

Statement on behalf of the London Legacy Development Corporation (9th February 2015)

Examination - London Legacy Development Corporation Local Plan 2015 to 2031

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions

Matter 7 (Sub Area 4):

Questions relevant to Sub Area 4, Bromley-by-Bow, Pudding Mill, Sugar House Lane and Mill Meads

- 1. Should a site for a new secondary school to the south of the Olympic Stadium be identified, as sought by LB Newham?**

See the Schools Explanatory Note (Appendix 1 to Matter 5, Question 6, particularly paragraphs 7-9). Given the background set out in that note it is not considered appropriate to specifically identify a secondary school site in this location.

- 2. Should the Area Profile be extended to include reference to Lee Valley Regional Park and its role in respect of Three Mills Island, or do minor amendments nos 115 & 118 cover the point?**

It is considered that minor amendments 115 and 118 [LD/26] provide a proportionate level of reference to the Lee Valley Regional Park and its role in respect of Three Mills Island.

- 3. Proposed amendment no 114 in LD26 sets out prevailing and generally expected building heights. Does this overcome the objections raised by some that the policies for Sub-Area 4 are too prescriptive about building heights?**

The text at paragraph 13.3 of the Local Plan, as changed by proposed amendment 114 in LD/26 is considered to represent a clear approach that sets out a point at which Policy BN.10, Building Heights, will apply to each component part of the sub area. 'Generally expected' applies to those locations that mainly have a general character or approach to height established by outline or full planning permissions, while 'prevailing' refers to the locations that have an established built height within its urban form. The cross reference to Policy 3.1 for Stratford High Street ensures that there is continuity with the approach to the point at which Policy BN.10 applies along the entirety of Stratford High Street. In each case the point at which Policy BN.10 is applied is identified and this is considered to provide an appropriately flexible approach rather than an absolute restriction on building height. It should also be noted that the site allocations within Sub Area 4 specifically identify the height at which Policy BN.10 will apply.

- 4. Are Policies 4.1 and SA4.1 which propose a new district centre at Bromley-by-Bow credible and viable:**
- in the light of changing trends in retailing highlighted in the FALP, Policy 2.15;**
 - bearing in mind that planning permission has been granted for the northern part of the SA4.1 site (referenced on Page 215), and therefore the landowner(s) of the southern part would be expected to provide all the items in Policy SA4.1?**

The LLDC Retail and Leisure Requirements Review [LEB/18] reviewed the changing trends in retailing that were also highlighted in the FALP [RP/3], Policy 2.15. The review concluded that LLDC should still seek to secure the comprehensive regeneration of the district centre, with provision of additional retail floorspace and other town centre uses. See recommendations BB1-BB5 in the Review. The Local Plan identifies a 'Potential' district centre at Bromley-by-Bow with the intention that an actual centre designation may follow in time through a future Local Plan review once the appropriate level of floorspace and function had been reached. The principles of the requirements for the components of the centre, in particular, primary school, Ideas Store and open space have been established in existing adopted planning policy documents including the Tower Hamlets Core Strategy (2010) [BBP/3], page 116, and the Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Planning permission has been granted for the northern part of the SA4.1 site. There is a substantial s106 agreement attached to that scheme, which was agreed in line with the LTGDC Planning Obligations Community Benefit Strategy, operated by the previous planning authority for this area, LTGDC, from 2008-2012. The agreement requires that £7,500 per residential unit in the first phase is paid towards infrastructure provision, which is ring fenced in the s106 agreement towards improvements to Bromley-by-Bow station, education in Tower Hamlets, Bromley-by-Bow Ideas Store and public realm at Bow interchange. The first 25% of the contributions for the first phase have now been received, with the remainder due on completion of each residential unit. The later phases of the scheme allow for up to £10,000 per unit to be provided (subject to viability appraisal). Any contributions due would not be ring fenced. The s106 agreement also allows for a 'deferred standard charge' to be paid in addition to the contributions set out above if sales values reach levels set out in the agreement. Therefore the site to the north will provide financial contributions towards the items set out in policy SA4.1. Improvements to the appearance of the subway beneath the A12 and the Phase One bridge works are also provided for under the s106 agreement as 'works in kind' (up to the value of £100,000) of which would be deducted from the contribution payable. It is therefore not considered correct to suggest that the burden of infrastructure provision will fall entirely on the landowners of the southern part of the site allocation. While the southern part of the site allocation has been identified for the range of uses and infrastructure contained within this site allocation for some time in existing planning policy, it would also be expected that actual delivery of those required elements would employ a range of resources to ensure delivery, including partnership working with the borough and, where appropriate, seeking funding from relevant existing or new sources, for example for education delivery.

5. Is Policy SA4.2: Sugar House Lane fully justified in terms of the mix of uses, number and type of new homes and new infrastructure which it seeks? If not, what substantive evidence supports a different mix?

Please also refer to our response to Matter 7 (general) Question 4 which explains our approach to the format of site allocations.

