



Local Masterplan: Mediation instrument of urban scales and overcoming spatial dilemmas between Node and Place

Autores:

Yara Cristina Labronici Baiardi - UNISO - yaciba@yahoo.com.br

Luiz Fernando Hagemann - Bartlett School of Planning - luizfernandohgm@me.com

Resumo:

This paper discusses what are the spatial dilemmas between NODE OF TRANSPORT and PLACE and the role of the Local Masterplan as an important urban instrument that could overcome it. In this scenario, the station area may be the basis of spatial tensions, but also can be considered a strategic point for the urban structuring and spatial transformation of a territory. Supported by the formulations of Contemporary Urbanism, as well as in the spatial guidelines that are being implemented in several European cities for the spatial remodeling of strategic train stations, this paper analyzes Stratford Station Area (London) as a case study. Stratford Station, which driven from Olympics Games of 2012, had accelerate overcome spatial dilemmas especially by “Local Masterplan”, an articulator urban instrument decisive for the spatial transformations providing an alternative to the Brazilian model of planning.

Local Masterplan

Mediation instrument of urban scales and overcoming spatial dilemmas between Node and Place

INTRODUCTION

It is understood that subway or train stations are strategic for urban structuring and spatial transformations of territory besides allowing local access to a metropolitan network. The stations areas are spatially potentialized when NODE of TRANSPORT and PLACE are articulated in the context of urban policies that combine innovative urban instruments from the Macro to the Micro Scale.

Accessibility is located at the root of urban development. It is the necessary to ensure access for the desired activities; the enjoyment of built spaces and; to allow social and economic exchanges. With an increasingly urbanized society in the century of cities, the design of such infrastructures emerges as the backbone to achieve quality in urban territories.

Initially, this paper discusses what are the spatial dilemmas between NODE of Transport and PLACE and the role of the Local Masterplan as an important urban instrument that could be the answer to overcome spatial dilemmas. Stratford Station, located in the outskirts of London and encouraged by international games, was chosen as a case study.

Stratford Station is part of the Borough of Newham, a London area that has been ranking in many inequalities indexes. In 2014, the borough had the second largest poverty child rate in London (41%); the biggest overcrowding ratio (25%) and of families in temporary homes (28,5 for 1000 families) of all neighborhoods in London¹.

Over the years, Stratford hosted many transformations – from spatial to social-economics – bringing Stratford to its life and death (Figure 1). In 1850, the area was still rural, even after 11 years of the arrival of train tracks. It was only in 1855 when the Royal Docks (located in the south, where today is London City Airport) and many industries came that Stratford started its spatial transformation, as a Node and Place.

However, as the area was heavily bombed during the Second World War and in 1975, the urban situation aggravated due to the increase of unemployment in the region and the closure of the docks, the replacement of the labor work for the machinery, the population

¹ Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/jan/24/most-children-in-uks-poorest-areas-now-growing-up-in-poverty>>. Accessed in 28 Mar 2018.

evasion and the destruction of the land by the industrial pollution during decades, Stratford became decadent.

With these constants, changes on the social-economic scenario and with the chosen of Stratford as Olympic site in 2005, the Borough of Newham faced in how to revive the area; decontaminate this extremely polluted industrial area; connect Stratford (socially) to London; attract visitors, residents and business. That said, the Urban Development challenge was overcome years of degradation and became Strategic **Mobility Urban Hubs**.

	43-410 AD	1086	1800s	1900s	Late 1900s –
Pre-Roman	Roman Britain	Medieval	Industrial expansion	Decline	Regeneration
Marshland and farm land along the spine of the River Lea	Settlements at Stratford	Eight tidal mills Cistercian abbey at Stratford Langthorne Early development of industry	Expansion focused around waterways and railways Industry at Fish Island intermingled with back-to-back terraces	Bomb damage Redevelopment with housing estates Loss of employment and manufacturing Under-utilisation of land Deprivation	Channel Tunnel Rail link Westfield Stratford City Olympics and Paralympics LLDC formed

Figure 1: Transformation of Stratford through the time

Source: The LLDC Local Plan 2015-2031, p.8.

But, What is Mobility Urban Hub? It's understood that Urban Hub is the central place of an area of influence that concentrates minimally two urban scales (from the local, passing through the neighborhood, city, metropolitan, being able to reach the global scale); and which still brings together a dense and diverse set of uses and forms (from housing, commerce, services, entertainment, etc.) accumulated over time, where a Mobility Hub is the articulating nucleus that promotes a high urban intensification.

