

Session 5 – Neptune Group - Annex 4

Minute of Meeting of 3rd April 2012

STOCK WOOLSTENCROFT

FISH ISLAND/PROJECT UPDATE – OPLC, GLA, LTGDC

MEETING NOTE

Date: 03.04.2012

Colin Wilson - GLA
Lyndon Fothergill - GLA
Eleanor Fawcett - OPLC
Peter Minoletti – LTGDC
Patrick Heffron – Neptune Group
Owen O'Carroll – Stock Woolstencroft
David Morton - Stock Woolstencroft
Emily Read – Stock Woolstencroft
Austin Mackie - AMA

OOO presented the work SW has carried out since the last meeting with the GLA.
Key areas of focus were:

- The size, configuration and activation of the Lofthouse Square
- Public space – type and quantum
- The approach to land use
- Massing
- Delivery and planning gain

KEY POINTS OF THE DISCUSSION

1.0 LOFTHOUSE SQUARE

- 1.1 EF queried the imagery used to describe the Lofthouse Square – stating that it should be a space that is active and animated at all times, rather than relying on a calendar of events. It was generally agreed that the curation of a space of that size to ensure a regular programme of events would be a timely and costly undertaking.
- 1.2 CW went on to describe the Lofthouse Square as not only a place of activity but a space that must serve the community of the area as well.
- 1.3 CW queried the location of the Lofthouse building – suggesting that perhaps the building should be rotated to an east-west orientation fronting onto Wyke Road. This would then open up a larger space onto the canal.
- 1.4 CW then suggested that the Lofthouse could potentially unite with the block on Monier Road – bridging over Wyke Road, and potentially downgrading the end of this route to an access only street.
- 1.5 It was agreed that SW would test options for reorientating the Lofthouse building, and moving it further southwards. It was further agreed that SW would test the breakdown of this space into smaller pocket spaces, allowing the introduction of some landscaping as appropriate.
- 1.6 LF requested that the squares and public spaces be tested for the impact of overshadowing from the surrounding buildings.
- 1.7 CW and PM were concerned about the impact of the Lofthouse building on the residents of Omega Works, in terms of daylight/sunlight and proximity. EF stated that Roach Road should be retained as a street with frontage created onto Omega Works. The point of the blind flank of the building to the north of Omega Works could be dressed to make this a more attractive feature.
- 1.8 CW, LF, PM and EF agreed that a smaller Lofthouse building would be preferable. It was further clarified that the footprint of the building would be broadly acceptable, but a reduction in height should be tested. OOO agreed that SW would test these issues for the next meeting.

2.0 MASSING

FISH ISLAND/PROJECT UPDATE – OPLC, GLA, LTGDC

MEETING NOTE

- 2.1 PM requested that any further documents produced describe building heights as datums, rather than storey heights, in order to accurately reflect the proposed massing.
- 2.2 EF queried whether Wansbeck Road was the most appropriate location for the taller element. She suggested that the location of this building should be tested, and the potential of locating it on Monier Road as a gateway marker be explored.
- 3.0 SCHOOL
- 3.1 The discussions around the primary school, proposed in the draft Fish Island AAP to be located on the Neptune site, revolved around the suitability of this location for a school, the lack of any other potential sites being highlighted, and the lack of evidence of a sequential test undertaken by Tower Hamlets to find a suitable school site.
- 3.2 PM stated that he felt that this site was not appropriate for a school. AM went on to describe the evaluation matrix that the design team have undertaken to grade potential school sites in the area in order to suitability. LF requested that we make this matrix available – agreed by AM.
- 3.3 EF raised the issue of school catchments, describing the schools that are to be built as part of the Olympic Legacy commitment, and subsequently identifying that the catchment for a school on FI Mid would likely be the community at Roman Road. As such a school would be better located further to the south of FI Mid, closer to the pedestrian bridge across the A12 at Cooks Road.
- 3.4 It was agreed by all that this issue needs to be resolved rapidly in order to avoid any delay on the application. EF suggested that she speak with the LLDC regarding this issue. AM suggested that the vacant live/work scheme to the south of the Greenway in South Fish Island could be converted to accommodate a primary school.
- 4.0 MONIER ROAD
- 4.1 EF queried the proposed built form fronting onto Monier Road, suggesting that more work and detail needed to be provided to ensure that these buildings respond to Monier as a primary frontage. OOC agreed that SW would text these buildings before the next meeting. EF stated that these buildings could take being slightly taller as a means to define this frontage as a key zone.
- 5.0 WIDER FRAMEWORK AREA
- 5.1 LF requested that we submit the capacity assumptions made for the wider framework area as a means to assess cumulative impact of development on local infrastructure and services.
- 6.0 DELIVERY
- 6.1 PM queried the deliverability of the proposed Hepscott Road bridge, and inquired whether Neptune was planning to contribute to the Monier Road bridge as part of the 106 contributions. He went on to state that the Monier Road vehicular bridge isn't due to be delivered until a later phase of the Legacy (estimated 2021).
- 6.2 AM explained that there was a broad agreement with McGrath's to submit a joint application for a bridge, to be delivered by Neptune Group. He stated that this was subject to a formal agreement being drawn up between the two parties. AM went on to explain that, whilst desirable, the Monier Road vehicular bridge does not impact on the PTAL levels of the site. It was agreed that the uncertainty on the delivery of the Monier Road bridge strengthened the need for the Hepscott Road bridge to be delivered for the benefit of FI Mid as a whole.
- 7.0 NEXT STEPS
- It was agreed that another meeting would be scheduled with the group for 3-4 weeks time. Also invited would be representatives of the LLDC planning team.

STOCK WOOLSTENCROFT

FISH ISLAND/PROJECT UPDATE – OPLC, GLA, LTGDC

MEETING NOTE

SW agreed to test the aspects of the design as set out above. SW also agreed to prepare a S106 proposal for the next meeting.

