



Nicola Zech-Behrens,  
Bishopsgate Goods Yard Regeneration Limited

27 February 2020

Dear Nicola,

**London Review Panel: Bishopsgate Goodyard**

Please find enclosed the London Review Panel report following the review of Bishopsgate Goodyard proposals on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2020. I would like to thank you for your participation in the review and offer the Panel's ongoing support as the scheme's design develops.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joanna Averley".

Joanna Averley  
*Mayor's Design Advocate*

cc.

All meeting attendees

Jules Pipe, Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills

Phillip Graham, Executive Director of Development, Enterprise and Environment, GLA

Patrick Dubeck, Head of Regeneration, GLA



**Report of London Review Panel meeting  
Bishopsgate Goodsyard**

Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> January 2020

Buckley Gray Yeoman, The Tea Building, 56 Shoreditch High Street, London E1 6JJ

**Attendees**

Joanna Averley (Chair)	Mayor's Design Advocate
Roger Hawkins	Mayor's Design Advocate
Tom Holbrook	Mayor's Design Advocate
Sowmya Parthasarathy	Mayor's Design Advocate
Tony Coughlan	Hammerson
Matt Yeoman	Buckley Gray Yeoman
Amr Assaad	Buckley Gray Yeoman
Eric Parry	Eric Parry Architects
Takayuki Nakajima	Eric Parry Architects
Kevin Fraser	FaulknerBrowns
Julian Shirley	DP9 Ltd
Giles Charlton	Spacehub
Matthew White	Chris Dyson Architects
Tom Bolton	Frame Projects
Paul Roberts	GLA Planning
James Keogh	GLA Planning
Jamie Dean	GLA Regeneration
Mike Ritchie	LB Tower Hamlets
Vicki Lambert	LB Tower Hamlets
Tim Warder	LB Hackney

**Apologies / report copied to**

Sarah Considine	GLA Regeneration
Jules Pipe	Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills
Phillip Graham	Executive Director of Development, Enterprise and Environment, GLA
Patrick Dubeck	Head of Regeneration, GLA

**Confidentiality**

Please note that while schemes not yet in the public domain, for example at a pre-application stage, will be treated as confidential, as a public organisation the GLA is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOI) and in the case of an FOI request may be obliged to release project information submitted for review.

## **1. Project name and site address**

Bishopsgate Goodsyard, Braithwaite Street, London

## **2. London Review Panel's views**

### *Summary*

The panel notes that the proposals are continuing to evolve and have great potential to benefit the city, but that some aspects require further development. For example, the design of Building 2 and the proposed wind mitigation fins would benefit from being more clearly integrated with the façade. The panel encouraged further thought about the material palette to ensure it is appropriate for the context. It also questioned the decision to omit detailed landscaping and public realm designs from the application. The quality of the building's setting will be essential to its success, especially at Platform Gardens level. Building 1, although still in outline form, is not yet of the quality required for such a prominent site. The panel's view is that it is too tall and lacks a distinctive architectural identity. More detailed designs should be developed before outline permission is granted, to provide confidence that it will match the quality of Building 2. The Design Guide will play an important role in this process. It will also be essential to ensure there is no structural impact on the listed elements below before detailed permission is granted. The footpath width and public realm quality beyond the western boundary requires significant improvement as part of the development, and the panel encourages discussions to ensure this is achieved. These points are expanded below.

### *Building 2 (full planning application)*

- The panel appreciates the confidence of the design for Building 2. There has been very limited design development of the façade since the previous review, other than the addition of the wind mitigation. The previous comments therefore still stand and this is a dominate building sitting above a fine grained structure and complex and busy ground plain of existing pavements and streets and new pedestrian routes through the proposed development.
- The addition of fins to mitigate wind effects on the façade appear retrofitted; rather than an integrated design solution. This will need resolution. The panel asks whether they this mitigation could be addressed through a more integrated solution.
- Overall the illustrations presented the review shows a façade which has lots of facets including louvres and the fins. The references to the building at Kings Cross with its simpler / cleaner facades and high quality finishes did not seem to sufficiently read across to the detailing proposed for Building 2.
- The panel recommend that the planning authority request a detailed presentation of the façade materials, finish and different elements (including the horizontal as well as vertical relationship of the elements). This should also consider the durability, maintenance and cleaning regime.
- The colour proposed for the building will influence its appearance significantly, and will be visible from distance. A clearer analysis should be provided of which shade of red should be used; taking hints from the surrounding buildings and street scape may be suitable.
- The quality of the materials used in the construction of Building 2 will be a very important to the design's success, and should be secured through the planning process.

