



FRAME PROJECTS

London Legacy Development Corporation Quality Review Panel

Report of Planning Application Review: Chobham Farm Zone 2

Thursday 18 May 2017

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

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Russell Curtis
Andrew Harland

Attendees

Hilary Wrenn	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Steve Tomlinson	London Legacy Development Corporation
Tessa Kordeczka	Frame Projects

Report copied to

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

Note on process

The Quality Review Panel comments below follow on from a pre-application review of Chobham Farm Zone 2. Panel members who attended the previous meeting were: Peter Studdert (chair); Peter St John; David Lindsey; and Andrew Harland.

1. Project name and site address

Chobham Farm Zone 2, land north of Penny Brookes Street, Stratford, London E15 1DR

Planning application reference:17/00175/REM

2. Presenting team

Carolina Ferrando	PRP
Angeli Ganoo-Fletcher	PRP Landscape
Marylís Ramos	PRP Environmental
Steve Hancocks	Higgins Homes
Rebecca Caines	Lichfields

3. Planning authority's views

Zone 2 is the third phase of the Chobham Farm development and is anticipated to form a link between Zones 1 and 4. Particular attention has been given to achieving a successful interface between the different zones. The delivery of Zone 3 – including its timing – remains undecided, however. It is important that the detailed design for Zone 2 results in an effective interim response to the boundary of Zone 3 to the east of the site, as well as integrating successfully to Zone 1 (completed) and Zone 4 (under construction).

While emphasis has been placed on the relationship between the different zones, comments are now sought on the architectural expression of the courtyard blocks and the maisonettes, as well as the landscape design.

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel supports approval of the planning application for Chobham Farm Zone 2 in principle. Reservations remain, however, about the significant number of single aspect units, in particular those that are north facing. Otherwise, the panel finds much to admire in the architecture of both the courtyard blocks and the maisonettes. It suggests some refinements to the elevation along Penny Brookes Street, and also the integration of deck access to the maisonettes. The panel welcomes the revised, much improved, landscape design strategy.

These comments are expanded below, and those made at the previous meeting that remain relevant are repeated for clarity.



Response to context

- The panel thinks that sound strategic decisions have been made to respond to the site's significant challenges, and that the proposal has the potential to result in a successful development.
- The panel commends the design team on its presentation – which sets out clearly how its previous comments have been addressed.
- This includes relocating ground floor office space from the corner of Penny Brookes Street and the shared surface route through Zone 2, and replacing it with retail use. This can be expected to contribute significantly to the liveliness and openness of this prominent corner.

Architectural expression

- The elevation along Penny Brookes Street is well mannered and coherent. Details such as variation in the design of balconies and contrast in brickwork work well. In addition, the chamfered detailing of entrances provides richness and distinctiveness to the ground floor.
- The panel suggests, however, that the elevation of the upper storeys might benefit from some minor refinement to add interest and lift it a little.
- The architectural expression of the maisonettes has developed well, resulting in a pleasing domestic scale.
- The panel notes that lift cores and deck access have been added to the maisonettes. Rather than simply applying deck access to the rear elevation, which could appear somewhat as a compromise, the panel thinks that a different approach might be taken.
- Either of two approaches might be pursued. Deck access could be integrated more strongly with the architecture, to avoid it appearing added on and extraneous. Alternatively, it could be expressed more explicitly as an element in its own right and a feature to be celebrated.
- Deck access is west facing, looking on to the community gardens. There may therefore be scope for considering the design of deck access together with the landscape of the gardens.
- The panel stresses that the success of the scheme will depend on meticulous attention to detailed design, quality of materials and construction.

Residential accommodation

- The panel had previously expressed concern that the internal layout of the courtyard blocks – with access from central corridors – resulted in a significant number of single aspect units. Generally, it considers north facing single aspect units to be unacceptable.



- The panel regrets that solutions that could maximise dual aspect units – for example additional cores or deck access – have not been applied, and recommends further exploration of ways to reduce, as far as possible, the number of single aspect units.

Landscape design

- The panel warmly welcomes revisions made to the landscape design strategy. These respond effectively to its previous comments and result in considerable improvements.
- It stresses the importance of ensuring that tree growth at the eastern edge, along Thornham Grove, of the landscaped green space at the heart of the scheme is sufficient to protect it from existing industrial use on Zone 3.
- The design of the podium garden is much improved, resulting in a softer and more welcoming environment for residents. While the tree planting in the centre of the garden will provide a pleasant small glade, the panel strongly recommends that the trees are permanently integrated, rather than planted in containers.

Next steps

- The Quality Review Panel supports approval in principle of the planning application for Chobham Farm Zone 2 – which it thinks has the potential to be a successful development.
- It repeats its reservations, however, about the significant number of single aspect units, including some that are north facing, included in the scheme.

