

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Will Steadman](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Sugar House Lane.
Date: 02 July 2014 15:19:40
Attachments: [BCAF48E8-C329-4173-ACE3-EFEC35C4F066\[5\].png](#)
[140626 Meeting Notes of 12 June 2014 amended.docx](#)

Will

It was good to meet you on the 12th. I trust your calf is recovering.

It seemed sensible to have some notes of our discussion and I have therefore prepared some. These are attached. If you have any comments then do not hesitate to contact me.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are reviewing their current position and I am sure we will be back in touch shortly.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

RIBA 
Chartered Practice

Planning . Design . Delivery
bartonwillmore.co.uk
7 Soho Square
London, W1D 3QB

Phone: [REDACTED]
Mo: [REDACTED]
Web: www.bartonwillmore.co.uk

"Information contained in this e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may be privileged. It may be read, copied and used only by the addressee, Barton Willmore accepts no liability for any subsequent alterations or additions incorporated by the addressee or a third party to the body text of this e-mail or any attachments. Barton Willmore accept no responsibility for staff non-compliance with the Barton Willmore IT Acceptable Use Policy."

MEETING NOTES

Job No: 23632/A7 – 10 Sugar House Lane

Subject: Meeting with Olympic Legacy Development Corporation

Date: 12 June 2014 @10.00am

Present:

	-	Gallagher Holding Ltd
	-	Gallagher Holding Ltd
Will Steadman (WS)	-	Senior Planning Development Manager – LLDC
	-	Barton Willmore

Location: 1 Stratford Place, Montfichet Road, London E20 1EJ

No.	Subject	Action
1.0	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the respective parties, to understand the LLDC's role in the planning process and explore the opportunities for the redevelopment of the land at 10 Sugar House Lane owned by Gallagher Holdings Ltd.	
1.2	These notes summarise those discussions.	
2.0	█ introduced Gallagher Holdings Ltd and explained they owned land at 10 Sugar House Lane and 113/115 High Street, Stratford. It was currently occupied by CW Plant Hire. █ also confirmed that he was working with the owner of the land to the north east on the corner of High Street and Sugar House Lane, so that both sites could come forward together.	
2.1	█ explained that for some years a company called LandProp had been buying the land on the peninsular of land around Sugar House Lane. A Hybrid planning application had been made and granted Consent for the development of the whole of the peninsular. █ noted that WS had a copy of that document in front of him. Consent was granted in September 2012.	
2.2	LandProp currently own some 97% of the land on the peninsular including some purchased, apparently without tender, from the London Borough of Newham. Over the past few years LandProp had made various offers to Gallagher Holdings for their interest. None of these offers had been accepted as Gallagher Holdings had always had aspirations to develop their site themselves and the offers were not considered to be at a sufficient level to agree a sale. Landprop had now approached Newham to support a CPO of Gallagher Holdings interest..	

2.3	Gallagher Holdings Ltd are now keen to consider the development prospects of their own land with a view to bringing forward a planning application. GH support the principle of the re-development of the area and consider they could bring forward development on their site which would be complimentary to the wider scheme and achieve the Local Authority's aspirations for the area	
2.4	<p>█ explained that to date they had not seen any details of Landprop's scheme design and were surprised the detailed proposals had not progressed given the extent of land currently owned by Landprop, the length of time since the grant of outline planning consent and the fact that the GH land was proposed in Phase 7 of the Landprop scheme and did not prevent them from commencing development on the land they currently own.</p> <p>█ explained that they done some initial investigation into the development potential of their site, hence █ involvement and it was felt that a proposal could be put forward that would not prejudice the greater master plan, retain and increase employment on the site and also create a number of new residential units.</p>	
2.5	<p>WS thanked █ for this introduction and confirmed that the peninsular and the GHL site now fell under the planning jurisdiction of the LLDC. WS confirmed that LB Newham had been the original planning authority and that the planning role had more recently been undertaken by the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation. The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation had granted the Hybrid Planning Consent for the peninsular in 2012.</p> <p>WS confirmed that to date he had not received or seen any information or proposals from Landprop relating to their detailed submission and scheme design.</p>	
2.6	WS noted █ comments about LandProp and compulsory purchase. WS confirmed that only a local authority / development corporation could compulsory purchase. This was only undertaken in exceptional cases and it could be a long and complex process. On the basis that a site within a development area could be brought forward without prejudicing the development aspirations of the area, it was unlikely that compulsory purchase process would be used. WS confirmed that the use of compulsory purchase powers by the LLDC in this instance seemed unlikely.	
	<p>█ noted that one of the reasons given by Newham for compulsory purchase was to achieve a comprehensive development.</p> <p>WS confirmed that to achieve comprehensive development he did not consider it necessary for the whole site to be in one ownership or developed by one party. WS confirmed that as planning authority they would consider applications on individual parcels of land within the wider site area and such applications would be considered against the relevant policy background and/or the current consent and masterplan for the area.</p>	
2.7	WS confirmed that as the planning authority they would base their planning decision on the 'relevant documents'. The two key relevant documents were the September 2012 Consent and the LLDC draft plan. The draft plan was expected to go for its next round of public consultation in summer 2014.	

