



FRAME PROJECTS

London Legacy Development Corporation Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: East Village public realm

Thursday 9 June 2022

Glenn Howells Architects, Middlesex House, 34-42 Cleveland Street, London, W1T 4JE

Panel

Cristina Monteiro (chair)
Simon Henley
Barbara Kaucky
Mike Martin
Ann Sawyer

Attendees

Sara Dawes	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Donald Roberts	London Legacy Development Corporation
Patrycja Karas	Frame Projects
Cindy Reriti	Frame Projects

Apologies / Report copied to

Anthony Hollingsworth	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Catherine Smyth	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Josh Hackner	LLDC Planning Policy and Decisions Team
Matt Halsall	London Legacy Development Corporation
Ruth Holmes	London Legacy Development Corporation
Frances Madders	London Legacy Development Corporation
James Bolt	London Borough of Newham
Ben Hull	London Borough of Newham
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects

Note on process

The Quality Review Panel comments below follow on from one pre-application review. Panel members who attended the previous meeting were: Cristina Monteiro (chair); Simon Henley; Barbara Kaucky; Mike Martin; Ann Sawyer.

Declaration of interest

Quality Review Panel member Ann Sawyer, Access=Design, is currently working with Glenn Howells Architects on another project. She has no connection with the East Village schemes.

1. Project name and site address

East Village public realm, area comprising Victory Park and Belvedere, Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, London E20

2. Presenting team

Ibrahim Diaz	Grant Associates
Jamie Dredge	Qatari Diar
Jayne Earncliffe	Earncliffe
Nick Hunter	Cast Consultancy
Steffan Rees	Quod

3. Planning authority briefing

East Village sits within Zone 3 of the overarching Stratford City Outline Planning Permission, which sets out key principles for development thresholds, land uses, building heights and massing, and the location and quantum of open space. The proposals are for improvements to the East Village public realm, comprising Victory Park and the Belvedere, for which Get Living intends to submit a stand-alone planning application. The public realm is closely linked to Get Living's applications for Plots N16 and N18/19.

Planning officers would welcome the panel's comments on the proposals, including usability and functions, the relocation of the Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play, the provision of a pavilion, and public toilets. Comments are also sought on the landscape design, in particular, the quantum of greening around play areas, sustainable drainage systems, biodiversity and the Urban Greening Factor, as well as the integration of the proposals into the wider area, including cycle routes and the promotion of active travel.

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel encourages the design team to be bolder in considering the location of the pavilion and play spaces, and their proximity to each other, to provide amenity and spaces that people will value. It is essential that daylight/sunlight and microclimate analyses inform the location of these elements, to ensure the success of the new public space.

The success of the pavilion and of wider landscape are closely interlinked and the panel urges the appointment of an architect, at this early stage, to allow their simultaneous design. The panel feels that the proposals would benefit from additional greening, as well as the extension of the Portland naturalistic landscape and water through to the Belvedere. Greater clarity in the hierarchy of routes throughout the park would also be beneficial: it is crucial that a clear and legible cycle route is implemented, to ensure that pedestrians are aware of where they might expect to encounter cyclists and from which directions they will come from.

Daylight / sunlight and microclimate analysis

- Further rigorous thought should be given to the location of the various uses within the park, in particular, the play spaces and the pavilion. Daylight / sunlight and microclimate analysis should be used to inform the activation of spaces at particular times of the day.
- Overlaying the daylight / sunlight and wind diagrams will confirm the best location for, for example, dwelling and play, to provide spaces that people will value.

Amenity and play spaces

- The provision of high-quality play spaces is key to the success of the park and its facilities. The Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play receives more sunlight than the Locally Equipped Area of Play, but neither play space is optimally located.
- In addition to daylight/sunlight and microclimate, consideration should also be given to locating the two play spaces in close proximity to each other, to allow family members to have access to activities within sight of each other.
- The play spaces should also be within close proximity to the pavilion and its provision of public toilet facilities.
- *Post meeting note*
As discussed in the review of Plots N18/19, the area of door stop play, adjacent to N18/19, does not justify the current distance between the Locally Equipped Area of Play and the Neighbourhood Area of Play.

The pavilion

- As noted in the previous report, the panel supports the proposed pavilion and feels that it would make a welcome contribution to the public realm. It will create a nucleus around which the outdoor spaces can be arranged, and should ideally be located near the Civic Plaza, with both the Local Equipped Area for Play and the Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play in close proximity.
- Given how closely interlinked the public realm and pavilion are, and the significant impact that each will have on the success of the other, they should be designed simultaneously. The appointment of an architect at this early stage, will ensure a holistic design approach to critical aspects, including the location, size, plan and layout of the pavilion.
- Consideration must be given to active frontages that create a clear relationship between the external space, associated activity, and the service being provided, as well as accommodating back of house functions, including storage, servicing and bins.
- The panel feels that the pavilion is too large for its proposed location and has the detrimental effect of splitting the open space in two. Further rigorous thought must be given to how it will function. The panel feels that a smaller pavilion, in conjunction with the provision of public toilet facilities, has the potential to work in this location.
- Alternatively, consideration should be given to relocating the pavilion to one side of Victory Park, or to the area currently proposed for the canopy, so that public toilet facilities are located closer to the Locally Equipped Area of Play.

Pedestrian and cycle movement

- It is crucial that a clear and legible cycle route is implemented, to provide pedestrians with an indication of where they might expect to encounter cyclists and from which directions they will come from.
- Detailed drawings of the cycle route are requested, including proposed surface materials and the suggested means that will be used to encourage cyclists to slow down in shared cycle/pedestrian areas.
- Most panel members feel that the cycle route would be best located on the southeast perimeter of Victory Park, to minimise potential conflicts with pedestrians within the park and to keep the route distanced from the Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play. However, further thought must be given to how cyclists will be encouraged to slow down at the large junction between East Village plots N18/19 and Victory Park.

- The option to extend the cycle route into Victory Park, off the north end of Anthems Way, could be tested further, as it has the potential to include distinct locations for pedestrian crossings which would reduce the conflicts in the shared junction.

Landscape design

- The panel feels that the open space could be improved by increasing the amount of greening at the centre of Victory Park and around the Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play. The Belvedere would also benefit from additional greening, to improve the Locally Equipped Area of Play and to give the community gardens a distinct character that would give residents a sense of ownership, in keeping with a typical allotment.
- The panel welcomes the extension of the naturalistic landscape and water from the adjoining Portlands through the north end of Victory Park. It feels that this could be further extended into the Belvedere, where the swales could be integrated into play.
- Greater clarity is needed to establish a hierarchy of routes throughout the park. A contour plan, as well as detailed drawings showing the width of routes, level changes, and drainage are required.
- The provision of seating, and the fun element of swings, at the top of the mound in Victory Park, would allow people to enjoy the views. However, the panel has concerns that the addition of the canopy will give unnecessary shading and further increase the amount of hard landscape in the proposals.
- Early consideration must be given to how the public realm and landscape will be managed and maintained.

Next steps

- The panel would welcome the opportunity to review the public realm proposals again as the design develops, taking into account these comments and consultation with planning officers.