

# Design Review Panel Notes

## Fulham Gasworks

Monday 12<sup>th</sup> September 2016

Panel	LBHF	Architects and Agents
Max de Rosee - Chair Nigel Bidwell Ed Moseley Kate Digney Charles Wagner Will Wimshurst Fiona Fowler	Paul Goodacre Davina Barton Jacques Du Plessis	<b>Architect:</b> Robin Partington & Partners  <b>Agent:</b> Boyer Planning  <b>Developer:</b> St William LLP  <b>Heritage:</b> KM Heritage

## 1. Main issues raised during Design Review Panel

1.	Type of planning application submitted
2.	Design codes
3.	Vision for the high street
4.	Traffic issues relating to the high street
5.	Phasing of the development
6.	Phase the park will be delivered in
7.	Role of the square
8.	Relationship between the park and square
9.	Conservation of gasholder 2 and 7
10.	Shape of new buildings
11.	Impact of tower on sunlight
12.	Exclusion area for the pipes
13.	Visibility of gasholders from Imperial Road
14.	Public and private access routes
15.	Entrance to car parking
16.	Use class controls
17.	Function of listed buildings
18.	Number of units

19.	Mandatory and guidance codes
20.	Size of dwellings
21.	Affordable housing provision
22.	Use of water on the site
23.	Possibility of using public art to commemorate gasworks
24.	Site clean-up
25.	Length of time to complete development

## 2. SUMMARY:

The Panel felt there was much to consider. Some aspects of the Place making strategy and the proposed phasing were complex and difficult to get to grips with.

The Panel felt that did not have sufficient information to comment on the detail of Phase 1 so their comments are restricted to the proposed masterplan.

The Panels views on the masterplan are as follows. There are concerns regarding the phasing, in that parts of the site will sit dormant after decommissioning, and to some extent, during construction phases.. The applicants are strongly encouraged to find meanwhile-uses to occupy the site to ensure it begins to connect with the surrounding neighbourhood from an early stage. The Panel felt that this would benefit local residents and should not be a missed opportunity. For example the Panel regretted the fact that the listed buildings are not being refurbished for possible community uses earlier in the phasing. In addition, the ecological potential of the site could be exploited early on, especially with the phased delivery of the park.

Generally, the masterplan links and the layout are clear and understood, and thought to work well. However, it was considered that the “high street” was disappointing and should have a more direct relationship with the park. The area feels hard and dominated by vehicular space. There appears to be a disconnect between the size of the space and the proposed high street character and feel. Comparatives with other spaces would have been beneficial to consider. The proposed square needs further investigation, in terms of its design and use. It could feel very bare without the right amount of animation. A grove of trees might add to the “high street” feel, for example. The panel felt that there would be an obvious opportunity to activate the space with the sense of the park coming in to the square.

The Panel regretted that the landscape designer was not present to give more detail. The park was seen to be underwhelming in size for such a large site. There was the view that there is a disconnect between the amount of public space and the scale of the development.

The Panel doubted whether the intended visual connectivity to the spaces from Imperial Road would be achieved in reality and encourage the applicants to enhance the gaps through the development to ensure the journey into the site is a welcoming one.. The edge of the market square leading to the park felt a bit tight. It should try to be more generous and mark the entrance.

The Panel would have liked more information on the interface between the buildings and the park. It would have been useful to understand the activity around the edges which could secure the success of the park as a public facility.

The Panel considered that plans for gasholder 2 should be more ambitious but it is accepted that this is a work in progress, and also felt that the applicants should try and think of a really special use for gasholder 7. Perhaps it could mark the entrance to the park.

The Panel remained unconvinced with regard to the proposed use of water around the base of the taller buildings. It considered that water on the site is not being used well and was creating barriers to movement.

Similarly, the results of the sunlight study were not convincing. The panel felt that shadowing would be an issue, and request that the applicants look at how the shadowing on the south side of the park could be mitigated?

The Panel fully support the form and line of the buildings in phase 1 in the way they hold the edge of the street and park. The Panel could not understand why this rigour was not used for the edges on the taller buildings. The height of the tallest element was generally found to be acceptable, but its impact would need to be thoroughly tested in views. The grouping of tall buildings may have a better composition if the proposed stepping down continued on the lower blocks. Otherwise, the massing is not considered to be an issue, but there is concern over the scale of some of the buildings around the edges of the masterplan site.

It was felt that building 5 given its proposed scale and massing was too close to the listed buildings to the detriment of their setting. Furthermore, the corner block to the entrance to the site, opposite the Harley Davison showroom on Michael Road was considered to be over-dominant and should be reduced in scale to be more sympathetic to the adjoining townscape.

The detail studies presented on phase two were really enjoyed. But the Panel were concerned whether there would be enough in the design codes to make sure the quality shown is realised.. Similarly, is there enough in the design codes to ensure enhancement of the conservation area? The applicants and the local authority are encouraged to ensure that the design codes are in sufficient detail to achieve the highest quality designs.

Lastly, the Panel felt that the National Grid depot should be celebrated and that the applicants should bring more joy to the proposed design of the depot. Possibly using the roof structure to bring an architectural treatment to the depot which would acknowledge its setting as part of the conservation area. It would form one elevation to Imperial Square so it would be important to get something of quality.