2.8	WS considered that the GHL site could come forward for development in its own right without prejudicing the wider masterplan of The September 2012 Consent. WS acknowledged that it was very helpful that the GHL site and the land to the north on the corner of the High Street and Sugar House Lane could come forward together.	
2.9	WS noted that the masterplan in The Sept 2012 Consent proposed employment only use on the GHL site. He also noted that the development was proposed at a relatively low height. WS confirmed that currently the LLDC draft plan followed these principles.	

3.0	THE PROPOSED SCHEME	
3.1	<p>■ then explained the principles of the capacity study Barton Willmore had undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The site could come forward respecting the existing alignment of Sugar House Lane without compromising the aspirations of the Consented Masterplan. b) There could be a calculation of the amount of employment use indicated in the Consented Masterplan on the GHL site. ■ confirmed that this had been done based only on the scaled drawings available but he believed that this could be easily accommodated on the site. c) This commercial space could provide an active frontage to any proposed development. d) Subject to an understanding of the current CW Hire business, part of this use might be retained on the site. The business currently hired out larger driven vehicles and these may be difficult to retain on site. ■ confirmed that these large vehicles could be relocated to a nearby branch of the company but that the majority of the business might remain on site. e) ■ confirmed that simply using the site for employment use over three or four storeys is a very inefficient potential use of the site. f) There also had to be a clear understanding of what could constitute 'viable' employment use. There was little point provided office accommodation for no companies to need it in this location. WS suggested that workshop/starter accommodation may be appropriate. ■ agreed. He explained he did a lot of design work with Workspace who provided such accommodation so was very familiar with that type of produced. However, he noted that Workspace had a scheme just to the north of the High Street and he was aware of the other employment uses within that immediate area. g) ■ felt that a high quality, GLA compliant, dual aspect flatted, securely accessed from Sugar House Lane could be successfully provided above the employment space. Having explored the height of the buildings nearby and along the High Street, he saw no reason why the general height of development along Sugar House Lane should not be 5 to 8 storeys high rising to a taller marker building on the corner of High Street and Sugar House Lane of over twenty storeys. h) ■ explained that the proposals had also taken into account the potential redevelopment of the site to the north west of the GHL site and believed that these proposals would not prejudice that sites future redevelopment . 	
3.2	<p>WS noted these indicative sketches and agreed that there was an acknowledged shortage of housing in London and that if such residential accommodation could be provided to meet all the required statutory standards then it was reasonable to propose it. However, it remains contrary to the current policy. WS suggested that GHL might wish to consider making representations in the upcoming consultation on the draft plan.</p>	
3.3	<p>WS confirmed that there was no reason why a planning application for the GHL site should not be made.</p>	

3.4	WS confirmed he would be the officer dealing with any planning application for the site.	
3.5	WS confirmed the site would attract CIL contributions if a planning application was made.	
4.0	SUMMARY	
4.1	█ thanked WS for the meeting and was comforted to know that the LLDC was unlikely to compulsory purchase the GHL site.	
4.2	█ would now review their position and consider their next action.	
4.3	WS confirmed that it was reasonable for GHL to make a planning application as soon as possible. He confirmed that if the application proposed development above 10 storeys it must be a detailed application.	
4.4	WS confirmed that it was reasonable to propose a mixed use scheme with residential use, particularly with the acknowledged shortage of residential accommodation across London. However, the currently consented masterplan and the draft LLDC plan only proposed employment use on the site. Therefore any diverge from this would have to be carefully argued.	
4.5	WS suggested that GHL might like to consider making representations in the next round of public consultation on the LLDC draft plan to amend the land use.	
4.6	WS confirmed it was important to demonstrate that any proposals for the site in a planning application did not compromise the aspirations of the masterplan in The Sept 2012 Consent, nor did it compromise the potential to develop adjacent sites.	
4.7	WS confirmed that as Development Corporations were excluded from the relevant Bill, they could not change for pre-application advice or meetings.	

