

minutes of meeting

project: 6075 - Grenfell Tower Refurbishment RBKC

location: RBKC Town Hall

date: 20 Nov 2012

title: Planning Application progress meeting

chadsworth house
wilmslow road
handforth
cheshire
sk9 3hp

t. [REDACTED]
f. [REDACTED]
cosec@tayloryoung.co.uk
www.tayloryoung.co.uk

architecture
landscape architecture
town planning
urban design

present:	Edward George	RBKC PLANNING
	Richard Craig	RBKC PLANNING
	Bruce Sounes	STUDIO E
	Blaine Cagney	STUDIO E
	Paul Dunkerton	KCTMO
	Marc Watterson	IBI-TY

distribution: All

agenda item

action

Introduction

AAP has now been undertaken with formal comments expected 29/11. Initial feedback, including RC comments are as follows:

- More colour
- More glazing
- Further consideration of the roof of the building
- External space around the nursery
- Canopy
- Amenity of accommodation impacting upon by canopy.

Canopy

PD - Residents and neighbours see the canopy as essential due to ASB. EG / RC - The LPA however do not view the canopy as essential, and if it were to stay the residential units that are impacted by the loss of daylight would need to be reconsidered.

EG – In summary, the following should be considered – remove canopy and reduce the family sized units to smaller units at the lower level. Whilst amenity is key the issue is also aesthetic but the restrictions to the scheme created by the existing structures are accepted. Can an alternative restrictive measure to avoid projectiles be introduced, e.g. control over the wider opening of the windows?

Nursery

Discussed whether there would be dedicated outside space or not, and whether this was covered by a canopy. Suggestions to the north of the nursery as this space can be easily defined with the landscape and levels, but to the east and west also suggested. Retractable awning could be used. Access and security around this space would also need consideration.

MW advised that the team need to either decide now so an alteration to the application could be made, or leave until a future date when a separate application can be made to deal with the amendments when decisions are

finalised.

Colour

The AAP said that there needed to be more use of colour. RC suggested that there could be differing elevations or design to match the individual units. BS tabled some ideas for the use of colour but this needs further consideration. RC also suggested a graded colour up the building. The issue of extending the sizes of the windows was discussed – BS explained that whilst they can be widened the engineers consider that this will impact on heat loss and overheating. Needs further consideration.

Roof

BS explained that it was not possible to include further accommodation at the top floor for the following reasons:

- No lift or stair access
- 2 water tanks at this level
- New calorifiers
- Exhaust ducts / bathroom vents from the flats below

There is therefore very little room to include any further built form.

RC – there remains a need to provide a bottom, middle and top to the building so this level needs further consideration.

Bicycle parking

Provision needs to be agreed.

Planning implications

We have used our single 'free go' so the submission of details will now be via superseded plans and a period of reconsultation supported by an explanation and justification of the amendments. This might take the application over the 8 week determination period. It may need to be considered at committee level. EG to advise in due course.

Actions

Team to consider:

- Canopy
- Nursery
- Roof
- Window design / size
- Bicycle parking
- Additional consultation with residents prior to finalisation of changes
- SE to issue revised plans to EG via email prior to next meeting
- MW / EG to arrange next meeting