The articulation between Mobility Hub and Urban Hub concentrates diverse activities and urban functions by virtue of the intersection of networks in place, and radiates urban dynamics with high intensification of people between the local, intermediate and macro scales.

The Mobility Urban Hub (Baiardi, 2018) is not any space that represents the concentration of lines of the transport system. It is first of all a place in common for at least two distinct transport systems that intercommunicate through a public articulating space, from walking to high-speed modes, flows and activities that merge with the territory as part of a single network, whether it urban or transport. The Mobility Urban Hub is the combination of urban function and transport function with no spatial ambivalence; instead, they are functions that add up and aggregate in the spaces of flows, spaces of passage and

permanence; to access, to inhabit, to enter; of economic and social exchanges that are intensely intercommunicated as a single body in place.

Considering the above, it is possible to affirm that understanding the planning strategies of an area as many the Macro Scale - for example of an Urban Mobility Hub – as Local Masterplan used in the intermediate scale, it is possible to overcome the spatial dilemmas between a Transport Node and Place that are evidenced in the Micro Scale. This text has, therefore, as a purpose to evidence the relation of the Local Masterplan in the spatial articulation between the Macro and Micro scales of the planning from the analysis of Stratford Station, and providing an alternative discussion to the Brazilian model of planning.

SPATIAL DILEMMAS BETWEEN NODE AND PLACE

Rail and subway stations are usually considered as NODES OF TRANSPORT in the network mobility. Richer (2008) argues that Transport Nodes are those where of two or more transport systems meet and they have, as network access point, the capacity of promoting the metropolitan range in a local area. Baiardi (2013) complements, explaining this space is characterized by the intensity of micro-accessibility and intermodality. As a result, the node refers to the system and not to the territory.

However, stations can also be PLACES where people can have access to non-transport amenities (Bertolini & Spit, 1998). These spaces are vital to the structuring of the territory where it operates and, the public space is the originator element that strengthens the links of people to 'place' (Richer, 2008).

Moreover, Cacciari (2009) in his work asks if it is possible to live without a Place. He points out that a post-metropolitan territory can be inhabited but it is only possible to inhabit it, if it is to be inhabited if it gives Places. For him, "the place is the place where we stop: it is the pause – it is analogous to the silence of a score. There is no song without silence. However, in the post-metropolitan territory one is not allowed to stop, to withdraw not to inhabit".

He adds that restoring PLACES is a regressive and reactionary mode. Either one applauds the movement of dissolution of places, or if it is a victim, or it is a theoretical problem that must be faced.

Calthorpe (1993) considers that the basis of the aesthetics of the place, depending on the context, is modernist: segregation, specialization, centralization and intense connection with technology. This ideology has resulted in activities and people's segregation; specialization and isolation of professionals and the systems they create; centralization of large institutions, and; the monopoly of certain technologies, namely the automobile. That is the spatial dilemma: how to connect the node of transport to territory after the imposition of the functionalist ideology of separation of the space? Node and Place must be conceived jointly, as one. And the Local Masterplan is one of the key of integration.

LOCAL MASTERPLAN

Urban development can be understood as the set of processes that lead to the growth of cities, either by expansion or by changes in their interior. Urban planning is a socio-spatial development strategy that can be defined as a tool used by the State to order the city territory, aiming at its urban, economic and social development (Lamas, 2010).

City planning can vary although is always related to the city's cultural context. In Brazil, for example, the municipalities are bind in the scope of planning to the instrument of the Masterplan [*Plano Diretor*], which is the basic mechanism of urban development and expansion policy on the city level. Even though the Masterplan considers all range of topics, as the Local Plan, it tends to be more generic, less evidence base and, more driven by zoning. Synthetically, zoning became the main plan. It is the way that parameterizes the drawing urban design through the indexes of use and occupation of the land. As result, it produces a large gap between the macro and the local scale.

Nevertheless, there are several discussions about the exhaustion of belief in the possibility of controlling urban growth, the rigidity of definitions and the excess of normative frameworks (Calabi, 2012). Many, like Senett, for example, criticizes the excessive planning and affirms that the cities must be seen like "complex and synchronous", open, lively, diversified, "incomplete" and "porous", within a vision of urban totality as opposed to closed cities with fully planned interiors. The challenge of planning it seems to be a non-rationalistic and in a flexible way (Souza, 2016).

