



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

### **Report of Formal Review Meeting: Carpenters Estate Masterplan Design Code**

Thursday 24 March 2022

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

#### **Panel**

Peter Bishop (chair)  
Cristina Monteiro  
Barbara Kaucky  
Ann Sawyer

#### **Attendees**

Kuljeet Sibia	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Hilary Wrenn	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Pippa Henshall	London Legacy Development Corporation
Frances Madders	London Legacy Development Corporation
Adrian Harvey	Frame Projects
Marina Stuart	Frame Projects

#### **Apologies / report copied to**

Anthony Hollingsworth	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Catherine Smyth	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
James Bolt	London Borough of Newham
Ben Hull	London Borough of Newham
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Cindy Reriti	Frame Projects

#### **Note on process**

The Quality Review Panel comments on the Design Code follow on from two pre-application reviews on the Carpenters Estate masterplan. Panel members who attended the masterplan review meetings were: Peter Bishop (chair); Peter Studdert (chair); Jayden Ali; Jane Briginshaw; Keith French; Simon Henley; Shashank Jain; Barbara Kaucky; Ann Sawyer.

Report of Formal Review Meeting  
24 March 2022  
QRP153\_Carpenters Estate Masterplan Design Code

## 1. Project name and site address

Carpenters Estate Regeneration, Carpenters Estate, Stratford, Newham, E15

## 2. Presenting team

Harrison Symonds	Proctor and Matthews
Neil Deely	Metropolitan Workshop
Pia Berg	Metropolitan Workshop
Joe Williams	Metropolitan Workshop
Nick Clough	Populo Living
Nick Bigelow	LDA Design
Louise Wille	XCO2
Lizzie Le Mare	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design

## 3. Planning authority briefing

The Carpenters Estate is located immediately south of Stratford Station. It lies within the Central Stratford area and is bounded by railway lines to the northwest and northeast. The Estate extends south to Warton Road and east to Jupp Road and the rear of the buildings that front Stratford High Street. To the south is the Bridgewater Triangle site, which forms part of the Pudding Mill Masterplan and which is expected to be connected to Carpenters Estate by a road bridge.

The site is currently occupied by a 1960s housing development, with a mix of typologies – notably, there are three residential tower blocks, two to three storey flats / maisonette blocks, and terraces of houses totalling 710 units. Other existing uses include Carpenters and Docklands Community Centre, light industrial units on Gibbins Road, Carpenters Arms Public House, Carpenters Primary School and The Building Crafts College. An outline planning application is expected to be submitted in early 2022 for the comprehensive redevelopment of Carpenters Estate providing approximately 2,500 residential units (50 per cent affordable), station-based retail bars, restaurants, and other neighbourhood and education uses.

Officers would welcome the panel's comments on the draft design code, including the clarity and rigour in its structure and content, the balance between prescription and allowing flexibility, the approach to sustainability, and the extent to which it adequately references policy, such as BN.5 in the tall building chapter. Comments on the extent to which it is likely to deliver a strong sense of place are also sought.



## 4. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

The panel thanks the design team for their presentation and for their work in producing the design code. It feels that it is an extraordinary piece of work that will help to shape the future of the Carpenters Estate. Key to its success will be its implementation. The design team should be clear about the purpose and nature of the document, and be mindful of how it will be interpreted and used by developers. The panel would like to see greater clarity about what elements of the guidance are non-negotiable, and it suggests that this is particularly important in relation to play, accessibility and sustainability. The approach to colour and materials is positive, although some further development of this would be beneficial. Similarly, the approach to place-making could draw more heavily on the estate's original ambitions and reflect elements of its existing character more clearly. Integrating the estate with the wider area, making it a 'real piece of London', will be important to the success of the masterplan.

Strategic public space should be secured early in the redevelopment of the estate. The approach to landscape design should make real the aspirations for independent mobility for children. The panel is supportive of the approach to tall buildings, but would like to see greater clarity on the tolerance for variation within the masterplan's massing parameters. Finally, the panel feels that guidance on inclusive and sustainable design should aim for the highest standards, and that these principles should be integrated into the document as a whole.

### *Site-wide guidance*

- The panel commends the design team on the quality of the document and the clarity of its illustrations.
- It will be important to establish the design code's aspirations and intent. In particular, the document should be clear about which elements are regarded as non-negotiable. The panel therefore questions whether some of the guidance designated as "should" might better be designated as "must", especially in relation to place making, children's play, accessibility and sustainability.
- The Panel feels that the code should be future proofed to anticipate changes in standards over its lifetime. There should be a stated expectation that, where applicable, development should exceed prevailing standards.
- It will be important for the design code to have a champion throughout the redevelopment of the estate, to ensure that its ambition is realised.