### *Public realm and landscape design*

- While the landscaping at the eastern end of the site is convincing, the panel feels that the western end requires further development. The Platform Gardens level landscaping behind the Oriel Gateway, adjacent to Building 2, would benefit from landscaping that emulates the distinctive urban character of comparators, such as the New York Highline, to provide a high quality setting.
- The panel is concerned by the absence of detail on landscape design in the detailed planning application for Building 2. The way a building of this scale meets the ground and enhances the public realm around its footprint is a crucial factor in determining whether it succeeds and whether or not the building itself is afforded consent. The landscaping and public realm design should therefore be as resolved as the design of the building itself, with details such as the oculus opening in the decking part of the detailed planning application.
- The panel considers that the detailed application should be extended to a wider area, and include the landscape and public realm design, to demonstrate high quality space surrounding Building 2.
- Stairs leading to deck level from the corner of Shoreditch High Street and Commercial Street entrance, with a narrow pavement and a landing concealed from the street behind a wall, could create an awkward space with the potential for anti-social behaviour. It suggests this issue should be resolved as part of the detailed Building 2 application.
- The pedestrian environment around the western end of the scheme, at the junction of Great Eastern Street, Commercial Street, Norton Folgate and Shoreditch High Street, requires significant improvement. The aim should be to improve a hostile pedestrian environment, and provide generous pavements to accommodate pedestrian flows from the Bishopsgate Goodsyrd development.

### *Building 1*

- Although Building 1 is at outline planning application stage, with design detail still to be developed, the panel considers greater certainty and a clearer approach is needed which fully addresses massing, rooflines and active versus blank / inactive frontages.
- Granting outline permission for a building of such prominence is risky, and doubts remain over the quality of the building that will be delivered.
- The panel is concerned that the building could be tall and over-bearing in relation to the street, that the service core is too dominant, and that overall the proposals lack distinctive architectural identity.
- The panel is unable to give more detailed comment without further information on scale, architecture and materiality. It suggests more information should be provided to help resolve these issues.

### *Historic structures*

- The panel notes the importance of ensuring that the historic elements of the former station can take the loading of the proposed new building above. It will be essential to ensure the integrity of listed structures is not harmed. The results of the ongoing structural review will help determine whether the

impact of the proposals is acceptable. This should ensure that the integrity and character of the arches, which are potentially a very strong and positive feature of the new retail units and public realm, are not compromised by meeting the structural requirements of the new building proposed on the deck above.

- Further clarity is also needed about how historic elements will be restored. The panel recommends that a repair strategy is developed for structures such as the Oriel Gateway, and that planning conditions are set to ensure restoration is carried out as agreed.

#### *Amenity space*

- As all designated play space is at roof level, it is important that the rooftop play spaces on residential buildings feels safe to users. Consideration should be given to the parapet height needed to give parents the confidence and allow children to play. Doorstep play should be incorporated where possible. This will be a key element in the façade and long views of the blocks and should be designed, included in the code and shown on visuals.
- As the outdoor spaces at Platform Gardens level are intended for use by residents as well as the public. With approximately 100 resident children likely to use them on a regular basis, a management strategy will be needed to ensure the spaces work for everyone, including older children.

#### *London Road*

- The panel questions the decision to separate and close off the western end of the London Road route for use as a cultural event space. As London Road is a logical east-west spine route across the site, it feels that blocking it could undermine ease of movement across the development and compromise a key historic feature and route through the structure.

#### *Bethnal Green Road and Sclater Street frontage*

- The panel is concerned that the development's frontage along the south side of Bethnal Green Road and Sclater Street is dominated by entrances, with little space for retail frontage.
- It suggests that residential lobbies could be located further within the blocks they serve to free up a greater proportion of active frontage. The Design Guide should set parameters to ensure active frontage is maximised on these streets.

#### *Servicing and vehicle movements*

- The inclusion of three servicing yards and two lane entrances, generating several hundred vehicle movements each day, risks creating a negative impact on the public realm in Bethnal Green Road, Sclater Street and Braithwaite Street. These may create areas of pedestrian / cyclists to vehicle conflict and an analysis of the comfort and safety levels for pedestrians and cyclists which are impacted by the development would be helpful.
- The panel asks whether a more ambitious, lower impact service strategy is possible involving, for example, consolidating deliveries off-site or using alternatives to heavy goods vehicles. It suggests the applicants consider options to reduce vehicle movements, anticipating the new approaches currently under consultation in the Draft London Plan.

- Pavements on these streets should also be carefully designed to ensure vehicle movements do not substantially undermine the pedestrian experience.

#### *Environmental sustainability*

- The panel suggests a whole life carbon analysis of the project would be beneficial. The wide range of proposed uses and the proportion of retained structures could provide both useful information and a positive story about the benefits of the development.

#### *Next steps*

- The London Review Panel looks forward to commenting on further iterations of the designs, as they reach detailed planning application stage.