

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

### **Report of Planning Application Review Meeting: Cherry Park**

Thursday 10 December 2015

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

#### **Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)

John Lyall

#### **Attendees**

Hilary Wrenn

LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team

Steve Tomlinson

London Legacy Development Corporation

Deborah Denner

Fortismere Associates

Tessa Kordeczka

Fortismere Associates

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

Anthony Hollingsworth

LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team

Allison De Marco

LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team

James Bolt

London Borough of Newham

#### **Note on process**

The Quality Review Panel comments below follow on from a pre-application review of the scheme for Cherry Park. Panel members who attended the previous meeting were: John Lyall (chair); Tom Lonsdale; Dan Epstein; and Peter Stewart.

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

Cherry Park, Stratford City, Zone 1

Planning application reference: 15/00358/OUT

## **2. Presenting team**

Emma Prichard-Selby Stratford City Developments Ltd

Reinhold Schmaderer Glenn Howells Architects

Chris Goddard DP9

Chris Gascoigne DP9

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

The design team has responded to points raised during pre-application discussions with the planning authority – which generally supports the form, massing and layout of the proposal for Cherry Park. It has requested more information about some aspects of the duplex units, and is seeking assurances that the quality of residential accommodation at ground level is acceptable.

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

The Quality Review Panel offers broad support for this scheme, which promises high quality residential development in a prominent location between Stratford Station, Westfield Shopping Centre and Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. Scope for further improvement remains, however, including: to reduce the number of single aspect units; to ensure provision of community facilities; and to further develop the landscape design. The panel would support planning officers in negotiating amendments to the outline planning application to respond to these issues, or using conditions to allow them to be addressed at a reserved matters stage. These comments are expanded below, and comments from the previous review that remain relevant are repeated for clarity.

### *Scale and massing*

- In broad terms, the panel supports the scale and massing of development proposed for Cherry Park.
- Two tall buildings, of differing height, are proposed on Westfield Avenue, and the panel supports this approach.
- The proportions of the mansion blocks that make up the remainder of the scheme also seem well considered.

### *Single aspect units*

- The panel notes that 55% of residential units are single aspect. It recommends that further consideration be given to minimising their number.

- Single aspect apartments accessed from long corridors are not best practice, and should be avoided where possible. In this respect, the panel would expect the same standards to be applied to private rental accommodation as to any other tenure.

#### *Community facilities*

- The panel thinks that further thought is needed about the quality of life that will be achieved for future residents at Cherry Park. High density private rental housing may result in a transient population, making it a challenge to create a strong sense of community.
- The realities of the housing market, however, mean that families with children are likely to occupy a significant proportion of the new homes – requiring community facilities such as a nursery and play space.
- The panel thinks that facilities such as corner shops and a community hall will be essential to make Cherry Park a good place to live.
- There is an opportunity for this scheme to lead the way in creating a strong sense of community for private rental housing – creating a place where residents will want to live over the long term.
- This will require greater clarity about the community facilities that the scheme provides.

#### *Landscape design*

- Detailed proposals for the landscape design will be provided at reserved matters stage, and the panel would welcome an opportunity to comment on these proposals.
- In terms of the strategic approach to landscape design, the panel thinks that some further thought is needed about the character and use of open space within the scheme.
- For example, the panel does not think that the small courtyard to the north east of the site is the best location for children’s play space.
- Cherry Park Square could be a better location for play facilities, especially if positioned to enjoy maximum sunshine. This would bring welcome animation and life to this space.
- Providing greenhouses or allotments as part of the landscape could also allow residents to take ownership of the generous open spaces.
- Coordination will be needed in relation to the improvements planned for Montfichet Road – for example, to avoid steps up to front doors.

- The potential to create a route through the Urban Garden which opens onto Westfield Avenue was discussed at the previous review. The panel continues to think that this would be beneficial, even if only as a generous undercroft.
- If the Urban Garden does remain a cul de sac, it could be treated as an intimate garden, with high quality landscape design and cafés.

#### *Architecture*

- While full details of the architecture remain to be developed, the panel supports the approach illustrated in the outline planning application.

#### *Next steps*

- The panel is confident that the design team, working with planning officers, will be able to address the points above.
- The panel looks forward to reviewing reserved matters proposals for the scheme's different components, including the various blocks and the public realm.