

Design Review Panel

Summary Feedback Notes

NAZARETH HOUSE

169-175 Hammersmith Road

22 August 2017

Panel	LBHF	Architects and Agents
Robin Partington [chair] Paul Sandilands Maya Donelan Ed Moseley Jonathan Manser Gary Colleran	Paul Goodacre Kerstin Kane Neil Egerton Barry Valentine	David Duckworth – Scurr Architects Brendan Sheehy - Nazareth Care Peter Edgar – Gerald Eve

Main Issues Raised during the Design Review Panel

1.	Availability of apartments for sale
2.	Servicing and access arrangements for the new building
3.	Separate address for the new building
4.	Retention of access from Hammersmith Road
5.	Cottages for market sale
6.	Relationship of new apartments with Talgarth Road and flyover
7.	Single aspect north facing apartments
8.	Access onto green roofs
9.	Refurbishment of Nazareth House and decant of existing residents
10.	Purpose of the openings in the boundary wall
11.	Reasoning behind the proposed stepped massing
12.	Impact of development in a Townscape Views Analysis

Panel Summary and Recommendation

The Panel thank the team for the presentation and their briefing note. Given the various elements to the overall scheme, we have prepared this response to follow the format of the presentation.

Proposals for the refurbishment of Nazareth House are welcomed, giving this important old building a new lease of life. The removal of the later and rather unsympathetic additions can only be of benefit to the building. It will be important, however, that the repairs to the façade are carried out in an architectural character and style that is in keeping with the original building. The materiality and detailing of the new work will also be very important and should be of a high quality and complement the overall composition. It was not possible to assess this as no elevations or details were presented in support of the proposed works in a number of

areas including the 'bridge' component within the courtyard and the escape staircase.

The Panel are also very supportive of the proposed openings to the boundary wall fronting onto Hammersmith Road. This subtle intervention will improve visual permeability, giving the site a stronger presence with a less hostile relationship to the street. The greater visibility that this affords, into and out of the site, is considered to be a very positive move. It is felt that the existing post box has an awkward relationship with one of the proposed openings and the applicants are encouraged to explore whether the post box could be moved to a more appropriate position where it would not interfere with the rhythm and setting of the new openings. Materials and detailing should be of a high quality and aligned to those used in the construction of the wall and Nazareth House.

The Panel are also very supportive of the proposed extension to the terrace of cottages in Shortlands. The proposal to continue the architectural language of the existing buildings is felt to be the honourable thing to do. It will be important to faithfully replicate their design, detail and materiality.

The Panel spent most of the allocated time discussing the new apartment block and it is here where the panel have most concerns. Currently, the proposed design falls far short of being a worthy neighbour to the existing Nazareth House building, lacking the craftsmanship, love and care that obviously went into its design.

The current design is not a happy or inspiring building, appearing to ignore many of the benefits that the site and its context offers, which is of concern given the sensitive context of the site, neighbouring buildings and the nature of the elderly residents who are likely to spend a more significant proportion of their time in their apartments, shared communal facilities and available amenity space.

The new apartment block is disappointing, the elevational treatment is bland with a cold "institutional" feel. The configuration of internal and external space fails to make best use of, or address the site and its assets, including neighbouring open spaces. The entrance space and corridors would not be particularly enjoyable to use with an institutional feel. Recessed entrance doors to apartments would help provide much needed punctuation to corridors and a threshold to each apartment rather than doors set flush in a bland corridor.

There are concerns over the inclusion of any single aspect north facing units which could be easily resolved by more careful planning of layouts, steps in the alignment of the elevations and window design on the east side. The introduction of west facing windows overlooking and celebrating the landscaped grounds within the clients ownership is an obvious move and of benefit to the scheme.

Locating the garden on the north side of the block means that it will not enjoy good quality sunlight or daylight for a significant part of the year. Given the nature of the proposed occupants any amenity space is really important for their wellbeing, so this space should be reconsidered. Balconies to the main elevations could also help provide much needed detail, articulation and punctuation to the façade, providing

individual units with outdoor amenity space. Sunlight and daylight issues need to be carefully considered both within the site and any impacts on the adjoining site.

The applicants are encouraged to explore ways of detailing the top of the building such that it is a celebration and conclusion to the overall form rather than looking like the concept simply ran out of energy and was truncated. Its neighbours successfully celebrate their roof profiles, and a contemporary solution such as a setback pavilion could help provide an aspirational top and successful termination to the building. This may also provide an opportunity for additional roof terrace and amenity space for residents.

The current design does not appear to include lift motor overruns or plant and this would need to be carefully considered and detailed as part of the overall composition, the fifth elevation (roof) also requiring careful consideration.

The Panel are concerned with the proposed use of timber cladding for the ground floor elevation. Timber would not provide a robust finish to an area of the facade which is vulnerable to splash back and damage. The timber could weather badly and spoil the appearance from an early stage.

Cill heights to the windows would need to be set at an appropriate height for wheel chair users, and residents who may spend a lot of their time sitting and enjoying the views. Windows would need to be easily openable for disabled residents. It was unclear whether this was the case in the current design and no sections were provided. Such considerations may begin to alter the proportions of the windows.

In terms of materiality, the Panel considered that the design might benefit from a reduced palette of materials, with the proposed metal panels adversely affecting the overall sense of quality. The use of brick with good proportions and careful detailing could benefit the design, providing a humane level of detail and visual relief. A single palette used with skill, might be a better way to deliver a more successful outcome, with Nazareth House and the cottages in Shortlands as good examples.

The Panel feel that the design should be developed further to address these issues.

In conclusion, the Panel welcome proposals for the successful refurbishment and regeneration benefits of Nazareth House, the sensitive extension of Shortlands and the works to improve visual permeability to the Hammersmith Road boundary wall. However, any new development within the grounds of the site would only be appropriate if it was sensitively and skillfully designed, using high quality materials and finishes, complementing existing buildings.

The Panel encourages the applicants to develop the designs for the new apartment building taking on board comments made and ensuring that Nazareth House gets the high quality neighbour that it deserves.