

**LONDON**  
**REVIEW PANEL**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] North West London  
GLA Housing & Land  
169 Union Street, London  
SE1 0LL

5<sup>th</sup> February 2019

Dear [REDACTED]

**London Review Panel: Bugsby Way colocation project**

Please find enclosed the London Review Panel report following the panel assessment of the London Borough of Redbridge proposals for Bugsby Way colocation project on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2019. On behalf of the panel, I would like to thank you for your participation in the review and reiterate the panel's enthusiasm to remain involved in a supportive capacity as the scheme's design develops.

Yours sincerely,



Sadie Morgan  
*Mayor's Design Advocate*

# LONDON

# REVIEW PANEL

## Report of London Review Panel meeting Bugsby Way colocation project

21<sup>st</sup> January 2019  
City Hall

### London Review Panel

Sadie Morgan (Chair)  
Holly Lewis  
Manisha Patel  
Paul Karakusevic

### Attendees

[REDACTED]	Howarth Tompkins
[REDACTED]	Howarth Tompkins
[REDACTED]	GLA
Nick Taylor	GLA

### Report copied to

Jules Pipe Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills

## **Summary**

The London Review Panel (LRP) are supportive of the aims and objectives of the Bugsby Way scheme, given the need to prove needs typologies and development models around co-locating industrial and residential uses. The Panel wishes to thank the client for bringing designs to LRP at such an early stage in the process, and would welcome further LRP reviews at key milestones in the development process. As well as recognising the ambition of the overall scheme, LRP members wish to commend the rigorous options testing undertaken by the design team. The Panel recognises the early stage of the design work, but nevertheless strongly encourages the client and design team to make a clear choice for a particular option as soon as possible and for this to be reflected in the approach to development. In the event that the client decides to procure a development partner via the London Development Panel, the Panel recommends presenting only one option rather than multiple options. Given the innovative nature of the typology, this will help ensure that the delivered scheme matches the ambition of the scheme presented to LRP, and meets the overall objectives of the client. The Panel strongly recommends further developing the Podium option presented by the design team (see *Podium Option* section below) as this meets the brief in terms of designing an exemplar project for London, but also responds better to the challenging site context and is more likely to secure high quality residential and industrial space. The Panel recommends that the site can support the scale of development set out in the medium to high options. Finally, the panel would strongly recommend that the clients looks into the potential for acquiring the SGN Land as this will allow for active frontage on Bugsby's Way, and delivers a higher quality, comprehensive scheme.

## **Criteria for defining success**

The Panel recognises the need for both the residential and the industrial aspects of the scheme to work well and meet all relevant statutory and policy standards. Building-based colocation offers a variety of opportunities for industrial and residential uses to successfully mix and to meet London Plan (LP) policy for no-net loss of industrial floorspace. However, the Panel believe it is important to recognise that different forms of co-location are variously effective at meeting the brief's desire for an "exemplar project", and involve different trade off's in terms of typical expectations of both residential and industrial occupiers. For instance, site-based colocation allows for traditional residential and industrial development that meets both occupiers' typical requirements. However, such development does not provide an "exemplar" project that substantially moves on the industry's understanding of what is possible in terms of the design, development and management of a colocation scheme.

### **Recommendation 1**

In moving towards a preferred option, LRP encourages the client and design team to clearly articulate its priorities for this project, and the criteria for defining and measuring success. The optioneering process should set out how well the various options respond to the requirements of the brief, and what trade-offs it involves. The presented design work suggests that much of this work has been done. The Panel recommends that this assessment - including the priorities of the brief as they have developed in the course of the project - be formalised in the final report produced by the design team. The criteria for assessing the success of the various options can then also be used to assess the design proposals of potential delivery partners.

## **Site context and development options**

The Panel agree wholeheartedly with the assessment that the site conditions are challenging, particularly the adjacency of the Blackwall Tunnel approach as it rises to cross Blackwall Lane. The various options presented generally orient residential uses away from the tunnel approach with industrial acting as a

form of buffer to the hardest edge conditions, an approach the Panel would agree with as sensible. The two preferred options utilised the smaller site footprint (minus the disused gasholder site), with the residential providing a new frontage onto Commercial Way. A series of discarded options were also presented some of which showed development on the gasholder site.

#### Recommendation 2: site context

The Panel recommend the design and client team to further develop the possible forms and function different buffers might take. The Panel would encourage further thinking on the impact of acoustic buffering, as well as visual buffering / enclosure for residents. While it may be difficult to buffer against air pollution from the road, the Panel would encourage the design team to think carefully about the impact of pollution on future residents and workers, and how design might be used to partially mitigate the problem.

