



FRAME PROJECTS

London Legacy Development Corporation Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Legacy Wharf Phase 3

Thursday 23 March 2023

Allies and Morrison office, 85 Southwark St, London SE1 0HX

Panel

Hari Phillips (chair)
Julia Barfield
Teresa Borsuk
Keith French
Barbara Kaucky

Attendees

Alexander Cameron	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Mo Aleshinloye	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Pippa Henshall	London Legacy Development Corporation
Paul Taylor	London Legacy Development Corporation
Adrian Harvey	Frame Projects
Patrycja Karas	Frame Projects
Ellen Peirson	Frame Projects

Report copied to

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

Declarations of Interest

Teresa Borsuk, Bellway Homes Limited is a client of Pollard Thomas Edwards.
Teresa Borsuk is not involved in any of the Bellway projects.

Note on process

The Quality Review Panel comments below follow on from two pre-application reviews, and one planning application review. Panel members who attended the previous meetings were: Peter Studdert (chair); Hari Phillips (chair); Julia Barfield; Teresa Borsuk; Catherine Burd; Keith French; Barbara Kaucky; and Johnny Winter.

Report of Formal Review Meeting
23 March 2023
QRP105_Legacy Wharf Phase 3

1. Project name and site address

Legacy Wharf Phase 3, Pudding Mill, London, E15 2PW

21/00460/FUL

2. Presenting team

Harrison Thomas	Bellway Homes Limited Thames Gateway
Robert Maxwell	Allies and Morrison
Adam Hewgill	Allies and Morrison
Paul Shirley-Smith	Camlins Landscape Architects
Diana Thomson	Savills
George Daniel	Savills

3. Planning authority briefing

The site is located within the Pudding Mill area which is also located within sub area 4 of the Local Plan and is identified in site allocation SA.4.3 'Pudding Mill' with the allocation including an area to be provided as play space. The site formerly contained a waste transfer centre, which has now ceased operation.

The Quality Review Panel previously reviewed the proposals in July 2020, and a revised proposal was then presented to the panel in August 2022. The current proposal has been revised again, with the overall quantum of development and scale being reduced, as well as the site layout being revised to remove the podium and introduce additional public realm at ground level. The proposal is now for the redevelopment of the site to provide new buildings ranging from six to 14 storeys and would provide approximately 343 residential dwellings in addition to commercial floorspace (1,656 square metres). The proposal would include a detailed element for two blocks that would be part eight and part nine stories with commercial uses at ground floor and residential uses on the upper floors, with the remainder of the site proposed in outline.

Officers would welcome the panel's comments on the proposed heights and massing, the architecture and materiality, the landscape character and scheme layout. In addition, comments are invited on the play strategy and the treatment of the nursery.



4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel thanks the design team for their presentation and for responding positively to the comments made at the last review. It welcomes the consideration of the climate crisis from first principles, but suggests that further consideration should be given to the circular economy of the scheme, including what happens to the waste material after demolition, and how the scheme is designed for deconstruction, with future waste material in mind.

Further consideration should also be given to placemaking, to ensure that the scheme has a unique character and a sense of place. The panel suggests that this should be more explicit in the detailed portion of the scheme, so that this can be embedded in the design code to safeguard the quality of the overall scheme. The panel feels that, although the architectural design has improved, it would like to see more special moments to add emphasis and richness. These should be described in detail. Given the proposed hybrid application, the panel feels strongly that a clear and robust design code will be needed to guarantee delivery of a high-quality design. The panel would also like to see one of the taller buildings included in the detailed planning application.

The panel is broadly supportive of the proposed heights and distribution of heights across the scheme. Nevertheless, the height of development proposed requires the criteria of BN5 to be met. While improvements have been made, the scheme currently falls some way short of these criteria.

Scale, heights and massing

- The panel previously expressed concerns for the height across Phase 3, at the July 2020, December 2020 and August 2022 reviews, and it feels that these concerns have been addressed and that the heights are more suitable.
- The panel welcomes the removal of the podium from the proposal and finds it to be an improvement to the quality of the public and semi-public spaces. The provision of a large central square works well, and the spaces feel much more generous.
- The relocation of the nursery to its own building is an improvement, but there are concerns over the orientation of Block C. The current orientation creates a confusion between back and front elevations of this block. The orientation should be tested with the experience of traveling along Cook's Road in mind. Alternative configurations, such as rotating this block by 90 degrees, should be explored.