█
Design Partner
23 June 2014

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Will Steadman](#)
Subject: Sugar House Lane
Date: 12 July 2014 07:14:21
Attachments: [BCAF48E8-C329-4173-ACE3-FFEC35C4F066\[2\].png](#)
[140626 Meeting Notes of 12 June 2014 amended.docx](#)

Will

I trust you are well.

I sent through notes of our meeting on Sugar House Lane and the Gallagher Holdings Land on the 2nd of July for your comment. I attach another copy but I would be grateful to know if you have any comments. Gallagher have a board meeting on Tuesday and wanted to be sure that the meeting notes reflected your views too.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]
Design Partner

RIBA 
Chartered Practice

Planning . Design . Delivery
bartonwillmore.co.uk
7 Soho Square
London, W1D 3QB

Phone: [REDACTED]
Mo: [REDACTED]
Web: www.bartonwillmore.co.uk

"Information contained in this e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may be privileged. It may be read, copied and used only by the addressee, Barton Willmore accepts no liability for any subsequent alterations or additions incorporated by the addressee or a third party to the body text of this e-mail or any attachments. Barton Willmore accept no responsibility for staff non-compliance with the Barton Willmore IT Acceptable Use Policy."

MEETING NOTES

Job No: 23632/A7 – 10 Sugar House Lane

Subject: Meeting with Olympic Legacy Development Corporation

Date: 12 June 2014 @10.00am

Present:

[REDACTED]	-	Gallagher Holding Ltd
[REDACTED]	-	Gallagher Holding Ltd
Will Steadman (WS)	-	Senior Planning Development Manager – LLDC
[REDACTED]	-	Barton Willmore

Location: 1 Stratford Place, Montfichet Road, London E20 1EJ

No.	Subject	Action
1.0	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the respective parties, to understand the LLDC's role in the planning process and explore the opportunities for the redevelopment of the land at 10 Sugar House Lane owned by Gallagher Holdings Ltd.	
1.2	These notes summarise those discussions.	
2.0	[REDACTED] introduced Gallagher Holdings Ltd and explained they owned land at 10 Sugar House Lane and 113/115 High Street, Stratford. It was currently occupied by CW Plant Hire. [REDACTED] also confirmed that he was working with the owner of the land to the north east on the corner of High Street and Sugar House Lane, so that both sites could come forward together.	
2.1	[REDACTED] explained that for some years a company called LandProp had been buying the land on the peninsular of land around Sugar House Lane. A Hybrid planning application had been made and granted Consent for the development of the whole of the peninsular. [REDACTED] noted that WS had a copy of that document in front of him. Consent was granted in September 2012.	
2.2	LandProp currently own some 97% of the land on the peninsular including some purchased, apparently without tender, from the London Borough of Newham. Over the past few years LandProp had made various offers to Gallagher Holdings for their interest. None of these offers had been accepted as Gallagher Holdings had always had aspirations to develop their site themselves and the offers were not considered to be at a sufficient level to agree a sale. Landprop had now approached Newham to support a CPO of Gallagher Holdings interest..	