The Panel highlighted the changing context of the Greenwich Peninsula in terms of the scale of development and encourage a ‘muscular’ approach to development on site. The site is likely able to support the scale of development set out in the medium to high options presented. Raising residential development away from traffic has obvious benefits, although care is required in landing residential access points and associated ancillary space in appropriate locations.

The Panel would encourage the client and design team to be mindful of wider change when it comes to developing an approach to positioning uses and the orientation of the building. While Bugsby Way is currently a somewhat hostile environment, wider changes currently underway mean that it may not always remain so. Development of the site has the potential to provide a positive and active new frontage onto Bugsby Way. Given the surrounding context of low intensity retail sheds and the potential for redevelopment, it is important that this scheme sets a positive precedent for re-establishing a more urban street frontage. Regardless of whether wider change takes place or not, Bugsby Way remains the main pedestrian and vehicle access route for future residential occupiers. As a result it is important that the development’s relationship to Bugsby Way be properly considered.

Following on from this, the Panel would strongly recommend that the client team look at options for acquiring the former gas holder site. Having an additional, fully accessible side to the development site would not only provide a positive frontage to Bugsby Way, but would also allow for considerably more design options that can meet the requirements of industrial and residential occupiers.

#### Recommendation 3: development options

The Panel recommends progressing with the podium development, as this provides best “proof of concept” for colocation, overcomes the particular difficulties of the immediate site context and delivers the best chance of securing a quality outcome for both residential and industrial occupiers.

The Panel recommends that in developing options for the industrial space under the podium, proper challenges are applied to the advised ‘requirements’ of industrial space, with a clear distinction drawn between the idealised expectations of the current market and the ‘must have’s’ that are unlikely to change over time. This could include length of required yard space, with current requirements meaning the orientation of the building / yard is currently East to West. A shorter yard space could allow the building / yard to be reoriented North to South, which would allow for an easier separation between industrial and residential access. However, this option would almost certainly require the acquisition of the gasholder site.

Similar challenge should be applied to the recommendations about the appropriate scale of industrial space. While the Panel agrees with assessment that demand for mid-box industrial will likely increase in this location, development of the surrounding area and the likely loss of nearby industrial space will mean there will probably be demand for smaller industrial units in the coming years. Smaller workshops or studio type units, as well as ancillary could be located on the edges of the podium, and would play an important placemaking function by providing a more positive, active frontage.

The Panel recommends that further consideration be given to the potential for including high quality amenity space for workers in the industrial space. While this is not typically part of traditional industrial developments, the project's status as an exemplar projects provides an opportunity to push new forms of best practice.

### **Development models**

Alongside the design option the Panel was presented with early thinking on potential development approaches by the client. Long-term stewardship of the scheme once built was emphasised as an important consideration, particularly the management of the interface and/or shared space between industrial and residential occupiers. This may lend itself to a PRS provider, but is not essential so long as there is a suitably developed management strategy in place.

#### Recommendation 4

The Panel recommends that the brief for any potential development partner presents one design option, as opposed to multiple forms of co-location. Given the risk averse nature of the development industry, it is unlikely that a developer will chose to progress the more ambitious podium option if there is the option to progress a more straight forward site base co-location option. The Panel recommends that the client and design team undertake a similar appraisal as for the design options, testing how far different development routes will likely deliver on the GLA's aspirations and the outputs of the brief.

The Panel recommends that, given the complexity and novelty of the proposed typology, that there is meaningful design-team input in developing the brief for any development partner. This will help ensure that the ambition of the scheme presented to LRP is maintained through the procurement process and into completion. Such input could come via the MDA Panel members or via the client's appointed design team.

The Panel recommends that the client gives proper consideration to ensuring the retention of exemplary design quality throughout the procurement and development process. The approach to this will vary on the development model chosen by the client. If the client wishes to take forward the project themselves, it would be advisable to consider options for novating the design team to the contractor and/or having design team input throughout the construction process. However, if the project is taken forward via the London Developer Panel, it would be advisable to have meaningful design input in the development brief, as well as appropriate conditions ensuring development partners retain high quality design through to delivery.

The Panel recommends that there is an on-going LRP design reviews for the scheme built into the development brief, with reviews taking place at agreed milestones. This will further help ensure that the design aspirations and overall ambitions of the scheme are maintained through to completion.