Others, like Rossi (1995), draws attention to the fact that the problems of urban scale design "are only acceptable and concrete when referring to a 'piece of city'" and the need for understanding the city as a set of urban facts and architecture, as opposed to the abstract schemes of drawing the big planes. A new possible way of acting in the city is identified but on an intermediate scale that we call Local Masterplan.

In this context, Portas (2011) understands a new parameter as a formal definer is needed, since the present ones (that composed the block, the street and the lot, as well as the two-dimensional zoning through plants) are not adequate to the city-territory new morphologies, including the 'traditional' figure of the Urban Project.

Then, he proposes the notion of Program-Space, establishing a cyclical relation: form-program-form. It is an alternative to the technocratic approach, in which the realization of the form transforms the program that, once transformed, changes the form, transforming the Program-Space into Program-Design (Portas, 2011). Nevertheless, aware of the risks that the proposed method could cause, as an excess of an individualistic formalism, it goes from the elaboration of a program for the Process of Architectural Programming.

He understands that only volumetric issues, which are an abstraction, would not be a sufficient model for the proposition of new morphologies. Therefore, he introduces the concept of structuring model, of significant structures, making use of different schemes. As result, Portas propose the Meta-Project and the Meta-Design.

The Meta-Project is understood as the structuring of the program of functions and an architectural metalanguage, a project of projects that before one or more macro-structures of urban elements define types and articulations (Portas, 2011). After the Meta-Project was transformed into a precise project, it would be transformed into Meta-Design, when it came into contact with its respective context.

Thus, Meta-Design would finalize the sequence of the proposed new "regulatory method", which is the cultural representation of the space that would solve the meta-program within an Urban Project.

This fact shows an incipient urban practice in the European urban planning (Scholl, Elgendy & Nollert, 2007) that can offer clues as how the drawing can be the instrument of mediation of scale in the morphological and the mediator question of the urban instruments.

Consequently, based on the concepts of Portas and the urban planning process of the European references as the urban development at Stratford region, we observe the protagonism of the figure here called the Local Masterplan, an urban instrument that transcends different urban scales.

According to Bullivant (2017) the masterplan in contemporaneity can be thus defined

"These days, a masterplan is also an activity that occurs very early in any process of urban change, well before major costs for change are incurred in the delivery process. So, there is huge scope, and an advantage in timeliness to hitting the mark at the speculative stage [...] Whether tending to a top-down or more bottom-up attitude, masterplanners are more likely nowadays not to prescribe a rigid blueprint but will create a performative set of tools with the aim of incubating the future. As integrated sets of principles, they add utopias, not single utopia, to a city or region's public laboratory of possibilities, because any plan need to be accompanied by a lot of open debate, a good degree of open-endedness, and must respond generously to the innate presence of difference of all kinds found in all cities and regions. [...] In identity, masterplanning has become an interdependent set of principles, an integrated gestalt of mechanism for directing change in cities, not one single tool but a synergistic and interactive set of design tools applied to key urban issues, including degree of density and the effect of their relationship, mixed use and its application, cultural identities and their interaction, ecological and economic sustainability and their satisfactory dovetailing, cluster policies, anti-flooding policies, transport infrastructure and families of housing models. Inevitably, a post- zoning – a more intelligent, rather than a wasteful use of land – is at the heart of a good masterplan. No one element can afford to be compartmentalized but must play its role as part of a conceptual network of interrelationships and elements that encourage social conditions to emerge or to be reinforced."

By masterplanning there is the benefit of articulate the physical phases of implementation of the development through lots but also of articulating equations of the

financial scope. This instrument can, therefore, be selective. It can highlight and not necessarily cover all parts of the area with the same precision (as might have been preliminarily established in the previous steps) (Bullivant, 2017). The Local Masterplan figure is a coherence scheme, especially on the use, density and communication systems, which is then negotiated between the parties involved to be adjusted both at the level of urban design and urban design.

As the masterplan process involves many stakeholders, an entity working as an arbitrator is always present and needed and previously established. It is normally a figure a public power, either a municipality or a district (the rules of which may vary from country to country), which helps the process be linearly.

The presence of a referee is essential as if there is no moderation, successive impasses are created, because everything can become equally important, where all even entities come to have the same power, or, if there is no power, same parties and its responsibilities are might be neglected, or decisions can be made based on a superior policy that is deferred to the dominant interests of the time. That is, for each situation, at each level of planning and political decision, what are the main aspects to be considered are discussed. When there is conflict, the presence of the arbitrator can facilitate the resolution of the conflict.

