

Planning Committee

London Thames Gateway Development Corporation Stratford & Lower Lea Valley 'Issues & Opportunities' Area Action Plan

Report of the Director of Planning

1. Purpose of this report

- 1.1 Newham has released a Stratford and Lower Lea Valley 'Issues and Opportunities', **Area Action Plan (AAP)** consultation document.
- 1.2 Consultation on the AAP was from 18th July to 30th September 2008. Newham have agreed that the LTGDC response can be submitted after this date in order to fit in with the LTGDC Committee cycle. Any comments made by members will be incorporated into the formal response of the Development Corporation.
- 1.3 This report provides members with an assessment of the consultation document and suggested comment on its content and the forthcoming AAP.
- 1.4 The report is in two sections, first an overview of the issues relevant to the LTGDC, based around the three centres, Stratford/Olympic Park, West Ham and Canning Town. The second section, is a completed consultation questionnaire, (this can be found in the Appendix). Both sections will form the basis of the consultation response.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The AAP is part of the London Borough of Newham's, Local Development Framework and follows on from the draft (Issues and options) Core Strategy which sets out the over arching vision and policy framework for Newham. This will guide regeneration of the Borough and planning policy for the period up to 2026.
- 2.2 The Development Corporation provided comment on the draft Core Strategy in a letter to Newham dated 12th May 2008. Members are now asked to comment on the AAP consultation document.

A copy of the AAP consultation document can be viewed via the following link:

<http://www.newham.gov.uk/Services/LocalDevelopmentFramework/AboutUs/StratfordandLowerLeaValleyAAP.htm>

- 2.3 The AAP provides the opportunity to consolidate and give weight to much of the planning work which has been undertaken in the area in recent years. As such, the final AAP should provide robust planning policy, reflect the guidance provided in the LLV Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) and assist in delivery of LTGDC projects.
- 2.4 It is anticipated the final version of the AAP will be approved by 2010 following adoption of the Core Strategy. Officers at Newham have suggested that the Borough will not produce a 'Preferred Option' for consultation but will proceed toward a final 'submission draft'.
- 2.5 To progress toward a draft AAP a series of meetings will be necessary to provide the opportunity for more regular feedback on the way the AAP is developed. An additional round of consultation will take place before the final 'submission draft' (that being the version sent to the Secretary of State for examination and approval).
- 2.6 Given the amount of change anticipated across the Lower Lea Valley, an AAP on this scale is a substantial undertaking. The LTGDC look forward to working closely with Newham to ensure the AAP is both comprehensive in detail and sufficiently robust, to ensure conformity with the London Plan.
- 2.7 The following section provides detailed comment on the AAP consultation document and makes recommendations regarding what the actual AAP needs to include. Officers have based their comments on the 'Issues and Opportunities' consultation document and recognise that this is not a draft Area Action Plan. The comments in this report are intended to guide the swift progress towards a draft AAP.
- 2.8 Echoing the structure of the consultation document comments are based around the three areas; Stratford and the Olympic Park, West Ham and lastly Canning Town/Custom House. Given the scope of the AAP, the LTGDC comments are focussed on these three areas.
- 2.9 During assessment of the document, suggested changes to the layout, content and structure have been identified. For brevity these types of drafting and presentation issues will be addressed via officer meetings as the draft AAP progresses. This section therefore distils the key messages that the LTGDC would wish to make at this time:

3.0 **Recommended Comments**

- 3.1 The LTGDC welcome the consultation on the AAP. The Action Plan will have a pivotal role in guiding the way the Lower Lea Valley manages the significant change and development that will take place during the lifetime of the plan. Building on the 2012 Olympics and subsequent legacy, there is a real prospect to deliver significant improvements across the Lower Lea Valley (LLV).
- 3.2 The AAP will cover a large area compared to most AAPs and the final version will need to balance accommodating the numerous projects across the area with sufficient detail to help deliver the projects identified. The AAP consultation document does not convey a clear spatial vision. The actual AAP will need to have clarity of vision, based on the Core Strategy and provide sufficient policy detail.
- 3.3 The North-South link road is not supported. The Corporation has undertaken work looking at improving connections across the Lower Lea Valley. The area already suffers from severance due to highways and rail infrastructure. No reasoned justification appears to have been provided for such a link road in terms of opening up sites for redevelopment or contributing to regeneration specific to the area. In fact the proposal appears to pass through sites identified for redevelopment and regeneration and appears likely to exacerbate severance and hold back regeneration.
- 3.4 Such a fundamental spatial proposal should be identified at Core Strategy stage and tested against other options (such as localised improvements) and then refined. There appears to be no such background assessment of the road and this undermines the robustness of the document and its soundness in terms of policy evolution.
- 3.5 The Development Corporation has identified priority projects that will improve connectivity across the Lower Lea Valley. These are looked at in more detail in our response on page 7 of the appendix. It is important that projects that are not viable or do not have an evidence base to support their inclusion are not pursued.
- 3.6 With significant large scale development underway around Stratford and at Canning Town, there is the opportunity to implement and extend local CCHP and other district energy infrastructure. The AAP should identify these local networks and allow for their extension – particularly on major development sites.
- 3.7 LTGDC consider that the consultation document does not sufficiently address major development sites at West Ham or how the Cody Road area can be better enabled to fulfil its function. A view of how these areas should develop needs to be resolved in the AAP.
- 3.8 Further to this, as the work on the Legacy Masterplanning Framework (LMF) and the Olympic Legacy Strategic Planning Guidance (OLSPG)

progresses, the AAP will, where appropriate be able to incorporate this in its next iteration. The AAP should then set out a clear hierarchy of planning policy and strong guidance for how the area should change.

