

Design Workshops

5 March 2009

ATTENDANCE LISTS

Residents

| Name | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Jackie & Katie Fineman | |
| Darrel Alexander | |
| Ravi Panara | |
| S. & H. Panara | |
| S. Gudaal | |
| Danielle Davis | |
| Yasmin Osman | |
| R. Uthayakumar | |
| Vickie (last name unknown) | |

LB Harrow

| | |
|---------------|----------------------------------|
| Elaine Sloane | London Borough of Harrow Housing |
| Alison Pegg | London Borough of Harrow Housing |

Independent Housing Consultants

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Chris Hearn | First Call |
|-------------|------------|

Catalyst Team

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Murray Crawford (MC) | Catalyst Housing Group |
| Ray Duffus (RD) | Higgins Construction |
| Stephen Fisher (SF) | Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects |
| Annalisa Spencer (AS) | Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects |

1.00

MEETING INTRODUCTION & Powerpoint presentation

SF began by introducing the Catalyst team who were present, as well as the team from LB Harrow and First Call. Tonight's theme was introduced as external appearance and materials.

Previous exercises from the Fun Day were shown, reminding residents which images they had said they liked and disliked. A previous workshop board on character and materials was shown and SF discussed which images residents had labelled 'like' and 'dislike'. Four pictures of each were shown and SF pointed out that one example appeared as both a like and a dislike image.

Residents were reminded of the 'Cool Wall' exercise they had done and shown images they had said were very cool and uncool. SF talked about which images had surprised us by being uncool/ very cool.

SF introduced 'character areas' and asked residents to consider the style and character of their existing estate and surrounding neighbourhood areas. The masterplan was shown and three different parts of the regeneration were shown as potentially having different characteristics:

- 'The Green'
- 'The Street'
- 'The Terrace', 'The Courtyard', 'The Mews' and 'The Close'

Plans and 3d images of the proposed areas were shown and SF explained what characteristics each area might have. Photo examples of other projects were shown as a suggestion of what the areas might look like. Residents were asked what they thought of these examples.

Residents were asked to divide into 2 groups for the first workshop exercise.

2.00

Notes form Workshop exercise 1 – Character Areas

Each group was shown 10 photo examples of each of the three areas:

- The Green
- The Street
- The Terrace, The Courtyard, The Mews and The Close

Residents were asked to tick the photos which showed what they want the area to look like, and cross the photos which showed what they don't want the area to look like, also noting down any relevant comments. At the end the groups put a gold star next to their favourite photo for each area.

Comments on 'the green':

- There was a preference for the more high density examples (4 storeys +)
- Some of the simpler examples were criticised for being too plain and lacking either activity or planting
- Trees are preferred but not too many large trees which might block views and make homes dark
- Residents were concerned that no parking was shown around the green space on any examples

Comments on 'the street':

- High density examples were not popular for the street (4 storeys +)
- The most popular examples were buildings of around 3 storeys which use brick in a modern way with glass and/ or render, and have private balconies and entrances off the street.
- Big windows onto the street are popular and homes should be light and airy.
- Residents liked street elevations which showed trees along the street
- Some residents commented that it would be nice to have flowerbeds outside the front entrances.
- Residents like the street elevation to have bays and varying densities of 2 to 3 storeys.
- There was concern regarding flat roofs and windows being too small.
- Some residents did not like the combination of grey window frames with yellow brick.

Comments on 'the terrace', 'the courtyard', 'the mews', 'the close':

- Residents like the traditional examples of a mews.
- There is a concern that these spaces might appear cramped
- Residents were concerned about whether they could park near their front entrances.
- There was a strong preference for the modern examples of repeated bays with large windows – although some residents also strongly disliked this style.

3.00

Powerpoint Presentation 2

Having decided what they wanted character areas to look like, residents were asked to think about how to create the character of areas and the style of buildings.

AS introduced materials as a way of creating style, in particular:

- brick
- render
- panelling
- roofs

A slide with different brick types was shown. The brick types varied between modern and traditional, and showed different brick and cement colours. Photos of brick buildings were shown to demonstrate the different effects and looks which brick can give a building, and how brick can be used next to other materials.