2.3	Gallagher Holdings Ltd are now keen to consider the development prospects of their own land with a view to bringing forward a planning application. GH support the principle of the re-development of the area and consider they could bring forward development on their site which would be complimentary to the wider scheme and achieve the Local Authority's aspirations for the area	
2.4	<p>█ explained that to date they had not seen any details of Landprop's scheme design and were surprised the detailed proposals had not progressed given the extent of land currently owned by Landprop, the length of time since the grant of outline planning consent and the fact that the GH land was proposed in Phase 7 of the Landprop scheme and did not prevent them from commencing development on the land they currently own.</p> <p>█ explained that they done some initial investigation into the development potential of their site, hence █ involvement and it was felt that a proposal could be put forward that would not prejudice the greater master plan, retain and increase employment on the site and also create a number of new residential units.</p>	
2.5	<p>WS thanked █ for this introduction and confirmed that the peninsular and the GHL site now fell under the planning jurisdiction of the LLDC. WS confirmed that LB Newham had been the original planning authority and that the planning role had more recently been undertaken by the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation. The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation had granted the Hybrid Planning Consent for the peninsular in 2012.</p> <p>WS confirmed that to date he had not received or seen any information or proposals from Landprop relating to their detailed submission and scheme design.</p>	
2.6	WS noted █ comments about LandProp and compulsory purchase. WS confirmed that only a local authority / development corporation could compulsory purchase. This was only undertaken in exceptional cases and it could be a long and complex process. On the basis that a site within a development area could be brought forward without prejudicing the development aspirations of the area, it was unlikely that compulsory purchase process would be used. WS confirmed that the use of compulsory purchase powers by the LLDC in this instance seemed unlikely.	
	<p>█ noted that one of the reasons given by Newham for compulsory purchase was to achieve a comprehensive development.</p> <p>WS confirmed that to achieve comprehensive development he did not consider it necessary for the whole site to be in one ownership or developed by one party. WS confirmed that as planning authority they would consider applications on individual parcels of land within the wider site area and such applications would be considered against the relevant policy background and/or the current consent and masterplan for the area.</p>	
2.7	WS confirmed that as the planning authority they would base their planning decision on the 'relevant documents'. The two key relevant documents were the September 2012 Consent and the LLDC draft plan. The draft plan was expected to go for its next round of public consultation in summer 2014.	

2.8	WS considered that the GHL site could come forward for development in its own right without prejudicing the wider masterplan of The September 2012 Consent. WS acknowledged that it was very helpful that the GHL site and the land to the north on the corner of the High Street and Sugar House Lane could come forward together.	
2.9	WS noted that the masterplan in The Sept 2012 Consent proposed employment only use on the GHL site. He also noted that the development was proposed at a relatively low height. WS confirmed that currently the LLDC draft plan followed these principles.	

3.0	THE PROPOSED SCHEME	
3.1	<p>■ then explained the principles of the capacity study Barton Willmore had undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The site could come forward respecting the existing alignment of Sugar House Lane without compromising the aspirations of the Consented Masterplan. b) There could be a calculation of the amount of employment use indicated in the Consented Masterplan on the GHJ site. ■ confirmed that this had been done based only on the scaled drawings available but he believed that this could be easily accommodated on the site. c) This commercial space could provide an active frontage to any proposed development. d) Subject to an understanding of the current CW Hire business, part of this use might be retained on the site. The business currently hired out larger driven vehicles and these may be difficult to retain on site. ■ confirmed that these large vehicles could be relocated to a nearby branch of the company but that the majority of the business might remain on site. e) ■ confirmed that simply using the site for employment use over three or four storeys is a very inefficient potential use of the site. f) There also had to be a clear understanding of what could constitute 'viable' employment use. There was little point provided office accommodation for no companies to need it in this location. WS suggested that workshop/starter accommodation may be appropriate. ■ agreed. He explained he did a lot of design work with Workspace who provided such accommodation so was very familiar with that type of produced. However, he noted that Workspace had a scheme just to the north of the High Street and he was aware of the other employment uses within that immediate area. g) ■ felt that a high quality, GLA compliant, dual aspect flatted, securely accessed from Sugar House Lane could be successfully provided above the employment space. Having explored the height of the buildings nearby and along the High Street, he saw no reason why the general height of development along Sugar House Lane should not be 5 to 8 storeys high rising to a taller marker building on the corner of High Street and Sugar House Lane of over twenty storeys. h) ■ explained that the proposals had also taken into account the potential redevelopment of the site to the north west of the GHJ site and believed that these proposals would not prejudice that sites future redevelopment . 	
3.2	<p>WS noted these indicative sketches and agreed that there was an acknowledged shortage of housing in London and that if such residential accommodation could be provided to meet all the required statutory standards then it was reasonable to propose it. However, it remains contrary to the current policy. WS suggested that GHJ might wish to consider making representations in the upcoming consultation on the draft plan.</p>	
3.3	<p>WS confirmed that there was no reason why a planning application for the GHJ site should not be made.</p>	