3.9 Stratford & Olympic Park

3.10 The Olympic Park, the regeneration of central Stratford and the Stratford City development need to be much better integrated in the AAP. These three projects are the main drivers of change in the Stratford area and this need to be reflected in the AAP.

3.11 The AAP objectives should include the objective to successfully integrate the Olympic Park, Legacy Facilities and Stratford City into a seamless and coherent new urban centre – Stratford; a coherent part of London with excellent links across the Lea Valley to Hackney Wick and beyond.

3.12 Significant infrastructure investment across the Lower Lea Valley is required. This has been identified through the LTGDC's Development and Investment Strategy (DIS). Some of the infrastructure which will come forward as a result of hosting the Olympics and through the development of Stratford City.

3.13 The Area Action Plan provides the opportunity to draw together the physical investment that will be taking place in the Stratford area during the lifetime of the plan.

3.14 The proposed North-South link road in this area is not supported. This proposal should not be pursued without a clear rationale. The LTGDC has undertaken detailed studies of ways to improve access including identifying key projects to improve accessibility – these are outlined in further detail in the questionnaire.

3.15 Key matters that need to be expressed in more detail in the AAP include:

- Specific actions in Stratford Town Centre, including an upgraded public realm and much needed changes and improvements to the gyratory.
- A more detailed and coherent approach to Stratford Town Centre and a clear programme of actions to improve it.
- Improvement and integration of Carpenters Estate into the wider area and Olympic Park.
- Incorporate the key findings from the Stratford High Street - Urban Design and Public Realm strategy, including better definition of the Tall Buildings Zone.
- Production of planning briefs and pro-active site assembly to bring forward the redevelopment of key sites to improve the appearance of the area.

- Specific projects to integrate the Olympic Park, Stratford and Stratford City and where interventions are needed over and above those proposed for the Olympics, to link the entire area together.
- The AAP should show all the 'potential connectivity' i.e. bridges, cycle ways and new routes, to help secure their inclusion in future developments scheme.
- Identify and safeguard key sites that will deliver the Lea River Park.

3.16 **West Ham Hidden Gems**

3.17 The AAP identifies some major development sites in and around West Ham. In conjunction with the Development Corporation, the AAP should develop a range of likely acceptable uses and appropriate site allocations before finalising the submission draft.

3.18 A major problem affecting West Ham is the severance caused by transport infrastructure. West Ham, Three Mills and neighbouring Sugar House Lane are poorly connected. The AAP needs to demonstrate how these areas can be better connected. Given the severance already experienced in the area, the proposed North -South route (as shown on Page 13) would increase this problem further and undermine the wider regeneration objectives of the AAP. Also refer to the response given to Question 22.

3.19 In Conservation Areas, Area Action Plans should set out the policies and proposals for action to preserve or enhance the area. This should include defining areas where specific conservation measures are proposed and areas which will be subject to specific controls over development. Abbey Mills, the Three Mills Area and Sugar House Lane are appropriate for this approach.

3.20 Recent masterplanning work covering the Sugar House Lane area, once agreed, should have its key findings incorporated into the AAP.

3.21 Major development around Bromley by Bow is proposed and considerable design and planning work has been undertaken. As proposals are agreed these should be reflected as they abut the AAP boundary. The emergence of Bromley by Bow as a mixed use-retail led centre should be referenced despite being outside the AAP area.

3.22 **Canning Town and Custom House**

3.23 LTGDC and Newham have been working closely to develop detailed plans for Canning Town and Custom House. The masterplanning work undertaken has been adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in 2008. The SPD is based on Newham's saved UDP policies. However the masterplan goes further than the present policies and as such these elements of the masterplan will need to be given weight through the AAP.

- 3.24 The AAP will need to better reflect the masterplan by identifying key sites (outlined below) and land use proposals. The AAP will provide additional weight to the masterplan which is currently based on saved UDP policies which are not sufficient to provide policy backing for some elements of the masterplan.
- 3.25 The LTGDC suggest that the AAP identifies the new town centre in more detail and include further site proposals for the creation of the 'Activity Street' and 'Residential Street'.
- 3.26 The removal of Canning Town roundabout and improvements to Barking Road need to be shown in more detail. The radically altered road layout will free up sites. The AAP should show how the area will look after its likely removal, not just the present situation. This will help guide development adjacent to the roundabout, allowing schemes to accommodate future changes and present a coherent planning framework. The LTGDC would like to see the AAP explicitly support the removal of the roundabout and slip roads.
- 3.27 LTGDC considers that the proposed tall building zone should be amended; it should include the southern tip of areas 15, 19 and 6 (as shown on the plan, page 32) so that it better reflects the finding of the Tall Building Study recently completed for Canning Town.
- 3.28 Canning Town's centre boundary is too widely drawn. Canning Town does not have the critical mass at present to sustain such a large town centre boundary. It should exclude most of area 6, 19 and some of area 12.
- 3.29 The sites that will form part of the Lea River Park need to be better identified. The 'Pura Food' site, although in Tower Hamlets should be amended so it does not appear as entirely parkland. Also a better illustration of the new combined open space at Canning Town and its relationship with the 'activity street' would demonstrate how these open spaces interconnect.
- 3.30 The North/South route proposal is not supported by the Development Corporation as a new vehicular route would increase severance in the area. Localised improvements are possible to improve north south access and public transport across the Lower Lea Valley, but this should be via the existing road network such as Bidder Street, Newham Way, and Silvertown Way. The issue of transport is discussed in further detail as part of the questionnaire response – under Question 23.
- 3.31 The LTGDC suggest that the AAP shows all the 'potential connectivity' i.e. bridges, cycle ways and new routes, to help secure their inclusion in future developments scheme (e.g. access to the 'Limmo' Site). A number of proposed pedestrian crossings are missing on the plan as shown on pg32 - namely from site 14 to 'Pura' Foods site, from sites 19 to 16 & 15, from site 15 across into Tower Hamlets. The masterplan identified several connections in the area. The AAP should prioritise these connections and bring them forward for delivery.

