

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham



# Design Review Panel Notes

**Watermeadow Court**

**23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016**

<b>Panel</b>	<b>LBHF</b>	<b>Architects and Agents</b>
Fred Pilbrow – Chair Jonathan Manser Ed Moseley Kate Digney Niall Cairns Will Wimshurst Maya Donelan	Davina Barton Kerstin Kane Steven Davies	Chris Darling Andrew Richardson Neil Henderson

## 1. MAIN ISSUES:

1.	Aspect of garden
2.	Balconies and overlooking
3.	Material and size of balconies
4.	Further information on the proposed garden
5.	Servicing route
6.	Proposed height in relation to nearby buildings
7.	Potential access route to the river
8.	Tenure types
9.	Possible inclusion of odd bit of land next to the site

## 2. SUMMARY:

Thank you for the presentation. The panel felt the proposals had evidently been the subject of careful consideration and the planning was logical and sound.

The proposed accommodation is set between an established low-rise terrace housing to the north west and a larger scale of riverfront development to the south east. The riverfront development is expected to be subject to a greater degree of change in the future, for example the office building across Meadowlands was subject to current pre-application planning discussions and the Harbour Club may be expected to come forward for development in due course.

It was stated the proposals responded to this context, however, the presentation seemed incomplete to the panel. We wanted to see more of the existing context and how the proposals responded to the scale transition across the site. The panel would encourage the applicant to provide a greater selection of townscape visualisations, including views that described the impact of the proposals to the gardens beyond the

crescent terrace to the north of the site. Sections should be provided that set the proposals in their wider urban context and elevations should be drawn to include surrounding buildings.

The panel would have liked detailed information on neighbouring amenity for daylight and sunlight and we would urge that this technical analysis is provided as part of any future application. We would also value an analysis of overshadowing of the landscaped garden space.

We felt there was a gap between the (promising) details suggested by the drawn elevations/precedents and the depiction of the building in the townscape views. We were concerned that the palette in the views was perhaps overly assertive - we were concerned about the bright colouration of the metal work and we would urge careful selection and provision of samples to test this aspect of the proposals.

Some aspects of the proposal might need further refinement such as aspects of the plan form at the neck of the development, however, the east-west facing units appear to be generally good.

We supported the servicing proposals from Meadowlands and raised technical questions about the parking - were two car lifts sufficient for the 80 proposed car spaces?

The garden design was viewed positively but it was noted that the detailed design should show how the required vents were accommodated. It was asked whether play space requirements had been considered.

The ground floor planning was supported. Issues of privacy and flood risk has been well thought out. The panel felt the duplexes with direct street access on Meadowlands were very well thought out and contributed positively to the public realm.