

# **Statement on behalf of the London Legacy Development Corporation (9<sup>th</sup> February 2015)**

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

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

#### **Matter 7 (Sub Area 2): North Stratford and Eton Manor**

- 1. LB of Waltham Forest commented on Eton Manor that it “objects to the orientation of the site that turns its back on the Borough”. Please would the LB explain this objection; how might it be overcome?**

Eton Manor has been developed in accordance with the plans for 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games and subsequently transformed into its final form following the Games as the Lea Valley Hockey and Tennis Centre, in accordance with the relevant planning permissions. It is in the ownership of and is now operated by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. The Legacy Corporation is not aware of any specific plans for change to this facility.

- 2. Should the Chobham Farm site allocation for Policy SA2.1 be extended to include land north of Henrietta Street with planning permission for employment use?**

The Chobham Farm development scheme, in the form that has planning permission, includes an area of employment uses alongside the railway lines to the north of Henrietta Street. This is consistent with the existing character and use of the land to the north of Henrietta Street as a whole and there has been no specific evidence that there is likely to be a demand for change to this wider location within the Local Plan period. Extension of the site allocation is not considered to be necessary to the delivery of this consented element of the scheme. (See also response to Matter 1, Question 11).

- 3. Are Policies SA2.1-2.3 consistent with Chapter 5 of the Local Plan including Policy H1 which seeks to secure a mix of house types and with the achievement of 35% affordable housing? Should they be more explicit in their requirements for different house types and tenures? Would the policies secure integration with the surrounding low rise housing estates in Waltham Forest?**

Policies SA2.1 – 2.3 are considered to be consistent with the approach within Chapter 5 of the Local Plan. These policies emphasise the requirement in Policy H.1 for achieving a mix of housing types and reflects the local focus given to this sub area by the Sub Area Vision on Page 173 of the Local Plan. Policies SA2.1 – 2.3 also reflect the character established by the three major planning permissions in place for these three areas: Stratford City residential (as it applies to East Village) being more than 50% complete or under construction and Chobham Farm and Chobham Manor with first phases under construction. Physically, the form of approved development (and that supported by the building heights approach and other policies in the Local Plan) become progressively lower as the edge of existing residential areas is reached and with distance from the high accessibility areas around the Stratford International Station. The street network within the Legacy Corporation area is now established and Policy 2.2 seeks improvements to Leyton Road that would help achieve further integration, while Policy 2.3 seeks to exploit opportunities, including those outside of the Legacy Corporation boundary, that arise to improve wider connectivity. This will also aid access to the new and planned community facilities associated with these new areas, including the Local Centre, schools and community facilities.

- 4. Policies SP1 and B1 of the Local Plan support the growth and maintenance of existing businesses and employment uses. Is there a conflict with policies in Sub-Area 2 which, it is claimed, permit the displacement of well and long-established employment uses without clear provision for alternative, appropriate sites?**

It is not considered that a conflict arises between the Sub Area 2 policies and the Policies SP.1 and B.1. Policy B.1(5) in particular is considered to provide a clear set of tests and requirements in the circumstances that a proposal seeks to remove existing employment uses, with 5(e) requiring a relocation strategy where appropriate. While Allocation SA2.1 allocates an area of land which includes existing areas of employment use, this allocation reflects the Strategic Site Allocation currently in place for this location in the Newham Core Strategy 2012 [BPP/02] and the approach in the Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan [BPP/10]. The existing planning permission for the Chobham Farm development that covers this area (12/00146/FUM) establishes the acceptability of the use mix within the site allocation and also requires a relocation strategy for existing business uses in a similar manner to the requirement in Policy B.1.

- 5. Should there be more information as to the diversity and balance of community facilities which should be provided (Policies 2.4 and SA2.2)? And is there justification for the criticism that East Village is a new local centre with too much retail space and insufficient other uses to create a lifetime neighbourhood?**

The level of provision of existing and planned community facilities is assessed within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Study [LEB/20]. Within this sub area a range of new community facilities are either in operation or planned. The all-through Chobham Academy, including playing fields, and the Sir Ludwig Guttman Health Centre provide (in addition to their education and health roles) community space or community access. The delivery of the community facility required in Site Allocation SA2.3 is also required by the provisions of the Legacy Communities Scheme planning permission S106 Agreement. The Timber Lodge in the north of the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, within Sub Area 2, includes community meeting space and access to a range of related activities. Access to these and the legacy sporting venues will be available to existing and new communities in the surrounding area.

Given the above described level of community facility provision within the sub area as a whole, much of which is close to but not directly within the Local Centre boundary, it is considered that there is sufficient provision to help the creation of a lifetime neighbourhood. The extent of the Local Centre boundary has been specifically drawn to define and enable concentration of the local retail provision within this. All of the retail space defined within this has either been built and is ready for occupation or has a planning permission. The site allocations and policies within the sub area part of the plan do not prevent future changes of use to community or other uses appropriate to a local centre should additional demand arise.

- 6. With proposed change no 92 in LD/26, does Table 8 accurately record the prevailing building heights in the sub-area? Should this section of the Local Plan give stronger guidance and more precise limits on the height and massing of new buildings?**

This change has been specifically designed to correct a drafting error and ensure that the principles established by the consented development schemes are reflected.

- 7. Should the Vision for Sub-Area 2 refer to the role of the Eton Manor area which contains the Lee Valley Hockey and Tennis Centre, as Lee Valley Regional Park Authority suggest?**

Paragraph 11.3 within the sub area section of the Local Plan includes a detailed reference to the Lea Valley Hockey and Tennis Centre. The vision includes reference to “access to affordable community sport and leisure activities” generally and this is considered to be appropriate to the context of the area and the structure of the vision statement itself.

- 8. With regard to poor air quality on the A12 and Leyton Road, what more exactly do critics expect the Local Plan to say and do?**

Policy BN.11 Reducing Noise and Improving Air Quality, sets out the approach that would be taken to the assessment of development proposals in the context of air quality.

**TOTAL WORDS IN THIS STATEMENT: 938**