- 3.32 The long term use of the 'Limmo' site needs to be resolved. The Lea River Park Design Framework suggests a topologically sculpted open space, with residential framing the open space to animate the area and provide some natural surveillance. The Canning Town Masterplan suggests that residential development alternatively could be set within the open space. The AAP should reconcile how residential units can be incorporated within this park-led scheme. Officers look forward to working with Newham to determine the right balance of uses on this site and how they might manifest themselves.
- 3.33 Significant research and masterplanning work has already been undertaken in this area, as such there is a substantial body of literature and information which should help progress this part of the AAP in a timely manner.

4.0 **Conclusion**

- 4.1 With so many projects and studies underway, it is important that the AAP provides an accurate representation of the present situation and how this will change in the future. LTGDC will work closely with Newham to ensure the AAP provides a clear indication of how the area will develop and the key projects that will deliver this change.
- 4.2 The Development Corporation recommend that a series of meetings are arranged with officers from Newham to assist in the preparation of the 'submission draft'.

5.0 **Recommendations**

- 5.1 That the Planning Committee AGREE the contents of Sections 3 & 4 of this report, and that these along with the Feedback Questionnaire in Appendix one, form the basis of the response of the LTGDC.

APPENDIX 1

This appendix includes the suggested response of the LTGDC to the Consultation Questionnaire:

Q.1 Do you agree with these objectives [page 4], are there any others you would like to include?

The LTGDC agree with the objectives identified (reproduced below for ease of reference) although these should be refined to provide clear spatial and planning priorities:

- Rejuvenated town centres of Stratford, West Ham and Canning Town
- Enhanced, new and extended green spaces with easier access to the waterways.
- Increased accessibility and movement through transport and highway improvements.
- A higher level employment base.
- Providing a broad range of higher skilled employment opportunities for local people.
- Improved range, quality and mix of housing stock.
- Integration of new and existing development with appropriate community infrastructure provision.
- Improving the relationship to Central London

Although the Olympic and Paralympic Games will have concluded during the lifetime of this AAP, legacy facilities including the velodrome, swimming complex, stadium and MPC/IBC will still mean the area will continue to host numerous sporting and other events.

The AAP should therefore include the objective to successfully integrate the Olympic Park, Legacy Facilities and Stratford City into a seamless and coherent new urban centre: Stratford, which will accommodate a range of events and uses to sustain and develop the area during the life time of the plan.

Q.2 Do you agree that it is important that the AAP sets down the legacy proposals that are fundamental to making a contribution to the delivery of Newham’s Sustainable Community Strategy?

The LTGDC agree that the AAP should set down the legacy proposals that will assist in delivery of the Sustainable Community Strategy. However more fundamentally the AAP should further the preferred Spatial Option of the Core Strategy. With the preferred option not out for consultation it is difficult to assess if the AAP proposals will reflect the core strategy. The LTGDC is optimistic that, as the masterplanning work undertaken in

the area is now coming to fruition – this will be sufficiently robust to be incorporated in the final AAP.

Q.3 On land left over from the Games should development be;

- Housing led?
- Employment led?
- A mix of the two?

The LTGDC is concerned about the use of the term ‘land left over from the Games’ as this is not specified. The Development Corporation will endeavour to ensure that there will be a mix of uses across the wider games area. Development should be housing led in some areas and employment led in other areas. The roles of sport and leisure in continuing to regenerate the area post games should also be acknowledged, possibly with a dedicated objective (see above).

Q.4 Is it important to retain facilities and venues after the Games for use by the community?

Both temporary and permanent facilities should be retained or relocated to best serve the needs of Stratford and the wider community to maximise the benefit of the Games. It is important that the park and its permanent facilities become a seamless extension of Stratford and through to Hackney Wick and not a post Olympic precinct.

The Development Corporation will wish to influence the LMF and the Olympic Legacy Strategic Planning Guidance (OLSPG) in particular as this will provide guidance for development around the Olympic Park area. LTGDC is eager to see how these will take forward regeneration projects; this work needs to be reflected in the AAP.

Q.5 Do you agree that an Olympic Park as agreed by the 2004 planning consent is the minimum size acceptable?

Subject to details of the Legacy Masterplan Framework and the OLSPD, at this juncture the LTGDC suggest that the size of the Olympic Park open space provision should remain substantially that specified by the 2004 planning consent, unless there was a proposal of regional or national benefit or significance that would materially outweigh this position.

Q.6 What other uses would you suggest for the Olympic Park e.g. cafes, museum, children’s play areas, facilities for youth?

The Olympic Park should accommodate a full range of facilities and spaces. The broader the range of uses the wider the patronage, and likelihood of civic pride and local ownership of the park and its facilities. Homes at the edge and some facilities within the park will help provide active uses and passive surveillance.