Slides showing render, panelling and roofs were also shown in the same way. As well as demonstrating these materials using samples and photos, 3d elevation studies were also shown. These studies show how different colours and materials can change the way a building looks. These images also show how materials can be used to bring out certain design features of the building.

AS then introduced design features as a way of creating style. Particular design features were introduced:

- entrances and canopies
- balconies
- bays and major features

AS asked residents to think about how these design features help to create a building's style, and how the repetition of these features helps to create the character of a street or area. Photo examples were shown which demonstrate how the repetition of features can be an effective design tool.

Residents were asked to divide into 2 groups. It was explained that workshop exercises on materials and design features would run at the same time, with the groups swapping over halfway through.

4.00

Notes from workshop exercise 2 – Materials

The exercise consisted of 2 parts:

1. Examples of Materials – Likes and Dislikes

This exercise was based on a display of 40 different materials. Each material was numbered. There was an opportunity to discuss the materials samples and ask questions. Residents put red dots and green dots on a list next to the numbers of materials they felt strongly about (a green dot indicated like and a red dot indicated dislike).

The most popular materials were:

- terracotta brick
- modern yellow brick
- split block stone
- coloured glass (white, grey and blue)
- render panels (grey and pale green)
- lighter wood effect trespa panels

The least popular materials were:

- traditional yellow-ish brick
- metal panel
- green metal panel
- dark wood effect trespa panel

2. Use of Materials – Likes and Dislikes

This was a red dot/ green dot exercise on A1 boards. The boards showed examples of:

- brick
- render
- panelling
- roofs

Each material was shown in 6 photos, all demonstrating different ways the material can be used. Residents put green dots next to the pictures where they like the way the material is used, and red dots next to those where they do not like the ways the material is used.

Comments on brick examples:

- modern yellow brick looks good
- striped or mottled brick looks bad

Comments on render examples:

- simple white render set against other materials looks good
- brightly coloured render looks bad

Comments on panelling examples:

- metal panelling looks bad
- coloured panelling to emphasise bays looks good

Comments on roof examples:

- traditional pitched and tiled roofs look good
- flat roofs look bad

5.00

Notes from workshop exercise 3 – Design Features

Three sheets were shown to residents:

- sheet 1 - entrances and canopies
- sheet 2 - balconies
- sheet 3 - bays & major features

The sheets each had 6 photo examples of a design feature, labelled with letters A-E. Residents were asked write the letters in order of preference, noting down any comments they had about any of the examples shown.

Comments on entrances and canopies:

Residents like entrances which are:

- open and airy
- light and spacious
- vibrant and attractive
- welcoming
- simple, not too busy
- elegant looking

- Entrance B was the most popular with its large window adjacent to the door
- Entrance F was disliked by one group for being “not posh enough!” whilst the other group liked it.
- Entrance D was also disliked for being recessed and dark.

Comments on balconies:

Residents like balconies which are:

- secure
- a good size
- private - separate from their neighbours’ balconies
- light, airy and bright

Comments on bays & major features:

Pictures C & E were the most popular, indicating that residents like:

- simple repetition of bays to create a pleasing rhythm
- bays articulated with dark cladding, against a contrasting white render building
- large windows
- repetition of bays combined with variation of densities (alternating 2-3 storeys).
- planters at the entrances

Pictures A & D were the least popular, indicating that residents don’t like:

- excessive timber cladding
- circular tower buildings
- fussy entrances with too much panelling and no planting

- Only modern choices were shown and some residents commented that’s it would have been better to show some traditional examples too.

6.00

Discussion & Summary

SF summarised the evenings workshops and closed the meeting by showing a selection of materials and inviting residents to put them in order based on how much each material costs. Residents correctly guessed that brick was the most inexpensive material but some were surprised at the cost of different types of panelling in comparison to render and to each other.

SF explained that it is important to use the right materials in the right places to create the best effect in the most cost effective way.

7.00

Residents Feedback

Residents were asked to fill in a short feedback form to let Catalyst know what they thought of the evenings workshop. Out of 1 to 5, most residents rated the workshop at 4 to 5 (with 5 being the best) and said they enjoyed the workshop. Some residents commented that the workshop was too long and some gave slightly lower ratings for the ‘easy to understand’ category.

Next Meeting:

Thursday 19th March: Design Workshop 5 – Masterplan Review
7.00pm at Pinner Hall