

## **Examination - London Legacy Development Corporation Local Plan 2015 to 2031**

### **Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions**

#### **Matter 2: Business Growth, Jobs and Lifelong Learning**

*Issues: With particular reference to its section 4, whether the Local Plan supports sustainable economic growth in line with paragraphs 18-22 of the National Planning Policy Framework; and whether it conforms with the London Plan's aims for economic growth in changing times, securing the legacy of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and tackling the persistent problems of deprivation and exclusion in the East of London.*

#### **Questions:**

1. Do the opening paragraphs 4.1 & 4.2 and Objective 1 provide a credible and appropriate starting-point for sustainable economic growth planning for the LLDC area? If not, precisely why not?
2. Should the Local Plan give more in-depth information about the economic impact of the Games, including the effect on local communities and businesses? In addition to benefits, should perceived, recent difficulties associated with the Games - disruption to some businesses and loss of local jobs - be acknowledged?
3. The Employment Land Review, Examination Document LEB/06, considers it best to regard Stratford City and Here East as part of the Central London office market. Although the supply of such office space currently proposed across London exceeds the projected demand, the Review concludes that the Stratford area has good credentials compared with some other possible areas of supply. Is there good evidence to support a different conclusion?
4. The London Plan, Document RP1, gives an "indicative employment capacity" for the Lower Lee Valley including Stratford of 50,000 to 2031. Over 30,000 predominantly office jobs are included in this figure. Is the Local Plan (Table 1) in general conformity, and is there any substantive evidence to dispute its figures?
5. The emerging Further Alterations to the London Plan [RP/03] shows Stratford as a Metropolitan town centre with potential to become an international centre. The London Plan 2011 showed it as a major town centre with potential to be a Metropolitan centre. Are the Local Plan's aspirations for office and business development consistent with these strategic plans?
6. Does Policy SP1 strike an appropriate balance between promoting national and international business on the one hand and strengthening the local economy on the other? If not, how exactly might the plan be amended to give added prominence to local matters? Suggestions have included:

- re-ordering the priorities in Policy SP1<sup>1</sup>,
  - making additional references to existing economic assets,
  - making additional references to encouraging social enterprise,
  - requiring the use of local supply chains to connect major developments to the organic growth of existing businesses,
  - acknowledging the importance of local employment sites for delivering lifetime neighbourhoods and reducing the need to travel to work, and
  - adding references to material from the Local Economy Study [LEB/5,6&7].
7. Is Policy B1 overly concerned with directing new and expanding businesses to the Employment Clusters, Table 2, to maintain their local character, instead of recognising that market forces should prevail? Is there a case for more flexibility over the location and maintenance of employment uses? Is there strong evidence to relax the requirements of Policy B1 5?
  8. Is Policy B1 5b) encouraging higher densities outside the clusters and within Other Industrial Locations likely to be detrimental to locally important cultural, artistic, manufacturing and food industries? Could it restrict the growth of activities around new technology more likely to occur in workshops and yards than in B1 office space?
  9. It is suggested that local employment land releases have been three times higher than the London Plan foresaw. There is also concern that low value uses providing jobs for vulnerable workers with low skill levels and pay are most at risk in the changing market. Does Policy B1 provide appropriate protection for employment sites in the area?
  10. Should Policy B1 and/or Table 2 refer to the Carpenters District?
  11. Should Cooks Road be excluded from Table 2, having regard for paragraph 22 of the NPPF?
  12. With the amendments nos. 7 & 8 proposed in LD/26, is Policy B2 consistent with the NPPF's paragraphs 23-27?
  13. Is Policy B2 consistent with town centre policy in the NPPF? Is the threshold for a retail and leisure assessment for a development of more than 200sqm too rigorous, or is it justified for this area?
  14. Is the promotion of the Stratford Town Centre Extension with approximately 55,000 sqm additional comparison retail floorspace by 2030 justified by up-to-date retail evidence? (See Retail & Leisure Requirements Review 2014, Peter Brett Associates, LEB/18)

---

<sup>1</sup> See table of minor amendments and corrections, LD/26, no. 4 to Policy SP1