With substantial utilities provision in place, the park should be able to accommodate a range of permanent and temporary events and facilities. Public animation of the park from performance spaces, to outdoor movies, to adventure playgrounds and seasonal fairs, will all play a part in creating a dynamic new part of London.

Q.7 Should the AAP have policies that require the building of family housing? (Homes with 3 or more bedrooms and private open space)

The Lower Lea Valley requires additional residential units of all sizes. There is a need to provide larger housing units as part of a balanced and responsive approach to housing needs. However, given the demand for such housing across the LTGDC area would suggest that a policy should be contained in the proposed Development Control DPD, to ensure all appropriate development schemes make provision for family housing across the Borough.

Q.8 Do you think the AAP should encourage the development of more social housing or housing that encourages more types of private ownership?

The AAP should encourage an appropriate mix, and that this is not an either/or question. The AAP and development schemes within its area, should seek to create balanced communities on any given site as part of its contribution to the wider area. As such, the amount of private / social housing that is appropriate will vary within the AAP area.

The AAP will have to be in general conformity with the London Plan and the strategic housing policies set out in that. The AAP should focus on the actions needed to bring sites forward for development.

Q.9 Is it important, when considering this type of increase in housing, to ensure that there are jobs locally for the community and that services such as schools, doctors surgeries, dentists and emergency services are built in advance of residents moving in to their new homes?

It is essential that appropriate social infrastructure, open space and transport capacity are provided in tandem with an increase in the local population. The OAPF provides a robust benchmark for the distribution and type of facilities available and the AAP should take this as its starting point. Building on this, the Development Corporation has established a Development and Investment Strategy (DIS) to guide the timely provision of infrastructure. The Development Corporation's agreed Planning Obligations - Community Benefits Strategy utilises a Standard Charge to pool contributions to assist such provision of infrastructure.

The draft AAP will need to broadly identify where social infrastructure will be provided based on residential growth, accessibility and its distribution within the LLV. Where possible the Development Corporation suggest that social infrastructure and

employment opportunities are focussed around new or emerging centres to encourage sustainable patterns of travel and growth.

Q.10 Is the area close to the Olympic Park a good location for family housing?

There is a general need for more family housing across the LLV. The AAP should specify areas where significant additional family homes are required or special policies may be appropriate (such as areas close to parks, open space or local facilities). Ultimately a mix of housing typologies will best make use of the space and around the park and post games development sites.

The proximity of the Olympic Park would help make local areas a good location for family housing in principle as part of a balanced legacy development. Also refer to the answer given in response to Questions 7 and 10.

Q.11 Do you think that some ‘high density’ housing could be designed to be suitable for families?

The LTGDC note that ‘high density’ is not specified; however high density does not necessarily mean tall buildings. Many of the areas of high density housing are the classic streets and squares of London and are appropriate of families. As such, the LTGDC suggest that most housing developments could include ‘family housing’.

Q.12 Outside of the town centres do you think more family houses should be built?

The LLV requires additional housing of all types across the area. Family housing with appropriate amenity space should be provided. The Development Corporation consider that most areas both, new and existing would be suitable for family housing but this would be determined on a site by site basis.

Q.13 Do you support the proposals for a new linear park?

LTGDC strongly supports the proposals for a linear park in the form of the Lea River Park, as identified in the Lea River Park Design Framework 2008. The AAP needs to identify sites to bring forward for incorporation into the park by CPO if necessary. The early key sites that need to be safeguarded from alternative development, should include the route of the ‘Fat Walk’, 12 Trees Crescent (to be shown as parkland), and smaller link sites as identified in the Design Framework. A policy is needed in the AAP to ensure development adjacent to the Lea River Park e.g. in terms of landscaping, should respond to the proposals for the park and enhance access and its appearance.

The Park is fundamental to the way the area could develop and in addition to the Greenway it should be represented on the ‘Spatial Vision & Development Clusters’ diagram. The Park and improved Greenway will form key connections across the AAP area and are significant additions to the East London Green Grid. The AAP should build

on existing strategic policies by providing local justification and explain the context for how the park will be realised.

The following are the priority connections to the Lea River Park and should be identified or safeguarded in the AAP. Although not all the connections shown are in Newham; they form part of a wider network of improvements and their inclusion in the AAP will help give a fuller picture of likely changes to the wider area:

| Park project | Delivery (Estimated 2007/8) | Potential ‘Connections’ infrastructure necessary |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Exotic Wild | 2011-2013 | None – see Lea River Park Design Framework |
| Poplar River Park | 2011-2013 | Bow Creek crossing from Fatwalk Bow Creek crossing to Star Lane DLR A12 crossing at Lochnagar Street |
| Working River (excl Fatwalk Light) | 2011-2013 | A12 crossings Bow Creek Crossing to Poplar River Park |
| Twelve Trees Park | 2012-2016 | A12 crossings West Ham station access Links over District/Hammersmith and City Lines |
| Mill Meads and Abbey Mills | 2015-2016 | None – see Lea River Park Design Framework |

Q14 Should we protect access to the waterways for better connections and recreation?

The AAP should build on the London Plan policies for waterways and the Blue Ribbon network and ensure that appropriate actions are taken to safeguard and enhance waterways and their associated infrastructure. Where possible this work should be aligned to demonstrate complimentary connections to the Green Grid and Lea River Park proposals.

Q.15 Should flood risk be managed through using natural river edge solutions?

