

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

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

#### **Matter 5: Infrastructure**

*Issue: Whether the Local Plan will secure the infrastructure needed to support sustainable development and convergence, consistently with paragraphs 156 & 162 of the NPPF.*

#### **Questions**

1. Page 223 of the Local Plan summarises the infrastructure delivery policies. Are there any substantive omissions from this list?
2. Should Policy SP4 or its supporting text include a reference to scheme viability, given the requirement for Local Plans to be deliverable (paragraphs 173 & 174 of the NPPF)?
3. Although the LLDC has a mandate to deliver infrastructure, representors point out that powers to operate and manage public services long term will not lie with the Corporation. Should the Local Plan clarify how responsibilities for infrastructure delivery, operation and maintenance will be discharged, in s7 or Appendix1?
4. Are the Local Plan's proposals and expectations for new and improved infrastructure justified, having regard for latest evidence notably the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), LEB/20?

#### **Community Infrastructure including Schools**

5. Is there any substantive evidence to demonstrate that the Local Plan with Policies C1.1 & C1.2, and planning permissions already granted for large scale developments, will not deliver the necessary new school places, healthcare and other community facilities required for the expected growth in homes and jobs?
6. LB Tower Hamlets raises concern that the Local Plan conflicts with the Fish Island Area Action Plan [BPP/06] Policy FI4.6 which requires residential development there to contribute to primary and secondary school provision. Is this correct?
7. Policy C1.1 expects new community facilities to be available for alternative uses when not needed by the main user. Should the policy be strengthened, possibly with reference to s106 obligations, to secure the desired outcome?
8. Does Policy C1.1 provide satisfactory and reasonable protection for existing community facilities?

#### **Telecommunications and Waste**

9. Given the importance of high quality telecommunications for business development, should Policy IN1 be more pro-active and encouraging to the provision of new infrastructure?

10. With the proposed amendments in LD/26, nos. 51-53, do Policies IN2 and S6 reflect a positive approach to planning for waste reduction and management within the LLDC area?
11. In view of the concerns of LB Waltham Forest, do the Local Plan's policies for waste provide a sufficient basis to support the planned development and regeneration in the Corporation area? "Better waste contingency plans" are suggested, but what form would these take?

### **Transport**

12. Should the sub-section on Transport and Connectivity give greater emphasis to walkable and lifetime local neighbourhoods, and less to enhancing national and international transport services? If so, what should be changed e.g. strengthen Policy T6? The IDP refers to the Transport for London Study identifying good strategic transport connections but poor local connectivity.
13. Objective 4, Policy SP4 and transport policies recognise the importance of improving public transport connectivity from existing and planned developments. Does the Local Plan give sufficient weight to the fact that the PTAL levels of specific sites could change over the plan period [eg. as per BPP/10 Pages 54-55]? Has the draw of Stratford International Station operating as a multi-modal transport hub been recognised sufficiently in the plan?
14. In Policy T3, should development proposals meet all 6 criteria or could compliance with no 1 suffice? Does this need clarifying?
15. Should Policy T4 promote improvements in public transport services to serve new developments, in particular to meet the needs of elderly, disabled and very young people who may be unable to walk far or cycle?
16. Should Policy T4 refer to Transport Assessments, and are the thresholds for providing them in Policy T7 clear and consistent with the NPPF, paragraph 32?
17. Is Policy T8 with its reliance on the London Plan's parking standards sufficiently aspirational or should it be changed perhaps to align with Hackney's new Sustainable Transport SPD?
18. Should the criteria in Policy T8 be clarified to aid effectiveness. For example, should "car parking at a low level" (criterion 1) be explained more fully, and should standards for the provision of electric charging points be set out? Is clarification needed as to whether off-street and/or on-street car parking is intended?
19. On paragraph 7.34, the GLA advises that the Capital Ring could be diverted or alternative routes provided through the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. Should this be acknowledged?

20. Is Policy T10 in general conformity with Policies 7.25 & 7.26 of the London Plan which aim to increase use of the Blue Ribbon Network (waterways) for passengers and freight?

21. Is the Local Plan sufficiently clear as to proposals for new bridges, in its text and in diagrams? Would proposed bridges across Old Ford Locks and the Bottom Lock on the Hertford Union Canal be unnecessary and out of keeping with the form and character of the Fish Island and Whitepost Lane Conservation Area, as suggested?

Jill Kingaby (Inspector)

### Potential participants [27]:

<b>Respondent Reference Number</b>	<b>Respondent Name and Organisation</b>
<b>REP.LP.004</b>	Julian Austin, Amec on behalf of National Grid
<b>REP.LP.008</b>	Hannah Clifton, London Borough of Newham
<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.029</b>	GL Hearn on behalf of Danescroft Land Limited
<b>REP.LP.033</b>	Steffan Rees, Quod on behalf of QDD Athletes Village UK Limited
<b>REP.LP.036</b>	Owen Whalley, LB Tower Hamlets
<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.051</b>	Victor Adegbuyi, Newham Union of Tenants
<b>REP.LP.056</b>	Richard Brown
<b>REP.LP.057</b>	Diana Thomson, Savills
<b>REP.LP.067</b>	Francis Basset, Newham Friends of Earth
<b>REP.LP.073</b>	Canal and River Trust
<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.082</b>	LB Waltham Forest
<b>REP.LP.086</b>	Deloitte on behalf of UCL
<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