to maintain it.

I like the new building's considerate approach of aligning the residential entrance so that it provides clear sightlines to and from the bus stop on London Road. This should be improved by the developer paying Merton Highways to raise the crossing over the entrance to Broadway Gardens to provide a better setting for the building with a safer and better access to all the new residents and shoppers, which will make both developments more economically valuable.

The proposal for a 15m long loading bay on the Highway on the London Road (A217) leaves only 1m behind it of footway space. This narrow pavement does not meet disability or highways

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]




Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Paul Garrett

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 April 2020 09:26
To: Paul Garrett
Subject: RE: Merton Design Review Panel - Meeting of 25 March 2020

Paul,

Apologies for my late response, I have been run off my feet with work and having the kids at home.

My comments below:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

360-364 London Road

Again I agree with the majority of the design officers comments, although I actually don't mind the appearance of the building. The top floor could have been treated differently, but it feels quite dynamic on the corner, and they've tried to respond to the context with the white ground floor and similar brick as the adjacent building.

Unfortunately there are some quite fundamental issues which need resolving with the scheme, most noticeably the servicing for the retail unit, the entry sequence, the ground floor experience and the general layout of the apartments (they've not done themselves any favours with the shape of the building here).

I would like to know what is happening across Broadway gardens, as it is currently a car wash, but in their visuals they imply a planning permission for the site, or at least something which is planned to be built there. This would be useful context.

Good to see a DRP presentation though

Verdict - **Amber/Red** (as servicing is a big issue here, but there are a number of positives in the scheme)

[REDACTED]

[Redacted text block]

From: Paul Garrett [mailto:Paul.G@uk]
Sent: Friday, April 3, 2020 11:23 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Merton Design Review Panel - Meeting of 25 March 2020

Hi [REDACTED]

I hope you have settled in to working from home OK. I appreciate things might still be a bit hectic, juggling home and work life. We are still trying to run the DRP and to this end I wondered whether you will be able to provide comments for the proposals for the DRP meeting of 25 March.

Hoping you are well,

Paul

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 March 2020 11:53
To: Paul Garrett <xxxx.xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx.xx>
Subject: RE: Merton Design Review Panel - Meeting of 25 March 2020

Paul,

Really sorry for not getting back to you on this...it completely slipped my mind with working form home and routine changing etc

I will review and return comments asap

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Paul Garrett [<mailto:Paul.G@uk>]
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2020 11:50 AM
Subject: FW: Merton Design Review Panel - Meeting of 25 March 2020

All,

I hope this e-mail finds you well in these strange and unreal times!

Like most of us I am now working from home, with somewhat erratic IT connectivity, so apologies if my contact is also erratic. I also realise everyone else will have heightened personal concerns as well as also trying to work successfully from home.

That said, we are trying to progress with the DRP and thank you to the three people who have now provided me with comments for the DRP meeting of last week. Please can I remind everyone else to take time out to look at the plans and provide me with comments as outlined below. If you are having difficulties please let me know if you can.

Many thanks,

Paul

From: Paul Garrett
Sent: 19 March 2020 12:53
Subject: Merton Design Review Panel - Meeting of 25 March 2020

All,

Please find attached the agenda for the next DRP meeting on 25 March. Plans will be available online by lunchtime tomorrow. Attached is a list of companies and staff involved in the agenda items. Please familiarise yourselves with these and the site locations and let me know if you consider you may have any conflicts of interest.

As you know, we will be undertaking this review by e-mail due to the coronavirus situation. We want to keep this as close to a normal review as possible so I am asking that we do this in two stages.

1. Review the online documentation as usual.
2. Formulate your views and then send them directly to me and do not copy in other panel members (please do this by the end of the evening the review would normally take place i.e. Wednesday 25 March).
3. You may raise questions if you wish, and if they are factual questions that I can answer, I will, but the applicant team will not be available to respond to these as it would result in an unduly protracted process.
4. I will then assemble your comments verbatim into a word document then circulate to all panel members.
5. Panel members can then digest what others have said and then add further comments if they so wish, copying in other panel members.
6. I will then summarise the comments overall as a draft set of notes and, with Linda's approval then re-circulate them to Panel members for final comments.
7. I will then amend as usual if necessary.

Regards,



Paul Garrett
Urban Designer
futureMerton Placemaking
020 8545 3063
paul.garrett@merton.gov.uk



Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to. This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly. If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk
<http://www.merton.gov.uk>