Care needs to be taken with using river edge treatment on riparian sites. There is no single solution to flood risk management. All schemes must provide high quality design and visual interest. Where appropriate the utilisation of natural SUDS and river edge methods in order to manage rain and flood water and enhance bio-diversity are welcomed. Any flood risk protection should be designed to integrate into the development scheme and avoid an engineering led approach. There is the opportunity for improved flood solutions to be incorporated into the Lea River Park.

Q.16 Should all developments be required to incorporate brown and/or green roofs?

LTGDC support brown and green roofs where appropriate but other coverings such as photo-voltaic cells may be more beneficial in some circumstances. In some areas heritage and visual appearance issues may also mean that despite their benefits, they are not appropriate everywhere.

Q.17 Which cultural and heritage features are important to you? Do you think these should be protected without exception, even if that means that some development can't take place?

The main heritage features are already identified through conservation areas and listed buildings. Key water features and open spaces are also important features. The protection of such assets is strongly supported and should be carefully integrated into an attractive and coherent urban fabric. The AAP provides the opportunity to identify these existing assets and the potential to afford protection to additional ones as part of a review.

The Sugar House Lane masterplan and its designation as a Conservation Area provide a good basis for a high quality conservation led scheme – which should be identified in the AAP. This should include key views (including those to Abbey Mills, Three Mills) along with heritage details/material (cobble streets and yards) and other features. A similar approach is likely to be needed with regard to the Olympic Park. The AAP should anticipate the most appropriate settings for the key iconic structures being developed.

Key views should be locally identified in the AAP ensuring, for example, views from the Olympic Stadium to the City of London and Canary Wharf are retained. The AAP should ensure that iconic new buildings such as the Aquatics Centre and Velodrome are not ‘crowded out’ or hidden by future development being too close.

Q.18 Do you think public transport needs further improvement? If so, what?

There are several projects underway that will improve public transport in the future including the DLR extension to Stratford International, High Speed 1 and regional services, and in the longer term, the arrival of Crossrail. Despite these wider connections, the actual Lower Lea Valley still suffers from localised severance and

**Stratford and Lower Lea Valley
Area Action Plan – ‘Issues & Opportunities’
Consultation Questionnaire Response**



limited cross routes. The Development Corporation has published its Transport Vision for the area which identifies the major transport improvements required in the LLV. A copy is attached for ease of reference.

In addition to the Vision, the LTGDC commissioned a detailed connections study to inform what projects could help improve access throughout the Lower Lea Valley. The AAP should have regard to this work and the Development Corporation can advise on how to incorporate the relevant sections of this work into the AAP.

The following projects are key priorities for the Development Corporation and should be referenced in the AAP. Not all the connections shown are wholly or partly in Newham; however they form part of a wider network of improvements and their inclusion in the AAP will help give a fuller picture of likely changes to the wider area.

Continues overleaf:

| Development | Delivery (Estimated in 2007) | Potential ‘Connections’ infrastructure necessary |
|--|--|--|
| St Andrews | 2008-2012 | Bromley by Bow station improvements A12 crossings to Bromley by Bow and Lea River Park |
| Canning Town Phase 10A (Crown Wharf) | 2008-2012 | Bow Creek crossing to Poplar River Park |
| Canning Town Phase 10B (Bidder Street) | 2018-2022 | Star Lane DLR footbridge (by DLR) |
| Poplar Riverside | 2008-2014 | A12 crossing to Langdon Park DLR Bow Creek crossing to West Ham station and Star Lane DLR |
| Lanrick Road | 2009 | None – see Canning Town Masterplan |
| Bromley by Bow, Imperial Street sites | 2009-2016 | A12 crossing to Bromley by Bow station |
| Bow Lock | 2010-2012 | A12 crossing to Bromley by Bow station |
| Sugar House Lane | 2011-2016 | Sugar House Lane/A11 junction Sugar House Lane link road Lea Navigation river crossing to Bromley by Bow |
| Parcelforce site | 2012-2015 | Vehicular access Walking and cycling access to West Ham station |
| Fatwalk Light | 2009-2012 | None – see Lea River Park Design Framework |
| East India Dock Basin | 2009-2012 | None – see Lea River Park Design Framework |
| Three Mills Green | 2009-2012 | Access improvements at Three Mills bridge |

The AAP should include these proposals to ensure any land required is safeguarded and facilitate appropriate land assembly.

As these planned public transport improvements become operational, Newham should look at improving the public realm and links from the public transport hubs to each

neighbourhood and local centre creating a network of high quality routes for pedestrians and cyclists.

Q.19 How can we make it easier to move about especially by walking and cycling? Are there any specific improvements you would like to see made?

Reducing the severance caused by highway and railway infrastructure would make cycling and walking in the area significantly easier. In addition, the removal of street clutter, an increase in the amount of carriage way dedicated to cyclists and pedestrians and continuous cycle routes (not a partial patchwork) along well lit, attractive and active streets, will help encourage people to choose cycling and walking for shorter journeys.

Q.20 Improvements are being carried out to the Greenway to make it more attractive for walking and cycling, what other ways could we encourage people to walk and cycle?

LTGDC supports improvements to the public realm including better pedestrian and cycle routes. New and improved routes emanating from the Greenway and the Lea River Park would help create a network of routes across the LLV and beyond.

The AAP should identify priority routes in and around Stratford, routes to West Ham and Canning Town and Custom House. In addition, appropriate cycle parking spaces should be identified at all commercial centres and transport nodes and key civic or social facilities – libraries, health centres etc.