Naturally, the relationship between urban design and specialized design has been very conflicting in Europe because it is basically a planning and design shock. With the new tools of the local masterplan, there are many new approaches to dialogue with this shock and procedural gap. As Bullivant (2017) reasons the need of this process of planning to be highly flexible to self-adjust throughout negotiations between the parties and thereby maintain their own design coherence. Is why it is justified that its area of operation is manageable in the context inserted

Consequently, specialized plans can be produced in a time frame from one or two to 20 years, for example. However, after the elaboration of this stage the smaller parts are produced to be adaptable, since the very nature of a Local Masterplan is to be able to incorporate changes as long as the macro strategies and the discussion between all the involved ones are maintained.

Like this, Local Masterplans accelerate the process because they bring stakeholders together for agreements much earlier than in traditional planning, as well as allow for adaptive specialized planning (Bullivant, 2017). It does not create a precise definition of everything, under a rigidity that could hinder the process.

In this argumentative view, it is observed that in the Brazilian scope a very rigid zoning was conceived, in which the zoning already considers a right that the private has, that is, the plan is binding of the minor, devoid of coherence of urban design, to the whereas in some European countries the local masterplan is an articulating and negotiating element between the parties involved (including the local government even if the development is private).

For European urbanism the "Local Masterplan" is an information of development intentions that is negotiated between the private and the municipality. The masterplan is an

informal tool that articulates legal constraints of the structural plan (as zoning uses) and in the specialized plan, considering new concepts that are then introduced legally in the structural plan, as well as in the specialized plans, establishing a cyclical relation in the development of the urban project. Subject to institutional specificities, it develops from the Program-Space in Program-Design to the Meta Project and Meta Design.

Carmona (2014) talks about design orientation and design guidance as instruments in the development process: “as a generic term for a range of tools that set out design parameters with the intention of better directing the design of development”. However, Carmona agrees that rigid manuals are not required, as guidelines can be a basis to be worked on in specific areas by means of codes, spatial attributes.

Design guidance and its codes are relevant because they are not legally defined, they only suggest data that may or may not be applied; is a tool within the development of a process; can accompany the local masterplan being a tool that is not intended to correct all the details as a specialized plan but offers a bit of flexibility in implementation.

The codes would be relevant because they create a guarantee of the quality of the drawing to be achieved, such as a local masterplan (Carmona, 2014), a drawing code. Codes can also help ensure coordination of the various stages of the process between the various parties involved. In this way, Carmona develops six main foundations for the guidelines of a masterplan:

1. Urban design: Quality urban design, the main goal among all;
2. Setting quality thresholds: It is necessary to establish the elements that clearly unify the place;
3. Investment up front: The preparation of space codes should involve all political parties articulated with the great master plan;
4. Rules for delivery that build upon a spatial vision: Drawing codes are effective tools to help interpret, articulate, and deliver expressive design vision elsewhere, typically in the masterplan;
5. Collaborative environment and partnership of interest: Strong collaboration between the parties is a prerequisite for the successful development of efficient codes;
6. Importance of clear and effective leadership: Efficient leadership is critical to articulating codes and making decisions.

Along with the six fundamentals, the use of Local Masterplan indicates a path of integrating urban design. As if big plans want to define and control everything, the Local Masterplan offers the possibility of flexibility. This dichotomy produces a challenge. Therefore, the imperative of creating urban design tools as part of a Masterplan can manifest itself as a set of adaptive principles (Bullivant, 2017). Design structures can be used by local authorities to outline their aspirations for areas of change and to help promote development. Stratford

Station is a case of success where drawing is the instrument of mediation of scale in the morphological and the mediator question of the urban instruments.

STRATFORD STATION

Stratford Station (Figure 2) is located in the neighborhood of Stratford and New Town, part of the Borough of Newham in the east of London (Figure 3). The neighborhood has 29,950 inhabitants and it is expected to growth to 62,250 in 2030. Nowadays, employment in the area is high. According with the official data from 2014 employment the ratio is 1.21 per resident. On the other hand, Stratford is still one of the most deprived areas in the country.



Figure 2: Square entrance to the Stratford Station
Source: First author, 2017.



Figure 3: Stratford Regional Location
Source: Apple Maps, 2018. Our treatment.

