



FRAME PROJECTS

London Legacy Development Corporation Quality Review Panel

Report of Planning Application Review Meeting: James Riley Point

Thursday 23 February 2023

Small Auditorium 1, Level 10, 5 Endeavour Square, Stratford, London E20 1JN.

Panel

Peter Bishop (chair)
Jonathan Hagos
Nathan Millar

Attendees

Hilary Wrenn	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Frances Madders	London Legacy Development Corporation
Halil Yorel	London Borough of Newham
Cindy Reriti	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Anthony Hollingsworth	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Catherine Smyth	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Pippa Henshall	London Legacy Development Corporation
James Bolt	London Borough of Newham
Ben Hull	London Borough of Newham
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects

Note on process

The Quality Review Panel comments below follow on from two pre-application reviews. Panel members who attended the previous meetings were: Peter Studdert (chair); Jonathan Hagos; Sabine Hogenhout; Shashank Jain; Barbara Kaucky; Mike Martin; Julia Ratcliffe.

1. Project name and site address

James Riley Point
Junction of Carpenters Road and Jupp Road West, Stratford E15 2HZ

2. Presenting team

Jessica Doughan	Populo
Mike Stott	Populo
Gary Alston	ECD
Laura Teixeira	ECD
Louise Wille	XCO2
Kieran Easton	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design
James Parrott	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design

3. Planning authority briefing

James Riley Point comprises a 23-storey residential tower, completed in 1969, on a site to the north of the Carpenters Road and Jupp Road junction. The site is located within the Carpenters Estate, for which an outline planning application, submitted in August 2022, is under consideration for new and improved housing, new commercial space, and community uses.

London Legacy Development Corporation's Planning Decisions Committee (PDC) approved the refurbishment of the James Riley Point residential tower block and new sports/community facilities development on the site in 2022. The developer now wishes to seek approval for amendments to the tower's façade, to improve the overheating performance of the design, without reliance on openable windows, and to improve daylight performance, taking into account the detailed design of window framing. Changes to the materiality of the balcony surrounds and to the arrangement of balconies across the facades are also proposed.

Given the impact of the material treatment and design changes on a tall building, planning officers request the panel's comments, to inform their assessment of the proposals against Policy BN.5: Tall Buildings. Officers would welcome the panel's views on the architectural approach to balcony additions to the tower, the architectural language and material treatment across the tower, and the contribution that the scheme makes to the surrounding townscape. Comments are also sought on the quality of external amenity space that the balconies will provide, including overlooking. Comments on the success of the proposals in regard to energy, sustainability, micro-climate, and climate change are also welcome.



4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel welcomes the improved balcony arrangement, and the higher quality of private external amenity and sense of placemaking that this will foster. However, it would like to see a similar enhancement to those parts of the elevations that do not have balconies, to improve the legibility of the tower as a whole.

The panel feels that the tower would benefit from a simpler material and tonal palette, and a reduction in the number of different details and junctions. The elevations and balconies should be well-detailed and executed, and the colours carefully specified, to ensure that they endure over time. High-quality materials are essential for a tall building, but further consideration should also be given to the embodied carbon of those materials. Overheating analysis should be undertaken for the updated proposals, to ensure that the development will meet future climate requirements and provide a high quality of life for residents.

The panel welcomes the client's commitment to retain the two architectural practices throughout the project. It considers that the scheme has the potential to meet Local Plan Policy BN.5, if the refinements suggested are incorporated into the proposal.

Sustainability

- The panel supports the design team's ambition to achieve EnerPhit Certification and welcomes the consideration that is being given to design measures that will help to reduce the risk of overheating.
- It welcomes the design team's use of TM59 modelling in the overheating analysis undertaken prior to the submission of the application, but it would like to see further analysis of the latest proposals, to ensure that the development will meet future climate requirements and provide a high quality of life for the residents who will be living here.
- The panel supports the ongoing investigation into an optimal mix of natural ventilation, including openable windows, ventilation panels, and mechanical ventilation, with the ambition to use mechanical ventilation only where absolutely necessary.
- While the use of ceramics is supported, the panel notes that some of the proposed materials are relatively carbon intensive and any further opportunities for minimising these, without compromising the overall quality of the scheme, should be considered.



Elevational treatment and materiality

- The panel likes the improved balcony arrangement, but it feels that the treatment at the south end of the east and west elevations, where there are no balconies, should be further enhanced, for example through greater expression of window frames and mullions, to improve the legibility of the tower as a whole.
- The panel encourages the design team to reduce the number of materials used and to simplify the tonal palette. For example, the green anodized aluminium, proposed for the picture frames, could also be used for the vertical fins in place of the bronze tone. Further testing is needed.
- If ventilation panels are to be included in the window arrangement, consideration should be given to their materiality and how they will fit into the overall aesthetic of the tower.
- The panel also suggests that the tower will be more successful if the number of different details and junctions are reduced.
- A section drawing is requested, to show how the vertical elements on the crown will align with the vertical elements on the main section of the building.

Balcony design

- The panel welcomes the improved quality of private external amenity and the spirit of 'conviviality' and strong sense of community that the balcony arrangement will foster.
- However, it would like to see mechanisms put in place, to provide residents with a means of shaping their personal outdoor space, to provide more privacy without resorting to the use of, for example, bamboo fencing, which would have an adverse impact on the aesthetic of the tower.
- Further, the client's careful, long-term management of the tower will also play an important role in successful placemaking.
- Drawings should also be provided, to show how the elevation will be viewed from the perspective of a resident standing on their balcony, when looking both up and down the building, to give a sense of what it will be like to inhabit the balconies.
- Carefully considered detail design will be crucial, to prevent thermal bridging between the existing tower structure and the new balconies.



- The panel feels that balconies should be positively drained, to prevent any unsanitary water falling onto balconies at a lower level, and to avoid the risk of staining of the facade.

Quality of the interior design

- Drawings are requested for the planning officers, to show how servicing will be integrated into the interior design and layout of the tower, given the restricted floor-to-ceiling heights.

Next steps

- The panel supports the proposal and considers that it has the potential to meet Local Plan Policy BN.5, if the refinements discussed here are incorporated into the scheme.