It may be appropriate to assess possible locations for cycle renting facilities as part of a London wide initiative. The inclusion of secure cycle parking and showers within commercial developments should also be required in larger commercial development and secured via development control policies.

The National Cycle Network runs along part of the Lower Lea Valley close to the Olympic Park and Hackney Wick. The AAP should identify connections into the network and where other cycle routes can be made.

Q.21 Do you think these [proposed new crossings] are in the right place and connect the key routes?

The OAPF identified the key connections that need to be improved in the LLV. The proposed new crossings (as shown on page 13 of the Consultation Document) are welcome in principle. The majority appear to be similar to those identified the LTGDC connection study. It is noted their position is approximate due to the scale of the plan and that the final list of proposals is yet to be decided.

The AAP should incorporate these with the additional work including the emerging masterplans, LMF and OLSPG and the follow on work from the LLV Connections Study (2007). The priority links of the Development Corporation are outlined earlier in the response to questions 13 and 18. A programme for delivery of new crossings should be

established and these should be referred to as implementation projects and not merely ‘proposed’.

The LTGDC is commissioning a study on the A12, and will shortly commission a study on bus routes and connections in the LLV as set out in the Transport Vision and this should be fed into the draft AAP as the findings of the work are agreed. As such the LTGDC looks forward to working with Newham to incorporate the study findings into the AAP.

It is noted that some connection projects are more advanced than others, e.g. the ‘Pura Foods’ footbridge, which has planning permission. Where possible the status of a project should be set out in the AAP.

The AAP shows few routes linking into/from the greenway and doesn’t show the context of the National Cycle Network at all, this should be included. Existing and planned cycle routes should be shown to help identify where gaps in the network exist and where the priorities are for completing the network and improving connections.

Q.22 Is this new road [North – South link] a good idea and do you think the route is in the right place?

The rationale for the North-South road link is unclear. A new urban road could be a retrograde step creating north-south access but causing severance east - west. This topic is dealt with in the main report under each area heading. Although it is noted that the route would be primarily for buses – how this would be managed is not clear. The route cuts through several key development sites including within the Olympic Park, at West Ham and conflicts with the Canning Town and Custom House SPG as this does not show the new route, which it appears would run through several key development sites.

The new link route would require major infrastructure such as bridges and underpasses to be able to be completed. The benefits of the link road are unlikely to outweigh the overall cost and other disadvantages such as increase severance.

The Development Corporation would support localised improvements to the existing network that could improve north-south access whilst prioritising cycling and walking and public transport but not the private car. Improvements to key employment sites for essential lorry delivery access will also be considered.

Q.23 Should there be more [car parking] constraint measures such as;

- limits on private non residential parking and controlled parking zones
- All new development be located within a 5 minute walk of a bus stop
- dedicated bus routes
- New homes having fewer cars parking provision, with some developments as car free housing?

The LTGDC support measures to reduce the reliance on the private car however specific measures should depend on the location and PTAL levels of a particular area, planned public transport improvements, and whether car parking can be satisfactorily accommodated in a scheme without compromising layout or design. There is no standardised approach that should be adopted.

Q.24 Should new schools be built or should more efforts be made to improve or extend existing ones with capacity?

The OAPF has identified the lack of facilities including schools in the LLV. The social infrastructure should be provided to create balanced sustainable communities. With significant new housing in areas previously used for employment/industrial uses, it is likely these areas will be some distance from existing schools. In these areas new schools will be required. All services and infrastructure must grow in tandem with residential population and demand.

LTGDC has also undertaken work to refine the OAPF assessment. The Development & Investment Strategy (DIS) outlines how residential growth and infrastructure should to be delivered in concert. The Development Corporation’s Planning Obligations – Community Benefits Strategy should be referenced as this will assist in delivering new and improved social infrastructure through the financial contributions from the LLV Pooled Fund that the strategy set up.

The AAP document notes there are surplus places in some areas within Newham. Clearly investment in these schools to improve them and encourage uptake of places is the most socially and environmentally benign approach.

The ‘Building Schools for the Future’ programme should already have identified the future for the present schools in the area.

Q.25 What can we do to ensure Newham attracts and retains quality jobs and skilled people?

Many people do not necessarily work and live in the same borough or even within London. It is difficult to quantify or control the provision of job opportunities. The AAP should ensure education and training facilities are well located and of a high standard of accommodation. Good quality public realm, a range of housing, local facilities and open space will help attract and retain both residents and businesses. The AAP should maintain a good supply of land and premises for employment uses.

Q.26 How can we ensure that local people are able to take up these opportunities?

Given the mobility of labour and within the provisions of employment law, it is difficult to ensure local employment opportunities through the planning process. Good transport and a range of housing to allow people in the area to be able to continue to live locally, will both assist. Other programmes such as local labour, skills matching and job

advocacy will also help and these could be part of S106 agreements on major development schemes.

Q.27 Should we provide fewer, but larger, state-of-the-art facilities collected together in highly accessible central locations or should there be more, smaller, facilities provided at the neighbourhood level? What type of facilities do you think could be successfully provided together?

The OAPF has identified the lack of many important facilities in the LLV. The social infrastructure should be provided to create balanced sustainable communities. LTGDC has also undertaken work to refine the OAPF assessment. The Development & Investment Strategy (DIS) outlines the projected residential growth and infrastructure need for the area and should be utilised.

