

## **London Legacy Development Corporation Quality Review Panel**

### **Report of Planning Application Review Meeting: Marshgate Lane**

Friday, 27 November 2015

Level 10, 1 Stratford Place, Montfichet Road, London E20 1EJ

#### **Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)  
Catherine Burd  
Lindsey Whitelaw  
David Gilpin

#### **Attendees**

Allison De Marco	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Anne Ogundiya	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Deborah Denner	Fortismere Associates
Tessa Kordeczka	Fortismere Associates

#### **Report also copied to**

Anthony Hollingsworth	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
James Bolt	London Borough of Newham

#### **Note on process**

The Quality Review Panel comments below follow on from two pre-application reviews, and a planning application review, of the proposals for Marshgate Business Centre and 14 Marshgate Lane. Panel members who attended the previous meetings were: Peter Studdert (chair); John Lyall; Alex Ely; Lindsey Whitelaw; Lynne Sullivan; and Liam Bond.

#### **Declaration of interest**

Deborah Denner is project manager for the Quality Review Panel. Her husband James Denner is a Director at Squire and Partners, who are the architects for Marshgate Business Centre. James Denner is not involved in this project.

## **1. Project name and site address**

Marshgate Business Centre and 14 Marshgate Lane, London E15 2NH

Planning application reference: 14/00422/FUL

## **2. Planning authority's views**

The planning authority has reservations about modifications to the façade design of the buildings providing workspace, following the Quality Review Panel's earlier comments. These had included recommendations for a simpler, more robust base to the buildings.

## **3. Quality Review Panel's views**

The Quality Review Panel had found much to admire in the planning submission for Marshgate Business Centre and 14 Marshgate Lane: more detailed comments are provided in the report of the planning application review meeting of 10 September 2015.

The panel had suggested, however, that the façades of the workspace in buildings 1 and 2 could benefit from a simpler approach. Although refinements have been made, the panel does not think that they are successful and recommends further revisions to the design.

While the panel welcomes the intention to simplify these façades, and supports a differentiation between workspace below and residential above, it thinks that the revised design is unsatisfactory in a number of ways.

The proportions of the podium level and the upper level – separated by a narrow gap – result in an awkward relationship between the two. The podium level appears flimsy. The workspaces provided will potentially accommodate light industrial uses and the lightweight, transparent façades created by extensive glazing do not reflect this – a more durable, solid treatment is required. In addition, it is unclear how well a south-facing glazed elevation will perform environmentally.

The panel therefore recommends that further thought be given to adding weight and robustness to the elevations of workspace accommodation.

### *Next steps*

The panel suggests that resolution of the design of the façades for these buildings be dealt with by conditions to approval of the planning application. The panel also offers to comment on amended designs.