- The design code should stipulate that specialist designers, particularly for play and accessibility, should be employed by developers of sites to ensure that the ambitions of the guidance can be realised in practice.
- The panel feels that the design code would benefit from clear cross-referencing, to signpost detailed guidance that appears later in the document.

#### *Character areas and sense of place*

- The panel feels that the place narrative within the code could be more clearly rooted in the character of the existing neighbourhood, renewing the original ambition for the estate and retaining some of the positive social value embodied within it. This could in part be achieved by seeking to retain elements of the existing fabric within the landscape and buildings.
- The code does not fully establish a clear definition for the character of different spaces within the public realm. The illustrations of the squares and streets appear very similar in character, and the panel would like the design code to encourage greater ambition for these spaces.
- The colour palette is rigorous and effective, but it is not clear how these colours relate to specific materials. In particular, the panel questions how far the palette reflects the aim of creating a 'real piece of London'. The panel would therefore like to see further exploration of materials, with additional examples shown, including their use in existing parts of London and on the indicative massing set out in the design code.
- The panel recognises the value of a consistent and coherent approach to colour but questions how this will affect the ability of people to navigate the neighbourhood. Attention should therefore also be given to other measures to reinforce legibility.
- The panel notes that the precedents shown for the refurbishment of James Riley Point and Lund Point appear to suggest a reworking of the existing architecture, giving the buildings a new skin. The panel feels that the code should instead encourage refurbishment to build authentically on the original architecture.

#### *Landscape and public realm*

- The panel would like greater clarity on the responsibilities of developers to provide high quality public realm early within the programme, and particularly the Neighbourhood Green, to ensure that this amenity is available to residents in the first phases.



- Where shared space is identified, the design code should include guidance on how this should be designed and managed.
- The materials palette for the public realm represents a good start, but the panel questions whether it can properly reflect the character of London streets.
- The colour palette for the landscape is relatively underdeveloped when compared to the rigour of the colour palette for buildings, and the panel would like to see further work on this.
- The document should be clearer about those spaces that are likely to be adopted, as this will have an impact on the kinds of materials that are appropriate, in terms of maintenance and use. This is particularly the case with the Neighbourhood Green, which is likely to be adopted by Newham parks' service. Materials will need to be aligned to the needs of the adopting body, and to the way in which the spaces will be managed over time.
- The panel notes that adopted streets can feel more inclusive, signalling the estate is part of the wider townscape, rather than a separate, private space. This could encourage people from outside the estate to cross its threshold.
- Further, the design code should illustrate how the masterplan area is intended to integrate with the wider area.
- While welcoming the language alluding to independent mobility for children, the panel feels that this is not reflected in the diagram, particularly in relation to crossings and car parking. For example, to genuinely facilitate independent mobility, the code should not allow for cars parking around or moving through the Neighbourhood Green.
- The design code should better define the provision required for older children's play, and the potential for integrating play into the wider landscape should be encouraged.

### *Tall buildings*

- The panel is pleased to see that the height of the base is included in the guidance on tall buildings, as this will be essential to safeguarding the quality of the way these buildings meet the ground. It would also like to see parameters established for podiums.
- The approach to marker buildings is positive, and the panel notes the importance of providing guidance on their design as well as their heights.



- The panel recognises that the code needs to allow for massing to vary within the limits of the parameter plans but feels that greater clarity is needed on the tolerance for variation, so that this is seen as the maximum, rather than minimum, allowable.
- The code should make clear that microclimate effects should be tested in relation to specific development proposals, rather than simply relying on the testing inherent in the parameter plans.

#### *Inclusive design*

- The panel notes that inclusive design should encompass more than simply later life, and it would like to see the code adopt a more comprehensive approach.
- This broader approach should be integrated into the entire document, rather than being restricted to a specific section.
- Rather than duplicate existing standards, the code should make explicit reference to these where appropriate. In particular, reference should be made to the Inclusive Design Standard.

#### *Sustainable design*

- As with guidance on inclusive design, sustainability should be integrated throughout the code, rather than confined to a specific section.
- The code should require sustainability targets that are best practice and exceed minimum standards, particularly in relation to embodied carbon.
- The panel would like to see guidance on the reuse of materials, including how and where these should be used, within the code.
- The panel broadly welcomes the approach to materiality, but notes that the precedents used should not prejudice developers against the use of more sustainable materials.

#### *Next steps*

- The panel would be pleased to see the design code again, but feels that the remaining issues can be resolved by the design team, working with officers.

