

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham



Design Review Panel Notes

Landmark House

Wednesday 7th December 2016

Panel	LBHF	Architects and Agents
Max De Rosee - Chair Robin Partington Ed Moseley Charles Wagner Melanie Whitlock	Paul Goodacre Davina Barton Jennifer Grove Sally Prowd Peter Wilson	Craig Tabb DP9, Ian Rennie, Eastern and Oriental Oliver Smith, Gillespies Graham Stirk, RSHP Architect Daniel Wright, RSHP Architect

1. MAIN ISSUES

1.	Different functions across the site
2.	Location of entrance doors, servicing, café and retail
3.	Pedestrian experience using the site
4.	Materials used to construct walkways
5.	Use of public realm
6.	Views of the proposal from various locations
7.	Height of tower
8.	Number of rooms in the hotel
9.	Consistency of elevations of hotel and offices
10.	Consideration given to nearby house
11.	Creation of different spaces
12.	Potential closure of the dual carriageway
13.	Green landscape proposed for basement level
14.	Plans for site if planning permission is granted

2. SUMMARY:

The panel thanked the presenting team for their considered approach to the site and the quality of the proposals.

The panel appreciated the qualities of the masterplan idea where the team are proposing a bold new civic square to be connected to the town centre: the proposal

would form the western edge of this space. The proposal is set up to provide a great public realm offering which would be further enhanced by creating a tunnel to submerge the carriageway. The Panel would love to see a civic space on that scale achieved. The proposed diagram was well-received by the Panel.

The public realm with the sunken garden and ground floor usage is interesting but the panel struggled to fully understand the character or the use of this space and what it would feel like. The panel did not feel comfortable with the current proposed sunken garden, and were left with some fundamental questions that would determine the success or otherwise of the space – who would use it? - would it be office workers or hotel guests? – would it be obviously public? - who would curate it? Is it private or public? The panel felt that there was tremendous potential in the ground floor plan but that the team hadn't fully exploited the potential yet. The panel wondered whether there might be too much open space and as a result its use was not sufficiently defined.

The panel welcomed the intention continuing the “street” down Angel Walk but were concerned that the carving-out of the base of the building may result in there being too much width especially relative to the height of the residential houses. It was suggested that compression can help to animate spaces. Angel Walk as proposed would be quite wide at 20m. plus, and the question is raised – is it too wide? Compression of the space to create an edge that responds to the residential scale might be of benefit for this part of the scheme. The panel felt that this would not necessarily have to be achieved by built fabric, and that a planting proposal could be considered to give a linear identity and definition to a street edge.

The panel found the location of the entrances and servicing routes was very convincing and well thought-out.

The proposed uses were felt to be extremely appropriate for the town centre. The proposed office provision and hotel are strongly encouraged.

It is apparent that the top of the hotel would appear in various viewpoints around the site. The top of the hotel needs to be something of really high quality. This will give the height a purpose and encourage members of the public to use it. It should not be an expensive or exclusive place which would send the wrong message, but a truly public amenity.

Similarly, the applicants are encouraged to consider the roof top spaces of the lower blocks for amenity space for the offices. Roof gardens could be considered.

The height of the proposals were discussed at length by the panel. Due to the elegant proportions of the proposals, the panel felt that the height proposed was not necessarily a concern on this site and the panel were encouraged by the quality of the facades at this stage. However, the panel were concerned that the building might set a precedent for other sites with less competent schemes and a sensitive context where height could be a negative issue. The panel encouraged the team to consider this site to be a unique case that should not create a precedent; this approach called for proposals of high design quality in both concept and detail.

The panel felt the facades were well-crafted, and were encouraged by the design intentions for the glazed wall and the proposals for stitching together the 12m modules. This may need more consideration as the design develops, and the panel would like to see more detail as it evolves.

Given the mid and long distance views of the tower, any proposals for electronic advertising on the elevations would not be welcomed and should be avoided.