

Paul Garrett

From: Paul Garrett
Sent: 29 April 2020 10:00
To: Paul Garrett
Subject: FW: Merton Design Review Panel - Notes of Meeting of 25 March 2020

From: Paul Garrett
Sent: 17 April 2020 15:15
To: [REDACTED]

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

All,

[REDACTED] point has been addressed regarding 'intermediate' verdicts and changed accordingly following consultation with the Chair, who, as well as being Chair, made a valid point about how the Planning Applications Committee interprets verdicts. No one contested the Red verdict. The notes have now gone out.

Many thanks,



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



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 April 2020 15:08
To: [REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 17 April 2020 11:19

To: [REDACTED]

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

I'm not sure we should be giving "AMBER towards Red" and "AMBER towards Green" verdicts. We might be opening up a can of worms.

Has this actually been agreed as a methodology?

In the past we have been very wary of this being a formal verdict, although we have discussed it in these terms at the meeting...

Once the report goes to the Planning Application Committee, does this extra information help or hinder?

I would urge caution and call the verdicts AMBER.

Paul Garrett

From: Paul Garrett
Sent: 29 April 2020 10:01
To: Paul Garrett
Subject: FW: Merton Design Review Panel - Notes of Meeting of 25 March 2020

From: Paul Garrett
Sent: 17 April 2020 12:09
To: Councillor Linda Kirby <Linda.Kirby@merton.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Merton Design Review Panel - Notes of Meeting of 25 March 2020

Thanks Linda,

I will amend. I hope to get the notes out today.

Regards,



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



From: Councillor Linda Kirby <Linda.Kirby@merton.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 April 2020 12:08
To: Paul Garrett <xxxx.xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx.xx>
Subject: RE: Merton Design Review Panel - Notes of Meeting of 25 March 2020

Dear Paul

Thanks for your email. I would stay with Amber. The report goes to committee and members will make a judgement on the concerns. At PAC red is a massive alarm. Green welcomed and Amber – a need to read the report in detail.

Kind regards

Linda

From: Paul Garrett <Paul.Gxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx.xx>
Sent: 17 April 2020 11:29
To: Councillor Linda Kirby <Linda.Kirby@merton.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Merton Design Review Panel - Notes of Meeting of 25 March 2020

Hi Linda,

Sorry to trouble you, but I wanted a guide from the chair on [REDACTED] point.

In normal circumstances the notes are in a written summary, so it can be written that something was amber, but 'was nearly a red' of 'wouldn't take much to be a green' – a point which gets raised when finalising verdicts in the meetings.

However, as the summary is now in a bullet point format, and essentially included almost every comment made, the data is more 'raw' and less of an interpretation. As everyone gave their individual verdict I weighted an overall verdict based on this and it wasn't always an easy RAG rating. Therefore, in this case I felt an 'Amber towards...' approach would probably work best.

Are you OK with this – any strong views?

Thanks,



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



From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 17 April 2020 11:19

To: [REDACTED]

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

I'm not sure we should be giving "AMBER towards Red" and "AMBER towards Green" verdicts. We might be opening up a can of worms.

Has this actually been agreed as a methodology?

In the past we have been very wary of this being a formal verdict, although we have discussed it in these terms at the meeting...

Once the report goes to the Planning Application Committee, does this extra information help or hinder?

I would urge caution and call the verdicts AMBER.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Paul Garrett

From: Paul Garrett
Sent: 15 April 2020 13:22
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: DRP Notes - Kwik Fit Site

Hi [REDACTED]

I am doing the DRP notes now and summarising them. About the Kwik Fit (London Road) site you said this:

“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.”

I'm struggling to understand this comment as on the 4th floor there are no flats adjacent to the house. If you can clarify that would be great, or perhaps I can call you after lunch.

Thanks,



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



Paul Garrett

From: Paul Garrett
Sent: 15 April 2020 15:10
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 360-364 London Road - DRP Display Panels.pdf(Review)- Adobe Document Cloud

OK. The revised plan on sheet 6 of the DRP boards shows that the one on Broadway Gardens has been cut back already. The other one hasn't, but the terrace does not actually extend out onto this. It is just a flat roof - and my confusion was it is the roof of the 3rd floor but not actually doing anything for the top floor! and I will reference this for you.

Someone else also got confused between the planning application drawings and latest drawings - you are right they were not at a good scale to follow.

Thanks,

Paul

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 April 2020 15:02
To: Paul Garrett <xxxx.xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx.xx>
Subject: 360-364 London Road - DRP Display Panels.pdf(Review)- Adobe Document Cloud

Hi Paul,

Apologies my comments weren't clear - spot the dyslexic architect!

It was these two corners that I'm struggling with. They are really heavy and I think pull the building down making it appear heavier than it should.

Hope clearer - very happy to chat through too.

■