Stratford and New Town holds one of the highest public transport accessibility levels (PTAL – figure 4) in London, scoring an average 5.8 (from a scale from 0 – lowest level – to 6b – highest level). The station was the epicenter of the area’s regeneration scheme lead by the Borough and further by the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) as part of the 2012 Olympic/Paralympic Games. It is located on the edge (and entrance) of the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park as well of the Stratford City (the largest shopping mall in Europe). Stratford Regional is mainly constrained by one highway, the A12 (north and west), e a high street (south).




Figure 4: PLTAL in Stratford.
Source: TfL, 2018. Our treatment.

The Station is one of the most connected stations in London's public transport network. It homes two subway lines (Central and Jubilee), the overground, national rail routes, the DLR (Docklands Light Rail) and, until the end of 2019, will be one of the few stops in London of the brand-new Elizabeth Line (Crossrail). Besides, it is in walking distance from Stratford International Station, designed to be one of the stopovers of the high-speed rail routes (however, currently there are no plans to be used as one) and is the final stop of one of the DLR's routes. In 2016, more than 60 million passengers commuted using Stratford, an average of 5 million per month. In addition to this high complex Node of Transport, a bus terminal (Figure 5) is located in front of the station (but there are another bus terminal on the other side of the train line – Stratford City Bus Station). Although Stratford Station is situated in the Inner London, it takes approximately half hour from the Westminster Palace (Big Ben) using the Jubilee Line.



Figure 5: Bus station in Stratford Regional
Source: First author, 2017.

BRIEF HISTORY OF PLANNING

England has a very particular planning system and distinct from the Brazilian model. Whilst in Brazil planning is more straight for, with zoning law specifying exactly what and how can be built, or the types of business a determined region can have; the English planning system tends to be more subjective. Though general rules are in place – such as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Local Plans and, design guidelines – the planning authorities have a great power in decide if a specific development is in the interest of the public sector and the communities. Furthermore, Architecture Design and type of buildings can be defined by the planning authorities in order to preserve – or to push – the neighborhood's character or the social families' demands.

Normally, the **Local Plans and the planning powers belong to Boroughs**. However, some cities – due their size – have the figure of a Mayor and new administrative executive

body behind it. Like in London, where the Mayor can influence, oversee or even overtake a planning application if he/she understands that it relates to London interests in a bigger scale.

Additionally, **Site Masterplans** are demanded to any big developments, in order to ensure that developments are well connected to their neighborhoods; integrated to the public transport network; cycling and walking are taken into account and; the whole follows the London's and Borough's Local Plan. In some cases, Boroughs enterprise masterplans to portions of their territory, like in the case of Stratford. The Figure 6 briefly shows the links between the plans and frameworks.




Figure 6: The Planning Hierarchy in England
Source: The Authors, 2018.

Much of the new planning process was established by the Localism Act 2011, in which the Parliament changed the powers of the local government in England with the objective of facilitating the return of the decisions from the central government to the communities. Moreover, Section 8 gives to the London Mayor the power to establish a Mayoral Development Corporations (MDC), with the goal to regenerate parts of London which have been identified as the mayoral development areas, as MDC plays a major role in induce spatial development by the public interest.

Lock (2017) states that

“(...) MDCs are designed for tighter and shorter-life projects, primarily urban regeneration schemes” and that “a portfolio Corporation might be practicable in a smaller geographical area where the number of local

authorities and third-party agencies are few and the portfolio is interlocked socially, economically and environmentally”.

In addition to the Mayor's and Borough's powers to induce development, many Supplementary Plans are produced. While in Brazil all levels of governments are obligated to release such plans, the scale tends to be more macro than micro. For example, as in England the Mayor of London have to produce a housing plan, acknowledging the housing shortage (from the immediate need to future demand), localizing the number of houses in each Borough and, subsequently, which Borough have to identify the desire neighborhood's and site to receive these houses – linked to demand needs. Then, the local authority (normally, the Borough) has the power to not provide any building permit outside the marked areas. As in Brazil, due the lack of legal instruments and the culture of zoning, the power of induce development is unbalanced in the private sector hands.

As previously mentioned, public transport accessibility and sustainable commuting is favorably embodied in the English planning system. Moreover, with the necessity of anticipated housing, jobs, education and leisure demands, planning in England has more chances to guarantee social, economic and environment development (in an integrated way) than the Brazilian system.