Character and sense of place



- Whilst the panel accepts the design team's approach of developing high quality 'background' architecture in principle, the scheme lacks a sense of place and the panel encourages the design team to further consider the narrative of its design.
- Key moments, details and/or buildings should be given greater emphasis with particular expression to generate variety, richness and interest across the scheme. These moments should be written into the design code and expressed more specifically in the detailed planning application.
- The panel does not feel that the industrial heritage described in the presentation is reflected in the design and suggests that the design team either look at the specificity of this building type and make it more explicit in the proposal, or else pursue other influences that could give the scheme more character.
- The panel feels that the design currently feels generic and would like to see greater ambition in the architecture. In order to satisfy Policy BN.5 of the Local Plan, the design team should push the design much harder to demonstrate that it is exceptional. The panel advises that this is not just about visual appearance but includes other aspects of the design such as sustainability, typology and quality of accommodation.

Layout and plan

- The courtyard between Blocks C and D does not work when the gate is closed as planned at night and instead creates a dead end. The cycle parking will also become inaccessible as it can only be entered from the west. Further consideration should be given to how these spaces will function. This might be resolved by reconsidering the orientation of Block C as noted previously.
- The substation that sits between Blocks A and G compromises this space along Cook's Road as well as the experience of what is described as a key route through the site. The panel accepts that there are limitations as to the location of the substation, but advises that the design team must consider how this will affect this route and whether it can be more effectively integrated into the scheme.
- The panel feels that the design of the staircase in Block D is underdeveloped. The slot windows are too small, and some are at knee level. The panel suggests that the staircase could be considered a vertical feature, and the design be developed further in order to encourage active use of the stairs.

Landscape and public realm

- The public spaces have the potential to make the scheme feel special and the character of the different external spaces should be developed to describe the different experience of each. The design team should explore how the City Mill



Square and the Residents' Garden can differ in planting and landscape design, as they currently feel generic.

- The panel would like to see the design team consider pedestrian movement through and beyond the site and to use this to add clarity to the public realm. For example, the panel is unconvinced by the relevance of the diagonal route across the central garden.
- The panel notes that building up to the red line boundary, coupled with the barriers required by having a nursery on the street edge on Cook's Road, will create an ungenerous public realm. The design team should consider the orientation of Blocks C and D on this edge and develop a landscape design that will create an enjoyable public realm on Cook's Road.
- The panel welcomes the inclusion of affordable housing and City Mill Square in Phase 1 of the development but questions the success of the first phase in its interim condition prior to the completion of Phase 2. The design team should consider how the development can be successful in its interim condition.
- Where trees are shown on CGIs they should accurately reflect the proposed design.

Detailed design and design codes

- The design team's aspirations for robust and simple architecture have been expressed too strongly across the scheme, and the taller buildings would benefit from being finessed, to create special moments within the scheme. The design team should identify particular areas of the scheme that can have an elevated quality of detail.
- The panel continues to encourage more of the scheme to become part of the detailed application and suggests that at least one of the taller buildings should form part of this, to give greater confidence in the development.
- The panel is not fully convinced by the design quality of the detailed portion of the application and therefore feels it would be inadequate for this to be the basis of the design code as it stands.
- The design team should develop a rigorous design code to give confidence to the overall scheme and to safeguard the creation of a cohesive neighbourhood. The panel is particularly interested in the potential of the nursery spaces and feels that they should be designed and coded.
- The panel would like the design team to consider what would happen at the boundary of the detailed application before the illustrative portion of the scheme has come forward. The design team should consider temporary landscaping and interim uses.



Environmental sustainability

- The panel is encouraged by the analysis of the sustainability of the scheme, but would like to know more about how the material removed during demolition will be reused and how this can have a positive impact. The panel would also like the design team to consider how they are designing for deconstruction.
- The panel would like the design team to respond creatively to microclimate effects within the elevations, particularly for overheating, and to consider options beyond the brise-soleil. The design team could test shutters, sliders, recessed or chamfered windows, which would also add character to the design. Similarly, legacy forest-scale trees could be considered, to reduce overheating and increase biodiversity.

Next steps

- The Quality Review Panel feels that the scheme has developed considerably since the previous review in August 2022, but that it still lacks design detail that could elevate the quality of the scheme and give the neighbourhood a more specific character. It is the panel's view that the proposal does not satisfy Policy BN.5 of the Local Plan.
- The panel would welcome the opportunity to review the scheme again, in particular with regard to the scope of the proposed design code.

