

Design Review Panel

Summary Feedback Notes

Wednesday 27th April 2016

WESTFIELD - Relay Square

| Panel | LBHF | Architects and Agents |
|---|--|--|
| Roy Collado – Chair Nigel Bidwell Alessia Mosci | Paul Goodacre Davina Barton Sally Shepherd | Simon Cochrane Westfield |
| Fred Pilbrow Melanie Whitlock | | Jason Forbes Westfield |
| | | Nick Ffoulkes Sheppard Robson Architects |

Main Issues Raised during the Design Review Panel

| 1. | The possibilty of using the space for external events and art during earlier phases |
|----|---|
| 2. | Two interconnected spaces which will be filled with building in the final phase |

| 3. | View of Dimco from different vantage points |
|----|---|
| 4. | Plans for Block D and E |
| 5. | Connection or synergy between Dimco building and other buildings |
| 6. | The architecture of Dimco and its listed status |
| 7. | The timing of construction of the restaurant extension and Blocks D and E |
| 8. | The challenges of improving the public realm and pedestrian walkway |
| 9. | Access road and tunnel entrance |
| | |

Panel Summary and Recommendation:

The panel thanked the Westfield team for their explanation of the complex scenarios of the medium and long term proposals for the area. There will be significant changes in the medium to long term on the site, and it will be important to keep a focus for the open space, in terms of its setting, orientation and use.

The Dimco building is listed and the panel were concerned with the likely impacts of the proposed restaurant extension in terms of its height and alignment. The panel felt that this relationship could be improved if the alignment on the western side was realigned to open up more of the views towards Dimco. The Panel fully appreciated the aims in defining the space, and concurred with the applicants analysis of how pedestrians would move around the space.

The plan for the area appeared to work and had a logic, but the 3D extrusion was less successful. Furthermore, the scheme appears more comfortable in its earlier phases than the final phase as the advent of the restaurant block changes completely the form and design of the outline consented block D. Block D will require further consideration in relation to the difference that the restaurant extension makes to the spaces and the overall site. When the restaurant extension exists, it changes the role of Block D visually and functionally. It would become a big building filling a space. That space has worked hard to take on a key role in the overall masterplan.

In supporting the restaurant block it must be noted therefore that the parameters of the outline permission require an adjustment and review of the assumptions made for block D. The panel considered that they did not work at all well together.