Not just Local Masterplans and MDC are, nowadays, being taking into account in planning in London. The Elizabeth Line (Crossrail) project is a new example of the use of legal instruments to ensure neighborhood improvement. The Crossrail is the largest transport project in Europe, with a budget of £14.8 bi and 114km of rail tracks. It will connect Shenfield (outside London) and Abbey Wood (east London) to Heathrow (west London) and Reading (outside London), crossing Stratford.

To safeguard the success of the project, Transport for London (TfL) and the Department of Transport (DoT) amongst the local authorities and the Mayor of London, did a series of investigation to recognized housing and jobs demands, in order to work with private and public entities to deliver the infrastructure need to surpass such shortage, whereas diagnosing the future demand as well. In this way, not only the new subway line had a deadline of delivery but also these 'attached' developments.

Furthermore, Crossrail was the first British transport project “to deliver integrated station designs with three elements in mind: the station, above station developments and improved public spaces.” For this, each area relies with a Local Masterplan which follows the key established principles of the designs: “attractive, adaptable and sustainable so their use can change over time; accessible including, where possible, step free; legible and free from clutter; and safe and secure. Importantly they also aim to retain the identity, diversity and characteristics of local areas giving confidence to local communities and to potential investors”. The funding was split between the Crossrail, TfL and third parties (which can be local authorities and/or developers that will be direct beneficiated with the Elizabeth Line opening).

URBAN INSTRUMENTS IN STRATFORD STATION AREA

The 'new' Stratford had its spatial transformation initiated in 2002 in an attempted to give a new use to the highly contaminated old industrial area. As showed, Stratford changed from a rural area to a major transport hub/industrial site (late 1800's) to became decadent in late 1900's. Therefore, Stratford has a significant protagonist to Newham's present development. Additionally, considering inequalities indexes and the chosen to be converted in an Olympic/Paralympic site, the Borough understood the necessity of supplementary planning for the neighborhood.

In alignment with the Borough's vision and prior to the 2012 Newham's Core Strategy, the Borough of Newham put in place in 2011 its Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan Development Framework (SMMDF). The SMMDF comprehends an area of 267ha and has the goal to create a new urban and metropolitan hub, having Stratford Metropolitan Center as the London's Future third city, after the City of London and Westminster. Stratford is part of the "Opportunity Arch" (Figure 7), the regeneration program set in preparation to the 2012 Olympic/Paralympic Games and to ensure a growth future legacy. The program is considered the largest redevelopment project in Europe.



Figure 7: Opportunity Arch, respectively.
 Source: Newham's Core Strategy, 2012, p.18

The SMMDF it is a general plan which establishes an agenda for the development in Stratford, but it is not a formal document of planning politics. Though, the future plans which have been developed – both the Newham’s Core Strategy (2012) as the LLDC Local Pan (2015) are based in aspects of the Masterplan for its own content.




Figure 8: Planning Policy Guidance Links (From the London Plan to SMMDF)
Source: SMMDF, 2011, p.19.

It is imperative to highlight that since the chosen of London as an Olympic/Paralympic City, a massive and constant planning had been put in place to not only deliver the Games but likewise to ensure that the Games would act as an inductor of development and, to safeguard the surroundings communities’ interests (Figure 8).

Once the Games finished, the Mayor set the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC). The LLDC overtook the whole perimeter agreed as the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park and some of its surrounds (Figure 9). The LLDC incorporated the assets and planning of the Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC), as well as the planning powers of the Thames Gateway Development Corporation and the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA), both corporations set to deliver the Games and its infrastructures.

From that point further, the LLDC became the Planning Authority of the area, replacing the traditional planning powers – generally hold by the Boroughs. The Corporation is responsible for making decisions regards planning in its boundaries. Initially, the Corporation used the existing Local Plans to later have their own.




Figure 9: The administrative borough's and LLDC's boundaries

Source: The LLDC Local Plan 2015-2031, p. 230.

Thus, the LLDC adopted in 2015 The Legacy Corporation Local Plan: 2015 to 2031, with the necessary strategies to the ongoing development of the area and to have the decision power to approve the projects of the same, to guarantee the continuity of the development policies initiated for the Olympics. Figure 10 exemplifies.

In sum, the Borough of Newham lost the planning control of part of its territory. However, all plans (London Plan, Newham Core Strategy, LLDC Plan and Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan) are cohere and articulated to each other.




