



FRAME PROJECTS

London Legacy Development Corporation Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Cherry Park (reserved matters)

Thursday 12 October 2017

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

Panel

Mike Martin (chair)
Toby Johnson
Fergus Feilden
Lee Bennett
David Gilpin

Attendees

Hilary Wrenn	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Catherine Smyth	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Russell Butchers	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Steve Tomlinson	London Legacy Development Corporation
Sophie Backhouse	London Legacy Development Corporation
Tessa Kordeczka	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Anthony Hollingsworth	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Ben Hull	London Borough of Newham

1. Project name and site address

Cherry Park, Stratford City, Zone 1

Planning reference: reserved matters pursuant to planning permission
15/00358/OUT

2. Presenting team

Scott Cromack	PRP Architects
Glenn Howells	Glenn Howells Architects
Carolyn Ouwehand	Glenn Howells Architects
Armel Mourgue	Gillespies
Graeme Flynn	Urban Microclimate
Evgenia Budanova	ChapmanBDSP
Kieran Hobbs	Westfield
Michael Day	Westfield
Chris Goddard	DP9 Ltd

3. Planning authority's views

Since the previous review of the scheme in May 2017, attention has focussed on securing outline planning consent for the Cherry Park development.

Further meetings have been held with the design team as the proposal has evolved. Issues that the planning authority considers would benefit from further consideration include: the architectural treatment of the elevations of both the towers and the mansion blocks; the relationship of towers A1 and A3 to Westfield Avenue; natural ventilation to residential accommodation; internal amenity areas, including solariums; and compatibility with the design codes of the outline planning consent.

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the revisions made to the proposal for the Cherry Park development since its previous review – many of which respond to challenges identified earlier. The design of the scheme – both buildings and landscape – has evolved well. The panel encourages further thought to the frontage of the towers and commercial façade along Westfield Avenue to identify a solution that makes the maximum contribution to the quality of the public realm. The panel finds much to admire in the rigour and elegance of the architecture of the towers; their success will depend on the detailed design, quality of materials and construction. The architecture of the mansion blocks has, however, yet to be fully resolved. Reconsidering the varied widths of the horizontal banding proposed for different elevations may be a way forward. The panel commends the comprehensive analysis of microclimatic conditions, and is reassured that, generally, an acceptable environment will be achieved – both internally and externally. The panel thinks that the solariums proposed as internal amenity spaces within the residential towers will



work well. It recommends, however, continued attention to wind levels at areas of the public realm expected to be heavily used by pedestrians.

These comments are expanded below.

Relationship to Westfield Avenue

- The street edge along Westfield Avenue will be critical in cementing the success of the development.
- The initial proposal for an urban garden opening onto Westfield Avenue between towers A1 and A3 has been rethought. Commercial space is now reconfigured, with an entrance from Westfield Avenue, between the towers, and with an urban terrace above at level 3.
- The panel recommends continuing thought to the frontage of the residential towers and the commercial façade along Westfield Avenue. This will have an impact on the quality of the public realm along this road – which the development should seek to enhance.
- A change of plane, achieved by setting the commercial façade back and broadening the public realm, could be an effective solution. The panel therefore encourages the design team to continue to explore this option. The panel would support the proposed tree planting incorporated into this option.
- Identifying an optimum solution may be helped by further studies of the surrounding public realm. It is important to consider the frontage and rhythm of the buildings in the wider context of Westfield Avenue – including, for example, what is on the opposite side of the road and the wider planned public realm improvements.
- While the panel's discussion focussed on the commercial façade on Westfield Avenue, it is equally important to arrive at a satisfactory design for the façade of the residents' amenity hub along Cherry Park Lane between towers A3 and A4.