3.4	WS confirmed he would be the officer dealing with any planning application for the site.	
3.5	WS confirmed the site would attract CIL contributions if a planning application was made.	
4.0	SUMMARY	
4.1	█ thanked WS for the meeting and was comforted to know that the LLDC was unlikely to compulsory purchase the GHL site.	
4.2	█ would now review their position and consider their next action.	
4.3	WS confirmed that it was reasonable for GHL to make a planning application as soon as possible. He confirmed that if the application proposed development above 10 storeys it must be a detailed application.	
4.4	WS confirmed that it was reasonable to propose a mixed use scheme with residential use, particularly with the acknowledged shortage of residential accommodation across London. However, the currently consented masterplan and the draft LLDC plan only proposed employment use on the site. Therefore any diverge from this would have to be carefully argued.	
4.5	WS suggested that GHL might like to consider making representations in the next round of public consultation on the LLDC draft plan to amend the land use.	
4.6	WS confirmed it was important to demonstrate that any proposals for the site in a planning application did not compromise the aspirations of the masterplan in The Sept 2012 Consent, nor did it compromise the potential to develop adjacent sites.	
4.7	WS confirmed that as Development Corporations were excluded from the relevant Bill, they could not change for pre-application advice or meetings.	

█
Design Partner
23 June 2014

From: Will Steadman
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Sugar House Lane
Date: 05 August 2014 12:26:00
Attachments: [140626 Meeting Notes of 12 June 2014 amended by WS.docx](#)
[image001.png](#)

[REDACTED]

My track changes attached.

Please circulate a clean version once you have reviewed.

Thanks

Will

From: [REDACTED]@bartonwillmore.co.uk]
Sent: 12 July 2014 07:13
To: Will Steadman
Subject: Sugar House Lane

Will

I trust you are well.

I sent through notes of our meeting on Sugar House Lane and the Gallagher Holdings Land on the 2nd of July for your comment. I attach another copy but I would be grateful to know if you have any comments. Gallagher have a board meeting on Tuesday and wanted to be sure that the meeting notes reflected your views too.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]
Design Partner

RIBA 
Chartered Practice

Planning . Design . Delivery
bartonwillmore.co.uk
7 Soho Square
London, W1D 3QB

Phone: [REDACTED]
Mo: [REDACTED]
Web: www.bartonwillmore.co.uk

"Information contained in this e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may be privileged. It may be read, copied and used only by the addressee, Barton Willmore accepts no liability for any subsequent alterations or additions incorporated by the addressee or a third party to the body text of this e-mail or any attachments. Barton Willmore accept no responsibility for staff non-compliance with the Barton Willmore IT Acceptable Use Policy."

MEETING NOTES

Job No: 23632/A7 – 10 Sugar House Lane
Subject: Meeting with Olympic Legacy Development Corporation
Date: 12 June 2014 @10.00am
Present: [REDACTED] - Gallagher Holding Ltd
 [REDACTED] - Gallagher Holding Ltd
 Will Steadman (WS) - Senior Planning Development
 [REDACTED] - Manager – LLDC
 [REDACTED] - Barton Willmore
Location: 1 Stratford Place, Montfichet Road, London E20 1EJ

No.	Subject	Action
1.0	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the respective parties, to understand the LLDC's role in the planning process and explore the opportunities for the redevelopment of the land at 10 Sugar House Lane owned by Gallagher Holdings Ltd.	
1.2	These notes summarise those discussions.	
2.0	[REDACTED] introduced Gallagher Holdings Ltd and explained they owned land at 10 Sugar House Lane and 113/115 High Street, Stratford. It was currently occupied by CW Plant Hire. [REDACTED] also confirmed that he was working with the owner of the land to the north east on the corner of High Street and Sugar House Lane, so that both sites could come forward together.	
2.1	[REDACTED] explained that for some years a company called LandProp had been buying the land on the peninsular of land around Sugar House Lane. A Hybrid planning application had been made and granted Consent for the development of the whole of the peninsular. [REDACTED] noted that WS had a copy of that document in front of him. Consent was granted in September 2012.	
2.2	LandProp currently own some 97% of the land on the peninsular including some purchased, apparently without tender, from the London Borough of Newham. Over the past few years LandProp had made various offers to Gallagher Holdings for their interest. None of these offers had been accepted as Gallagher Holdings had always had aspirations to develop their site themselves and the offers were not considered to be at a sufficient level to agree a sale. Landprop had now approached Newham to support a CPO of Gallagher Holdings interest..	