It would be prudent to focus facilities around existing local, district and metropolitan centres. These have a range of commercial and social uses to reflect neighbourhood needs.

The provision of facilities within estates can undermine neighbourhoods with residents from estates having less opportunity to mix with the wider community. Ideally community facilities should be part of the neighbourhood or district centres. The addition of community facilities adds to the range of services and activities these places can accommodate and therefore improves the vitality by attracting a greater number of local residents.

Q.28 Do you think West Ham is the appropriate location for the new sports facilities, a new major faith and community centre or neither?

West Ham is a large centre with good public transport and is appropriate for these types of uses in principle. The rationale for these particular uses needs to be evidenced in the AAP, or preferably the AAP should refer to the acceptable land use classes. This section should be clearer at present potential uses are only cross referenced with Page 18 of the consultation document. The LTGDC supports the distribution of land uses already set out in the OAPF.

Q.29 Do you think that nurseries should be provided within existing or new schools or as stand alone establishments?

Nurseries need to be distributed equitably across the area, where the residential population profile warrants their development. The opportunity to bring under used buildings back into use for uses such as nurseries is to be supported. Major schemes should include local new facilities to complement local existing ones. These should be close to other facilities and public transport. Their location within schools is also supported in principle.

Q.30 Would you prefer to take your child to childcare in large town centre facilities, close to train, tube and bus connections; or would you prefer smaller facilities to be provided closer to your home?

The LTGDC has no comment to make on this issue.

Q.31 Do you agree that the area’s schools should be opened up to the wider community, providing some of the facilities and services that the community needs?

Yes, in principle.

Q.32 How can we ensure that community facilities best reflect this diversity and the needs arising from it?

As the AAP is developed, an Equalities Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of the statutory process. This, along with consultation responses and ongoing feedback will help guide the range of facilities and the way in which the AAP would best reflect diversity. The Development Corporation will work to assist Newham and the local communities to best identify appropriate community facilities’.

Q.33. What specific things would you like to see included in plans for the area to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour?

Crime and the perception of crime have a major impact on many parts of the community and prospects of investment and regeneration. The reuse of vacant buildings, a clutter free public realm, reduction of unauthorised advertising, graffiti removal and litter free streets help make an area look better and feel safer.

Better lighting, active ground floor uses, and a clear sense of public and private space all help make an area appear safer. The opening up and redesign of introverted estates and culs-de-sac help stitch the urban fabric back together.

Q.34 Do you agree with the Spatial Vision shown opposite? Do you agree with the roles and characters for each of the development clusters?

The LTGDC agrees with the broad thrust of the spatial vision as shown on page 24 of the AAP consultation document but do not support the North South link road as stated in the accompanying report and Question 22.

The LTGDC suggest that Stratford and its Olympic Park along with Stratford City and the areas around Pudding Mill Lane and a redeveloped Carpenters Estate should be a single development cluster. The AAP should see these areas as constituent parts of the emerging Stratford. These projects together should create a coherent, dynamic and attractive new mixed use metropolitan centre.

The future role of Cody Road area needs to be set out as it is not clear in the present document.

Q.35 To encourage businesses to move to Newham, should Stratford Town centre and Stratford City be the main location for new office development in the AAP area or should new office development be spread across the AAP area?

The AAP needs to address the existing and emerging development quarters of Stratford as a single urban entity. Stratford and the Olympic park, along with Stratford city need to be planned and managed together to maximise the benefits each brings to the area. Encouraging office development around transport nodes (including West Ham and Canning Town) will reduce the need to travel and is supported. Furthermore an increased population of workers will increase footfall and this is likely to improve the retail demand of the area. Given the scale of development nearby Stratford should be the main focus for office development.

Q.36 Do you agree with the area shown on the plan for tall buildings to be located in?

The term tall building needs to be defined. Work regarding taller buildings was carried out in the area. The Stratford High Street Urban Design and Public Realm Strategy suggested an area; however this differs from that shown in the consultation document. It would be sensible for consistency that these two boundaries match. To do so, it is necessary that the rationale and evidence behind the decision for the final boundary is reviewed and agreed for inclusion in the AAP.

Q.37 Should the existing Stratford town centre focus on independent and specialist shops?

Given the scale of Stratford City it will have a significant impact both drawing people to the area, as well as retailers that pose potential competition to the existing retail centre.

Working with the Stratford Renaissance Partnership and Newham, the Development Corporation would wish to see research undertaken to best assess how retail in the town centre should be developed as part of a wider entertainment, leisure and retail offer. This issue is very important and LTGDC is eager that a clear and agreed role for the future of Stratford is secured and, where possible, referenced in the AAP.

Q.38 Is it important to have a market in Stratford?

The LTGDC supports the provision of a market and the need to ensure it is integrated satisfactorily into the regeneration of the town centre. The Market should form part of the overall retail offer and complement the wider town centre, as referred to in the answer above.

Q.39 Should the Cultural quarter be expanded to include the whole of Stratford Town Centre and consist of new, development with a mixture of different uses?

As noted in the answers to Q37 & Q38, Stratford Town Centre needs to be addressed as a coherent commercial mixed use centre. The cultural offer of the present centre needs to be developed along with the public realm, vehicular layout and physical appearance of the area so that the present town centres provide a broader cultural, leisure and retail offer which can add value to the overall visitor experience.

Q.40 Should it include more eating and drinking outlets and leisure opportunities with affordable, modern workspace to encourage creative, computer related and other knowledge based industries?

