

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

### **Report of Planning Application Review Meeting: Strand East Bridge 3**

Thursday 8 September 2016

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

#### **Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)  
Teresa Borsuk  
Tom Lonsdale

#### **Attendees**

|                  |                                         |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Will Steadman    | LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team |
| Sara Dawes       | LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team |
| Pippa Gueterbock | London Legacy Development Corporation   |
| Deborah Denner   | Fortismere Associates                   |

#### **Report also 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                |

#### **Note on process**

The Quality Review Panel comments below follow on from two pre-application reviews of reserved matters proposals for Strand East Bridge 3. Panel members who attended the previous meetings were: Peter Studdert (chair); Adam Khan; Julia Barfield; Alex Ely; Neil Deely; Andrew Harland; Lindsey Whitelaw; Liam Bond; and Peter Lainsou.

## 1. Project name and site address

Bridge 3 at Strand East, Sugar House Lane, Stratford E15

Planning application reference: 16/00423/REM

## 2. Presenting team

|                     |                 |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| Michiel van Soest   | Vastint UK B.V. |
| Valli van Zijl      | Vastint UK B.V. |
| Fiona Young         | ARC-ML          |
| Michael Westlake    | ARC-ML          |
| Stephen Haskins     | engineersHRW    |
| Ciaran Malik        | engineersHRW    |
| Antony Nelson       | Planit-IE       |
| Christopher Schiele | GL Hearn        |
| Emma Gill           | GL Hearn        |

## 3. Planning authority's views

Planning officers have some concerns about the design of Bridge 3 at Strand East, which they feel would benefit from further refinement before planning approval is granted. They would encourage the design team to explore ways in which greater structural honesty can be achieved, as well as recommending further thought about the design of the bridge handrail and concrete 'shoes' either side of the bridge. They would be reluctant to see these detailed design issues dealt with through planning conditions.

## 4. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

In broad terms, the Quality Review Panel supports the design of Bridge 3 at Strand East. The concept of an arched glulam bridge, resting on concrete abutments, with metal railings has the potential to be successful. However, the panel recommends further thought about the detailed design of the abutments and railings, to ensure the quality promised by early concept sketches is achieved. They support the view of planning officers that the detailed design of the bridge should be resolved prior to planning approval – rather than being subject to planning conditions.

### *Concrete abutments*

- The panel would encourage the design team to consider canting the junction, or creating a 'nib' between the concrete abutments and the arched glulam beam. They currently meet with a vertical joint, giving the impression that the glulam beam is unsupported.
- Whilst the panel understands that the bridge is a u-shaped beam with no horizontal forces, it may improve the appearance of the bridge if the concrete abutments are designed to visually support the glulam beam.

### *Metal railing*

- The panel thinks that the concept of metal railings, following a gentler curve than the glulam beam structure, could be successful.
- At the bridge landings, the potential to extend the height of the concrete bridge abutments to the necessary height has been considered. However, the panel agrees with the design team that extending the railings to the edges of the bridge is preferable, to maximise the sense of openness.
- To be successful, the railings will require carefully resolved bespoke design – resolving the relationship between uprights, the glulam, integrated lighting and the concrete abutment.
- Further information will be required to demonstrate the design of the railings is well resolved prior to reserved matters approval.

### *Next steps*

- The panel recommends further information on the detailed design of the bridge, including the abutments and railings, should be submitted prior to reserved matters planning approval.