2.3	Gallagher Holdings Ltd are now keen to consider the development prospects of their own land with a view to bringing forward a planning application. GH support the principle of the re-development of the area and consider they could bring forward development on their site which would be complimentary to the wider scheme and achieve the Local Authority's aspirations for the area	
2.4	<p>█ explained that to date they had not seen any details of Landprop's scheme design and were surprised the detailed proposals had not progressed given the extent of land currently owned by Landprop, the length of time since the grant of outline planning consent and the fact that the GH land was proposed in Phase 7 of the Landprop scheme and did not prevent them from commencing development on the land they currently own.</p> <p>█ explained that they done some initial investigation into the development potential of their site, hence █ involvement and it was felt that a proposal could be put forward that would not prejudice the greater master plan, retain and increase employment on the site and also create a number of new residential units.</p>	
2.5	<p>WS thanked █ for this introduction and confirmed that the <u>LLDC was now the local planning authority for the peninsular and the GH site following the transfer of planning powers from LTGDC to LLDC on 1 October 2012. now fell under the planning jurisdiction of the LLDC.</u> WS confirmed that <u>LTGDC was the planning authority from 1 October 2005 to 1 October 2012 following the transfer of power from LB Newham. had been the original planning authority and that the planning role had more recently been undertaken by the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation.</u> The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation had granted <u>planning permission for a the Hybrid Pplanning application Consent</u> for the peninsular <u>in on 27 September 2012.</u></p> <p>WS confirmed that to date <u>that LandProp had not he had not received or seen any information or submitted any Reserved Matters application pursuant to the extant planning permission and noted that a number of planning conditions had been discharged. proposals from Landprop relating to their detailed submission and scheme design.</u></p>	
2.6	<p>WS noted █ comments about LandProp and compulsory purchase. WS confirmed that <u>only a local authority's and urban development corporation's had the power to make a could compulsory purchase. This was only undertaken in the public interest. exceptional cases and it could be a long and complex process. On the basis that a site within a development area could be brought forward without prejudicing the development aspirations of the area, it was unlikely that compulsory purchase process would be used.</u> WS confirmed that <u>he was aware that LBN were considering the use of compulsory purchase to complete site assembly, unlike LLDC. the use of compulsory purchase powers by the LLDC in this instance seemed unlikely.</u></p>	

	<p>■ noted that one of the reasons given by Newham for compulsory purchase was to achieve a comprehensive development.</p> <p>WS confirmed that to achieve the principle of comprehensive development did not necessarily require he did not consider it necessary for the an entire whole site to be in one ownership or developed by one party. <u>In relation to the peninsular site, WS referred to the LTGDC's Sugar House Lane and Three Mills Land Use and Design Brief as promoting comprehensive development and resisting piecemeal development in order to achieve the planning objectives for the area e.g. no net loss of industry capacity and the introduction of alternative uses.</u> -WS confirmed that as planning authority they <u>were duty bound to</u> would consider applications on individual parcels of land within the wider site area and <u>that any such</u> applications would be <u>determined in accordance with adopted and emerging considered against the relevant planning policy background and its compatibility with the extant planning permission.</u> /or the current consent and masterplan for the area.</p>	
2.7	<p>WS confirmed that as the planning authority <u>the LLDC would determine any application in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and identified the Newham Core Strategy, the LLDC draft Local Plan and the extant planning permission as key reference documents.</u> they would base their planning decision on the 'relevant documents'. The two key relevant documents were the September 2012 Consent and the LLDC draft plan. The draft plan was expected to go for its next round of public consultation in <u>August summer</u> 2014.</p>	
2.8	<p>WS considered that <u>redevelopment of the GHJ site would need to demonstrate how it was compatible with the delivery of the</u> could come forward for development in its own right without prejudicing the wider masterplan of The phased masterplan approved in September 2012 <u>and that including the adjacent Consent.</u> WS acknowledged that it was very helpful that the GHJ site and the land to the north on the corner of the High Street and Sugar House Lane <u>may assist.</u> could come forward together.</p>	
2.9	<p>WS noted that the masterplan in The September 2012 <u>permission included building identified for non-residential use</u> Consent proposed employment only use on the GHJ site, including ground floor A1, A2 and B1 uses and upper floor B1 uses within modestly scaled buildings when compared to the residential towers on Stratford High Street. He also noted that the development was proposed at a relatively low height. WS confirmed that <u>currently</u> the LLDC draft plan <u>located the GML site within a proposed employment land use designation.</u> followed these principles.</p>	

