

London Legacy Development Corporation Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: UCL East masterplan

Thursday 20 October 2016

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

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Neil Deely
Johnny Winter
Mike Martin
Lynne Sullivan

Attendees

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Hilary Wrenn | LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team |
| Peter Maxwell | London Legacy Development Corporation |
| Irene Man | London Legacy Development Corporation |
| Paul Middleton | London Legacy Development Corporation |
| Deborah Denner | Fortismere Associates |
| Tessa Kordeczka | Fortismere Associates |

Report copied to

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Anthony Hollingsworth | LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team |
| Allison De Marco | LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team |
| Ben Hull | London Borough of Newham |

1. Project name and site address

UCL East, Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park

2. Presenting team

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| Selina Mason | LDA Design |
| Graciela Moreno | LDA Design |
| Martin Summersgill | UCL |
| Richard Maung | Deloitte Real Estate |

3. Planning authority's views

The planning authority is particularly interested to assess how successfully the masterplan responds to: points of arrival; movement through the site; interpretation of 'fluid zones'; north / south routes through Marshgate; and entrances to the buildings.

Design teams have now been appointed for both Marshgate (Stanton Williams) and Pool Street (Lifschutz Davidson Sandilands).

This meeting focuses specifically on key issues emerging from the Quality Review Panel's previous consideration of the masterplan, notably connection to Pudding Mill; the north / south route through Marshgate (The Lane); and the configuration of blocks on Pool Street East and Pool Street West.

The outline planning application for the masterplan will be submitted in December 2016.

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel is encouraged by the significant progress made in developing the masterplan, including carefully considered responses to its earlier comments. It makes some observations about the quality of the environment of The Lane (north) on Marshgate, and suggests that the expression of the 'fluid zones' of the buildings on Pool Street West and Pool Street East might help to inform the best configuration of the Pool Street blocks. Much will depend on the detailed design codes and parameter plans that support the masterplan and the panel would be pleased to review these. Further details are provided below.

Development of masterplan

- The panel appreciates the depth of analysis undertaken to identify optimum solutions for the Marshgate and Pool Street sites.
- The revised masterplan responds well to issues previously identified by the panel and, overall, demonstrates strong placemaking qualities.
- In particular, the configuration of the four plots on Marshgate promises to come together well. The scale of the buildings will, however, also determine

the successful creation of social spaces. In this context, three dimensional modelling would be helpful.

- This is particularly relevant to The Lane on Marshgate (see below). The panel asks whether design codes and parameter plans developed to support the masterplan might include a specification that would prevent these relatively narrow spaces becoming too oppressive.

Movement / connections

- The panel questions whether the arrival point from Pudding Mill at the southwest of Marshgate merits such a large space. Clarification of how this space might be contained and animated would be helpful – bearing in mind that it relates to City Mill River and also the planned secondary school.

Marshgate (PDZ2)

- The Lane establishes a shared surface route through Marshgate between Plots 1 and 2 (north) and Plots 3 and 4 (south). While a service road, The Lane is also conceived as a pedestrian route.
- The Lane (north) is proposed at a minimum width of 12.4m and The Lane (south) at 15m. While Malet Place at the UCL campus in Bloomsbury is suggested as a precedent for The Lane, the panel is not convinced that it demonstrates that a wider north / south route through Marshgate would not be more appropriate given the proposed height of the buildings fronting The Lane.
- The panel questions whether, for those approaching from Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park and Thornton Street to the north, it will be evident that The Lane is a pedestrian route leading through to Marshgate's central plaza – rather than predominantly a service road.
- While acknowledging that The Lane (north) is not anticipated as a principal pedestrian route – and that main entrances will be located on the plaza – there appears to be little that would draw people through it.
- On the other hand, The Lane (south), which is wider and will include main entrances, would appear to work well as a route from Pudding Mill and Siding Street to the south.
- In this context, the panel recommends that parameter plans specify where building entrances are to be located.
- Although The Lane (north) is a relatively short street, the buildings on either side can be expected to have heavy servicing requirements. In order to better understand how well The Lane might work, details of the servicing strategy to be included in design codes and parameter plans would be helpful.

Pool Street West and Pool Street East (PDZ1.2b and PDZ1.2c)

- The panel appreciates the thorough analysis undertaken to arrive at the most appropriate configuration of the blocks on Pool Street West and Pool Street East. It acknowledges the challenges in identifying the best option – including relating successfully to Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park and the London Aquatics Centre – because of the scale of the linear blocks.
- The panel suggests that a solution might be sought in exploiting the ‘fluid zones’ to be incorporated at the lower levels of the buildings.
- Expressing the largely transparent ‘fluid zone’ more explicitly by stepping back the levels above – so that the ‘fluid zone’ provides the prominent street frontage – could set up a stronger dialogue with the park and London Aquatics Centre, and also establish a stronger edge along Pool Street.

Public realm

- Clarification of how prescriptive – or flexible – the design codes for the UCL East public realm might be would be helpful.

Next steps

- The panel commends the masterplanning team for work undertaken to resolve outstanding issues – with positive results.
- Successful implementation of the masterplan will depend on the detailed design codes and parameter plans that support it. The panel offers to review and comment on the codes and plans, once the outline planning application is submitted.