Architectural expression

- The panel commends the design team's progress in developing the architecture of the towers and the mansion blocks (B and C blocks) – which was at an early stage when previously reviewed. The design shows a clear direction – with welcome additional detail. The provision of models contributes considerably to an understanding and appreciation of the details of the design.
- The panel finds much to admire in the strength, regularity and elegance of the architecture of the towers.
- The depth of the façades contributes considerably to their architectural quality. Retaining this will be essential to preserve the design's integrity; a more sheer façade on buildings of this scale would appear thin and insubstantial.



- The panel stresses that strict consistency in the architectural treatment of towers A1 and A3 – as well as A4 – will be essential, and that the quality of the buildings will depend on the detailed design, quality of materials and construction.
- While the architecture of the towers demonstrates considerable promise, the panel thinks that this has yet to be replicated in the mansion blocks.
- Variations in the width of the horizontal banding is proposed for the ‘urban’, ‘transition’ and ‘park’ edges of the mansion blocks. The panel thinks that more consistency in the horizontal banding would result in a simpler, cleaner design – which would also relate more strongly to the towers. Generally, the panel thinks that the thinner banding of the ‘park edge’ would work more successfully.
- A perceived dissonance in the treatment of the tower blocks and the mansion blocks could detract from the coherence of the development as a whole. The panel therefore recommends further refinement of the architecture of the mansion blocks to match more closely the rigour of the tower blocks. A more solid expression might be preferable, although this may be challenging given the proposed form, and details such as balconies and extensive glazing.
- The panel also recommends further careful consideration of how the frames of the buildings meet the ground – and in particular how the base of the buildings might assume a more domestic feel, while at the same time, in the case of the towers, being appropriate to their scale. This will be critical for the integrity of the scheme.

Residential accommodation

- The panel welcomes the details provided of the glazing and ventilation to the towers. This includes the solariums proposed as internal amenity spaces, with sliding doors and an internal glass balustrade. The panel thinks that these are an effective solution – especially for the higher storeys – that will work well.
- While welcoming the proposed generous, full height glazing, the panel raises the issue of privacy – especially to bedrooms.

Landscape design strategy

- The panel repeats its broad support for the approach to the landscape design, including defining distinctive character areas. The proposals for the landscape design have evolved convincingly and have the potential to be successful.



Microclimatic conditions

- The panel had previously highlighted the considerable microclimatic challenges confronting the scheme: a configuration of buildings and open spaces that could result in a number of shaded spaces; the quality of the streets and open spaces around the towers that might be compromised by wind funnels and downdraughts; and the elevational treatment of the towers that would need to balance both adequate protection and adequate light.
- The panel therefore strongly supports both the reconfiguration of buildings and the architectural interventions that have sought to effectively address these challenges.
- It is also reassured by the comprehensive studies / testing of wind, daylight and sunlight levels and potential overheating.
- A challenge may remain, however, in ensuring adequate daylight / sunlight levels to north and east facing single aspect apartments in the mansion blocks that look onto a rather shady Cherry Park Square.
- The panel also seeks reassurances that the extensive double height glazing of the towers – especially on south facing elevations – will not result in overheating. While the detailed design of window openings, vent panels and apartment layouts have sought to avoid this risk, the quality of glass used will be critical: an appropriate G-value must be ensured throughout.
- The panel recommends continuing careful consideration of microclimatic conditions at the corner of tower A3, at the entrance to Cherry Park Lane from Westfield Avenue, and also the wider public realm. This will be a busy thoroughfare – and could potentially be very windy. Equally, the corner of mansion block B2 at Westfield Avenue and Montfichet Road could be vulnerable to strong gusts of wind.
- While some areas of the landscape – for example, the southwest corner of Cherry Park Square and the courtyard of mansion blocks C1, C2 and C3 – will be predominantly in shade, the panel thinks that this will be acceptable given that residents will have a good choice of landscaped areas within the development.

Next steps

- The Quality Review Panel encourages the design team to continue to refine the proposal for Cherry Park, taking into account the comments above. It is confident that these can be successfully addressed, in consultation with planning officers.