Figure 10: Area boundaries of the Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan Development Framework
Source: SMMDF, 2011, p.23

To guarantee the success of the long-term planning, a number of studies have been held (Figure 11). In addition, the analyzes had the purpose to keep the cohesion between the numerous Supplementary Plans (not restricted to the complementary masterplans but also to the housing, active transportation, services and others).




Figure 11: Overall Spatial Strategy, connections and Public transport network.
Source: SMMDF, 2011, p.35/50/53.

A detailed spatial analyzes was made in each neighborhood inside the Stratford Regional. Context, development options and preferred approaches were taken in account. Such method was used to preserve the areas' character, understand the community thinking of growth and, to recognize the opportunities and constrains in the sites. The main propose of all this planning is to diagnose each areas' needs and potentials as well connect all levels of planning to ensure the development of the Borough and London in an articulated way.



Figure 12: Old shed in the Stratford station area.
Source: First Author, 2017.

LOCAL PLAN: 2015-2031 THROUGH LONDON LEGACY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION – LLDC

Following all layers of planning, the uniqueness of the English planning system and the proven role of MDC in delivery success development schemes, the LLDC has its own planning guidance. It is the 2014 LLDC Local Masterplan, called London Legacy Development Corporation Local Plan 2015-2013. According with the plan, the mission of LLDC is described as “to use the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity of the London 2012 Games and the creation of Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park to develop a dynamic new heart for east London, creating opportunities for local people and driving innovation and growth in London and the UK”.

As prior acknowledged the importance of NODE, now is the PLACE which takes over. Therefore, the Local Plan emphasis three areas: [1] Park – the core of the Olympic Park; [2] PLACE – focusing in making the desired place to live and invest, and; [3] People – aiming in reduce the inequality gap in east London.

In the strategic breakdown for the development of the Local Plan: 2015-2031, the key diagram (Figure 13) shows the aspirations for the area as a whole, denominating the surrounding of the station as Town Center (big blue circle) which should be connected to the current downtown (Stratford Old Town).




Figure 13: Key diagram of the Local Plan.
Source: LLDC Local Plan 2015 to 2031, 2015, p.25.

The plan, identified the spaces available for the implementation of the political strategies by dividing them into 21 subareas (Figure 14) and, among others, the key pedestrian connections and the key visual perspectives have been detailed (Figure 15).




Figure 14: Acting perimeter of the LLDC, synthesis map with the principles and division of the 21 subareas

Source: LLDC, 2018.




Figure 15: Key pedestrian connections. Key visual perspectives
Source: Local Plan 2015 to 2031, 2015, p.116 and 88 respectively.

This Local Masterplan uses the same ‘structure’ of the SMMDF, recognizing the opportunities and constraints of all 21 subareas. Having in mind the three areas (park, place and people), the ‘action plan’ it is design to guarantee that the whole LLDC ‘neighborhood’ achieve the same level of quality of living.

Furthermore, the Plan has established a clear path to how to deliver its vision (Figure 16). Explaining how connected the policies are and the legal instruments at its disposal. It acknowledges that third-parties – such as the private sector – are part of the its successful delivery.




Figure 16: Flowchart of planning processes in local scale in London.
Source: LLDC Local Plan 2015 to 2031, 2015, p.232.

As a result, the combination of strong and forceful planning system, the powers given to the Mayoral Development Corporation and the Local Masterplans give Stratford a fighting chance to provide a vibrant ambience, community engagement, job creation and, a real Olympic legacy not merely to the region but similarly to London.

CONCLUSION

The role of Local Masterplan and the statute of the architectural design in the process of urban planning is fundamental to achieve spatial transformations that contribute to urban development. Drawing can be the instrument of mediation of scale in the morphological and the mediator question of the urban instruments.

The Stratford Station through a long process of urban planning, where the Local Masterplan was the basic instrument that permeated all phases of development, years before the Olympic/Paralympic Games (Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan of 2011) and until the year of 2031 (Local Plan: 2015-2031 of London Legacy Development Corporation), providing an alternative to the Brazilian model of planning. As London and the Boroughs set a clear vision of future urban and spatial development, Stratford transcended from a poor and industrial area, to become one of England's major Urban Development Hubs and social rising neighborhoods. Therefore, the relevance of the Local Masterplan and the status of the project as one of the main instruments in the urban development of an area is evidenced. The results show how a planning path through Local Masterplan as urban and spatial instrument can surpass spatial segregation between NODE and PLACE and to potentialize urban development as Mobility Urban Hub.

