

ATTENDANCE LISTS

Residents

Name	Address
S. Singh	Mill Farm Close
S. Ravichandran	Mill Farm Close
Ravi Panara	Mill Farm Close
Harry Hilliard	Mill Farm Close
Sophie Alderson	Mill Farm Close
Dani	Mill Farm Close
H. Chin	Mill Farm Close
Jayne Starett	Mill Farm Close
D.Davis	Mill Farm Close
J. Begum	Mill Farm Close
Rianna Everitt	Mill Farm Close
Darell Alexander	Mill Farm Close

LB Harrow

Elaine Slowe	London Borough of Harrow Housing
--------------	----------------------------------

Independent Housing Consultants

Louis Blair	First Call
-------------	------------

Catalyst Team

Murray Crawford (MC)	Catalyst Housing Group
David Rayner (DR)	Higgins Construction
Judith Marshall (JM)	Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects
Annalisa Spencer (AS)	Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects

1.00

MEETING INTRODUCTION & Powerpoint presentation

JM introduced the Catalyst team who were present, as well as the team from LB Harrow. JM explained that Mill farm resident Ravi Panara had been doing work experience at PTEa and showed the group some photos of the team at work.

JM introduced tonight's workshop topic as: Review of External Appearances and Materials and briefly described the agenda for the evening.

A powerpoint presentation was shown, reminding residents of the previous workshop on external appearances and what they had said about:

- the character areas – what each should look like
- materials – which materials you liked and disliked
- design features ie. windows, entrances, bays and balconies

JM and AS then told residents how their previous comments had helped to develop the design. 3D perspectives were shown to demonstrate recent design changes and explain how design decisions have been made.

There were two workshop exercises: one group exercise on design developments to the character areas, and one individual exercise on balconies, as an example of a single design feature which can have an impact on what the whole building will look like.

Residents were asked to divide into 3 groups to start the workshops.

Notes form Workshop exercise 1 – Character Areas

Each group was given three A1 sheets showing each of the three areas:

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

Each sheet showed a 3d perspective of the area and listed design changes which have been made (as could be seen on the image). Residents were told these changes were as a result of their previous comments, and asked to tick or cross each change. A tick meant a good change and that they agreed with the way the design has been developed. A cross meant they felt this was a bad change and they did not agree.

The sheets also showed some photo examples which had been preferred at previous workshops. Residents were asked whether the images showed architectural elements which are suitable for the areas in question.

Comments on ‘the green’:

- all residents agreed that it was right to introduced traditional stock brick as a main material
- generally it was agreed that bays should be articulated by a change in materials
- there were different opinions regarding size of windows -whilst many residents liked larger windows to increase natural surveillance and light, some felt that this could compromise privacy
- generally it was felt that balconies should overlook the green space where possible, particularly if this meant less balconies would overlook private gardens - whilst some residents liked the coloured glass, others suggested alternative balcony materials ie. steel
- most residents agreed that paths and soft landscaping should be added to the green space
- most residents want a designated play area for children within the green space
- groups were divided in their opinion about whether a designated ball sports area should be added to the green space
- the most popular photo examples chosen as suitable for the green were those which show:
 - balconies
 - clearly articulated bays
 - simple repetition
 - modern use of brick

Comments on ‘the street’:

- all residents agreed that different materials should be used to create more defined bays
- all residents agreed that green space should be reduced to create more parking along the street
- all residents liked balconies which overlook the street and parking, although it was agreed that sunlight is still the most important factor regarding the orientation and position of balconies
- all residents liked the top storey to be set back
- generally groups all liked the boundaries introduced to separate private gardens from public space
- all groups liked the increased street lighting and canopies added around entrances
- all residents agreed that the reduced tree density was good as it allowed more natural light into homes

- the most popular photo examples chosen as suitable for the street were those which show:
 - balconies
 - simple repetition
 - large, welcoming entrances
 - bin stores by the front entrance
 - a mixture of brick and render

Comments on ‘the terrace’, ‘the courtyard’, ‘the mews’ and ‘the close’:

- generally residents liked the use of traditional stock brick in a modern way with modern materials, but not all residents agreed that coloured glass should be used
- whilst most residents agreed that traditional paving surfaces should be used to create a traditional mews feel, some had worries about there being no differentiation between the pavement and the car park
- all residents liked that green space had been reduced and replaced with parking bays
- generally residents liked the balconies overlooking car parking
- all residents agreed that canopies and lighting should be added outside entrance doors
- generally groups agreed that window sizes could be reduced slightly to increase privacy
- additional comments included:
 - modern style liked
 - repetition liked
 - one group commented that the 3d image looked box-like and dull and needed more detail and articulation.
 - some residents expressed a preference for the style of architecture used at Page Road.

- the most popular photo examples chosen as suitable for the terrace, courtyard, mews and close were those which show:
 - traditional materials used in a modern way; especially brick
 - repetition
 - clearly articulated bays
 - entrances with bin stores, canopies and lighting

3.00 Notes form Workshop exercise 2 – Balconies

Each group member was shown a balcony image in 3d. They were asked if they liked the shape, size and balustrade shown and if they had any other comments about the balcony drawing.

The sheets showed a choice of balcony materials: steel, glass, masonry and mixed materials. 3D balcony drawings showed how each material would make the balcony look. Different photo examples of balconies in all of these materials were shown and residents were asked which ones they liked/ disliked.

Comments on the balcony example shown:

- generally residents liked the size of the balcony shown
- some residents did not like the shape of the main balcony shown, but preferred one of the other 2 types of balcony
- whilst many residents liked the glass balustrade, others suggested that coloured glass, darker glass and metal or concrete balustrades would improve the balcony.

Comments on balcony materials:

- Whilst it is evident that all residents have very varied opinions regarding balcony materials, the most popular photo examples showed either glass balustrades or a mixture of materials.

- Steel balustrades were also generally liked
- The brick balcony photo example was popular but the other examples of masonry or concrete were not generally preferred.

4.00 **Discussion & Summary**

JM explained to residents that their choices and comments showed an overall tendency for classic, simple architecture. The majority of residents seem to like elegant repetition and traditional, robust materials used in a crisp, modern way.

Residents were told that, whilst it is clear that there are many individual opinions and tastes, the feedback from the design workshops is forming a clear overall picture of the type of architecture Mill Farm Close residents want to see.

5.00 **Residents Feedback**

Residents were asked to fill in a short feedback form to let Catalyst know what they thought of the evening's workshop and other previous workshops.

Each of the following criteria was marked by residents from 1 to 5 (with 5 being the best):

Informative: scores were generally 4-5
 Interesting content: scores were generally 4-5
 Easy to understand: scores were generally 3-4
 Quality of workshop: scores were generally 3-5

- On average, residents thought the length of the workshop was fine
- In general most residents felt that the workshops have been enjoyable

6.00 **Next Meeting:**

Thursday 30th March, 7.00pm at Pinner Hall
 Design Workshop 7 – Final round-up of all meeting topics and workshops:

7.00 **Additional Information:**

MC invited residents to visit Page Road, a built example of another Catalyst scheme on Saturday, 25th April