3.0	THE PROPOSED SCHEME	
3.1	<p>■ then explained the principles of the capacity study Barton Willmore had undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The site could come forward respecting the existing alignment of Sugar House Lane without compromising the aspirations of the Consented Masterplan. b) There could be a calculation of the amount of employment use indicated in the Consented Masterplan on the GHJ site. ■ confirmed that this had been done based only on the scaled drawings available but he believed that this could be easily accommodated on the site. c) This commercial space could provide an active frontage to any proposed development. d) Subject to an understanding of the current CW Hire business, part of this use might be retained on the site. The business currently hired out larger driven vehicles and these may be difficult to retain on site. ■ confirmed that these large vehicles could be relocated to a nearby branch of the company but that the majority of the business might remain on site. e) ■ confirmed that simply using the site for employment use over three or four storeys is a very inefficient potential use of the site. f) There also had to be a clear understanding of what could constitute 'viable' employment use. There was little point provided office accommodation for no companies to need it in this location. WS suggested that workshop/starter accommodation may be appropriate. ■ agreed. He explained he did a lot of design work with Workspace who provided such accommodation so was very familiar with that type of produced. However, he noted that Workspace had a scheme just to the north of the High Street and he was aware of the other employment uses within that immediate area. g) ■ felt that a high quality, GLA compliant, dual aspect flatted, securely accessed from Sugar House Lane could be successfully provided above the employment space. Having explored the height of the buildings nearby and along the High Street, he saw no reason why the general height of development along Sugar House Lane should not be 5 to 8 storeys high rising to a taller marker building on the corner of High Street and Sugar House Lane of over twenty storeys. h) ■ explained that the proposals had also taken into account the potential redevelopment of the site to the north west of the GHJ site and believed that these proposals would not prejudice that sites future redevelopment <u>-redevelopment.</u> 	
3.2	<p>WS noted these indicative sketches and commented agreed that, <u>despite strategic planning policies seeking to address a shortage of housing in London, this needed to be balanced against safeguarding the capacity of industrial land and that in this instance, a significant part of the peninsular site remained designated employment land. -there was an acknowledged shortage of housing in London and that if such residential accommodation could be provided to meet all the required statutory standards then it was reasonable to propose it. However, it remains contrary to the current policy.</u> WS advised that if GHJ opposed this designation suggested that GHJ might wish to consider making they had an opportunity to make representations <u>on the in the upcoming next</u> consultation <u>draft of the Local Plan. -on the draft plan-</u></p>	

3.3	WS confirmed that <u>subject to comments made</u> , there was no reason why a planning application for the GHL site could should not be made.	
3.4	WS confirmed he <u>would probably would</u> be the officer dealing with any planning application for the site.	
3.5	WS confirmed the site would attract CIL contributions if a planning application was made.	
4.0	SUMMARY	
4.1	█ thanked WS for the meeting and was comforted to know that the LLDC was unlikely to compulsory purchase the GHL site.	
4.2	█ would now review their position and consider their next action.	
4.3	WS confirmed that it was reasonable for GHL to make a planning application as soon as possible. He confirmed that if the application proposed development above 10 storeys it must be a detailed application.	
4.4	WS confirmed that it was reasonable to propose a mixed use scheme with residential use, particularly with the acknowledged shortage of residential accommodation across London. WS advised that However, the currently consented masterplan and the draft LLDC plan only proposed employment use on the site. Therefore any diverge from this would have to be carefully argued.	
4.5	WS suggested that GHL might like to consider making representations in the next round of public consultation on the LLDC draft plan <u>if they wanted to context to amend</u> the land use <u>designation</u> .	
4.6	WS confirmed it was important to demonstrate that any proposals for the site in a planning application did not compromise the aspirations of the masterplan in The Sept 2012 Consent, nor did it compromise the potential to develop adjacent sites.	
4.7	WS confirmed that, <u>at present</u> , as the LLDC Development Corporations were excluded from the relevant Bill, they could not do not apply change for pre-application charging fees. advice or meetings.	

█
Design Partner
23 June 2014