In sum, the English model of planning understand the vital role of vision the development as a whole. Even though some criticism lay over the model, something focusing more on economic development than social is imperative to accept that the frameworks in place look from the macro vision to the micro. While, the level of planning details varies from the macro do micro, the evidence base documents, the social-environment-economic aspects, the neighborhood's character and, the delivery and funding are always part of the process.

In contrast with the Brazilian, the English model looks the particularities and the evolving and involvement process of planning. It gives communities and governments a major influence in induce development. It admits that compromises with private stakeholders are needed to deliver a successful project. Whereas frameworks and guidance policies are published, they work more as a north rather than a right to build, as the zoning system.

The Local Masterplan provides an integrated vision in the materialization of the equipment within a planning integrating with the disciplines involved. It is an instrument that adapts constantly without losing its goals, which transcends different urban scales and urban instruments.

This instrument whose concept is under construction requires a plural team and is committed to the local complexities and to the evaluations necessary to the process, since the viability of a plan is established over time by stakeholders.

It is necessary to draw and project the art of the relationship of urban space, the relations between the full and empty. In this sense, the urban design through a Local Masterplan can define the relationships among the different urban elements, align the

different urban scales and be a necessary tool to qualify the proposals and intentions among all those involved.

REFERENCES

BAIARDI, Y.C.L., Nó de transporte e lugar: Dilemas, Desafios e Potencialidades para o Desenvolvimento de um Hub Urbano de Mobilidade. Tese (doutorado) – Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo, Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie. São Paulo, 2018.

BAIARDI, Y.C.L. (2013). O papel da microacessibilidade na mobilidade urbana: o caso da estação de trem Santo Amaro na cidade de São Paulo. Dissertação (Mestrado) – Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo, Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, São Paulo.

BERTOLINI, L.; SPIT, T. (1998). Cities on Rails: the redevelopment of railway stations areas. London: E & FN Spon.

BERTOLINI, L. (1998). Station area redevelopment in five European countries: an international perspective on a complex planning challenge. International Planning Studies, 3:2, 163-184, p. 180.

BULLIVANT, L. (2017). Masterplanning Futures. New York: Routledge, 2012, p. 4. Our griffin. Available at: <<https://www.book2look.com/embed/9781135717834>>. [19.12.2017].

CACCIARI, M. (2009). A cidade. Translation: J.J.C. Serra. Barcelona: GG, p. 35.

CAMPOS, V.B.G. (2013). Planejamento de transportes: conceitos e modelos. Rio de Janeiro: Interciência, p.2.

CALABI, D. (2012). História do urbanismo europeu: questões, instrumentos, casos exemplares. Translation: M. Barda; A. Marco. São Paulo: Perspectiva.

CALTHORPE, P. (1993). The next American Metropolis: ecology, community and the American dream. Canada: Princenton Architectural Press.

CARMONA, N. (2014). “Decoding Design Guidance”. In: BANERJEE, T. (Ed.). Urban Design: critical concepts in urban studies. New York: Routledge, p. 40.

CONCEIÇÃO A. L. M. (2015). From city’s station to station city an integrative spatial approach to the (re)development of station areas. 2015. Thesis – Technische Universiteit Delft, Delft.

LAMAS, J.M.R.G. (2010). Morfologia urbana e desenho da cidade. 5ª ed. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, p. 111.

NOVAIS, P. (2010). Uma estratégia chamada planejamento estratégico: deslocamentos espaciais e a atribuição de sentidos na teoria do planejamento urbano. Rio de Janeiro: 7 letras.

PORTAS, N. (2011). A cidade como arquitetura. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.

ROSSI, A. (1995). A arquitetura da cidade. Translation: E. Brandão. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, p. 171.

RICHER, C. (2008). L'émergence de la notion de pôle d'échanges, entre interconnexion des réseaux et structuration des Territoires. Les Cahiers Scientifiques du Transport, AFITL, p. 101-123.

SCHOLL, B.; ELGENDY, H.; NOLLERT, M. (2007) Spatial Planning in Germany. Formal Structure and Future Tasks. Karlsruhe, Universitätsverlag:Karlsruhe publisher.

SOUZA, M.L. (2016). Mudar a cidade: uma introdução crítica ao planejamento e à gestão urbanos. 11 ed. Rio de Janeiro:Bertrams Brasil, 2016.

Acknowledgements

First Author is thankful for scholarships received by CNPQ and IPM for the development of her thesis.