The site allocation has been derived from the overall structure and quantum of development that has planning permission within this site allocation through a multi-phase, mixed use outline permission. This has established an approach and character for the location that has been suitably tested through the planning process and represents an appropriate approach to the site in the context of the conservation areas that are present within and adjacent to parts of the site.

The amended wording proposed in LD/26 for Site Allocation SA4.2, is considered to provide adequate flexibility within this context to allow adaptation and change to the consented scheme without the loss of its principal components. No specific evidence has been presented to suggest a different mix or quantum of development would be more justified.

6. Is the requirement in Policy SA4.3 Pudding Mill for 25% nonresidential floorspace to the west of Cooks Road and around the Crossrail portal justified? Should the policy allow more flexibility to reflect market conditions and enable more housing development?

The site allocation text is clear that 25% non-residential floorspace is achieved across the Pudding Mill site allocation as a whole with “predominantly industrial floorspace use mix in the area to the west of Cooks Road and around the Crossrail Portal”. The requirement is therefore across a wider area than the part of the site to the west of Cooks Road. The site allocation does not specifically restrict the quantum of housing development but rather in conjunction with the other policies of the Local Plan will require the amount of residential development in any particular scheme to be balanced against the identified requirements for other uses. In the case of the land to the west of Cooks Road, the balance will be influenced by the Other Industrial Land designation. This policy has been informed by evidence (Pudding Mill Land-use and Design Framework [LEB/16]) and Employment Land Review, Document [LEB/06]) and further justification is set out at Policy B.1 and its supporting text. It is considered that the policy set out in the site allocation strikes the appropriate balance between employment and residential uses to enable viable high quality mixed use schemes to come forward.

7. Should Policy SA4.3 or supporting text refer to the proximity of the Pudding Mill site to the Bow Midland West Rail site, since new development should have regard for its operational requirements?

It is considered that minor amendment 125 (see LD/26) provides adequate recognition of this matter, with a significant separation from the Bow Midland West site achieved by the Great Eastern Railway Line and the River Lea for the vast majority of the site.

8. How many homes are sought on this site, and why should the policy omit the requirement for a significant proportion of family homes?

Paragraph 2.9 of the Housing Position Statement [LD/28] provides assessment of the number of units that could potentially come forward on this site. The Legacy Corporation will be seeking to maximise housing in accordance with policies set out in the plan such as SP.2, SP.3, BN.1 at a density, design and mix that are appropriate to the location. It is considered that including specific housing numbers within the site allocation would make this inflexible and inconsistent with the Local Plan as a whole which seeks to maximise housing while balancing this against the requirements for other uses that have been identified and will be necessary in order to achieve a sustainable and successful place. The requirement for a significant proportion of family housing should not be omitted as it is consistent with both the housing evidence base and the requirements established within the Strategic Site Allocation S09 for Pudding Mill within the Newham Core Strategy (2012) [BPP/02].

9. Aren't the proposed (i) re-alignment of Barber's Road to give screening from Crossrail and (ii) the provision of industrial development along the western edge of the site to separate residential uses from noise and pollution along the A12, positive measures to achieve a high quality development?

The realignment of Barbers Road and the provision of industrial development in accordance with the Other Industrial Land designation indicated along the western edge of Cooks Road are considered to be part of a strategy to achieve high quality development within the site allocation as a whole and to align with the Strategic Site Allocation S09 for Pudding Mill within the Newham Core Strategy (2012) [BPP/02].

10. Should the site be enlarged to include land between DLR rail track and High St Stratford, and between the A12 and Bow Back River?

It is presumed that the reference here is to the location and extent of the Local Centre at Pudding Mill. The location has been broadly established in principle through the Legacy Communities Scheme Planning Permission which locates the local centre uses around and adjacent to the Pudding Mill DLR station. This provides a focus for local retail and other centre uses that will be capable of serving the future population in an accessible location that can also be easily reached and is not too close to either the proposed Bromley-by-Bow District Centre or the Metropolitan Centre at Stratford. The location and the Local Centre typology is considered to be adequately justified by the evidence within the Retail and Leisure Review Study [LEB/18]. It is also consistent with the Strategic Site Allocation S09 for Pudding Mill within the Newham Core Strategy (2012) [BPP/02]. While it is acknowledged that some ground floor units along Stratford High Street have struggled to find appropriate uses, it is suggested that this is at least in part as a result of their location which does not provide the type of space and environment that would be capable of providing a coherent centre. Policy 3.1 Stratford High Street Policy Area also encourages flexibility, encouraging the economic use of these spaces in a manner that would be appropriate to an out of centre location.

11. Is delivery of SA4.3 “from 2015” feasible?

Detailed applications are currently being considered for development on this site. At the time of writing the Local Plan in summer 2014, delivery from 2015 was considered feasible. However it is now anticipated that the bulk of development is more likely to come forward from 2016, so "from 2016" would now be more appropriate.

TOTAL WORDS IN THIS STATEMENT: 1,611