15. Have the potential impacts on other town centres of growth at the Extension been assessed adequately? Are all the Local Authorities which make up the LLDC area supportive of the growth of Stratford Town Centre Extension?
16. Should the Local Plan address the problems around the likelihood that Stratford will have its own independent existence from the LLDC residential and business community, with its own supply chain? How might future integration be secured?
17. Should Policy B2 with paragraph 4.22 do more to resist the growth of betting shops in high streets, and if so, how?
18. Is there a case for more community engagement in the design and implementation of interim uses than in the past, to provide benefit to local businesses and community groups, and to avoid unacceptable adverse impacts? If so, how should Policy B3 be changed?
19. Are all the criteria in Policy B4 justified including the figure of "75 per cent of historic market rent" as achieved at Neptune Wharf? And does the Glossary include a satisfactory definition of low cost workspace?
20. Should Policy B5 be strengthened in the interests of generating more jobs locally and enhancing skill levels? For example, should targets for job creation (20% was suggested) be set, and should use of a local supply chain be sought for some developments? Should some minor as well as major developments be subject to s106 obligations? Are firmer monitoring arrangements required?
21. The supporting text to Policy B6 refers to convergence and the contribution that enhanced higher education can make to eliminating deprivation. How in practice might local people and schools be affected? Should the policy say more about achieving local connections?

Jill Kingaby (Inspector)

## Potential Participants [38]:

<b>Respondent Reference Number</b>	<b>Respondent Name and Organisation</b>
<b>REP.LP.007</b>	Peter Brady, Planning Law Practice on behalf of Gilcris Property LLP
<b>REP.LP.008</b>	Hannah Clifton, London Borough of Newham
<b>REP.LP.013</b>	Alan Gunne-Jones, Planning & Development Associates Ltd on behalf of Gowlain Building Group Ltd
<b>REP.LP.015</b>	Manoranjitham Saravanamuthu
<b>REP.LP.023</b>	Michael Holloway, Daniel Watney on behalf of Roypark (1988) Ltd and Newstates Ltd
<b>REP.LP.024</b>	Warren Lubin
<b>REP.LP.026</b>	Jeremy Castle, Deloitte on behalf of iCity.
<b>REP.LP.028</b>	Lucy Rogers East End Trades Guild
<b>REP.LP.029</b>	GL Hearn on behalf of Danescroft Land Limited
<b>REP.LP.031</b>	Steve Butters, CPRE
<b>REP.LP.032</b>	Vilna Walsh, Firstplan Ltd on behalf of Aggregate Industries (UK) Ltd and London Concrete Ltd
<b>REP.LP.036</b>	Owen Whalley, LB Tower Hamlets
<b>REP.LP.037</b>	Julian Cheyne
<b>REP.LP.041</b>	Gill Wildman, Plot London
<b>REP.LP.045</b>	Alister Henderson, Planning Perspectives on behalf of National Grid Property
<b>REP.LP.046</b>	Osita Madu
<b>REP.LP.047</b>	Katie Glasgow, London Borough of Hackney
<b>REP.LP.049</b>	Ulrike Steven, What if:projects Ltd
<b>REP.LP.054</b>	Geraldine Black, Community Links
<b>REP.LP.056</b>	Richard Brown
<b>REP.LP.057</b>	Diana Thomson, Savills
<b>REP.LP.058</b>	Austin Mackie on behalf of British Telecom
<b>REP.LP.066</b>	Tim Gaskell, CMA
<b>REP.LP.068</b>	Barton Wilmore on Behalf of Gold Pot Holdings
<b>REP.LP.069</b>	Mara Ferreri
<b>REP.LP.071</b>	Gerald Eve LLP, Sulzer Dowding
<b>REP.LP.072</b>	Montagu Evans on behalf of Constable Homes Limited.
<b>REP.LP.074</b>	Karen Tang on behalf of Acme Studios
<b>REP.LP.077</b>	Tobias Hug on behalf of the HWFI Development Community Group (list submitted separately) Katie Schöffmann
<b>REP.LP.079</b>	GVA on behalf of Workspace Group Limited
<b>REP.LP.080</b>	Bromley by Bow Centre
<b>REP.LP.082</b>	LB Waltham Forest
<b>REP.LP.083</b>	Plot London
<b>REP.LP.087</b>	Joseph Alexander
<b>REP.LP.089</b>	GLA
<b>REP.LP.091</b>	London Tenants Federation
<b>REP.LP.096</b>	Just Space
<b>REP.LP.121</b>	Rev. David Richards