As noted in the answers to Q37 to Q39, Stratford Town Centre needs to be addressed as a wider commercial mixed use centre. With considerable development pressure on the town centre and the construction of a major shopping centre adjacent to the existing town centre, urgent work is required to map out an agreed role for the future of Stratford and reflect this in the AAP.

Q.41 How can we encourage business start ups?

In partnership with the SRP and other local stakeholders including higher education establishments, there is the opportunity to provide a range of units and spaces. Some could include mentored business support and practical guidance on business development. The LTGDC would suggest these are clustered around Stratford, Sugar House Lane, Rick Roberts Way and potentially parts of Canning Town.

Q.42 Will these improvements [page 29 - Pedestrian and cycle improvements to Stratford] make it easier for pedestrians?

In principle the improvements will make it easier for pedestrians and cyclists. The Development Corporation would also refer to the answer given in to Questions 19, 20 and 21 as also being of relevance. Links to local and national cycle networks need to be identified and delivered.

Better integration of the Carpenters Estate will be crucial in linking this edge of Stratford centre directly with the Olympic Park creating a key route through the area.

Q.43 Should we encourage houses that are predominantly for families in the Olympic Park rather than 1 or 2 bedroom flats?

There is a general need for more family housing across the LLV. The AAP should specify areas where significant additional family homes are required special policies may

be appropriate (such as areas close to parks, open space or local facilities). The LTGDC would suggest that the Development Control DPD should specify the general housing policies to be applied. Ultimately a mix of housing typologies will best make use of the space and around the park and post games development sites. To establish a mixture of housing types and sizes throughout the AAP area these should reflect local need. Also refer to the answers given to Questions 7 and 10.

Q.44 Should a new local centre be provided on High Street 2012 for new residents or should we expect them to travel to existing centres for facilities and shops?

A local centre to meet the needs of the growing local population would be welcomed, and a possible location has been identified in the Stratford High Street Urban Design and Public Realm Strategy (2008) which both the LTGDC and Newham support. It would be prudent to have a local centre situated part way between Bromley by Bow and Stratford.

Underutilised sites along the High Street should be identified in the AAP to be brought forward for redevelopment. The AAP should identify the actions and sites where the local centre can be focused. LTGDC are willing to work to define the role, facilities and where necessary assemble the land to deliver a local centre.

Q.45 Should this [Carpenters Estate] be a comprehensive redevelopment that would require people to move out of their homes, but which could help sort out the big problems of poor design and failing building structures?

LTGDC is working with officers to progress the current masterplan (subject to endorsement by our Board). Any masterplan will need to link Carpenters into the Olympic park and Stratford City and the town centre.

Q.46 Do you think the number of shops at West Ham should increase or remain about the same?

The OAPF suggest an expanded commercial centre to West Ham this should be reflected in the AAP. The specific range and number of shops at West Ham will be primarily determined by demand. As key development sites, including the former ‘Parcelforce’ site, come forward for development, any increase in the residential population is likely to bring in additional demand for local good and services. Care is needed to ensure that additional floorspace does not compromise other existing and expanding centres.

Q.47 Do you agree with the promotion and protection of affordable and flexible workspace in Three Mills and Sugar House Lane?

The Development Corporation would support any reasonable initiative in Three Mills and Sugar House Lane to retain affordable and flexible workspace. Masterplanning and land

use analysis that has been undertaken, will guide how the area should develop in the future. The LTGDC would want the AAP to fully reflect the Sugar House Lane masterplanning work once agreed by all parties. Once this is finalised the AAP should identify the necessary policies for this area and safeguard key sites.

Q.48 Should the employment sites close to West Ham station that are no longer in use be released for alternative mixed-use development?

The OAPF identified appropriate areas for release or consolidation and the Development Corporation broadly supports these designations. Mixed-use does not however, as the question suggests, preclude employment uses within mixed use schemes.

Site 3 on the plan on page 30 in the consultation document should include provision for some open space in the southwest corner of the site. This would reflect that identified in the OAPF and this would then allow the opportunity to provide links across to Abbey Mills and Three Mills Green.

Site 5 also on page 30 needs to be revised in the AAP to ensure that it is clear that the site is part of the Lea River Park and its primary use is open space.

Q.49 How can we ensure these ‘hidden gems’ are better valued and used by the local community?

In order to increase the appreciation of the ‘hidden gems’ it is essential the local community have greater physical and intellectual access to them. By establishing the Lea River Park and the ‘Fat Walk’ this would dramatically improve the accessibility. These better connections between the ‘gems’ (Abbey Mills, Three Mills and Twelve Trees etc) is likely to increase the number of people visiting. Interpretation and information boards, lighting etc will aid greater understanding of these features and their role in the evolution of the urban landscape.

Q.50 Does West Ham provide an ideal location to build larger family housing?

There is a general need for more family housing across the LLV. The AAP should specify areas where significant additional family homes are required special policies may be appropriate (such as areas close to parks, open space or local facilities). The LTGDC would suggest that the Development Control DPD should specify the general housing policies to be applied. To establish a mixture of housing types and sizes throughout the AAP area these should reflect local need. Also refer to the answers given to Questions 7 and 10.

There is no reason why West Ham would not be an appropriate location for family housing, although the severance caused by the busy Manor Road may mean it is not an ideal location.

Q.51 If it is feasible do you think that in the long-term the gas holders should be taken out of use so that the space they fill could be freed up for development and quality open space?

LTGDC support the earliest decommissioning of the gas holders to allow the area to be developed in line with the Lea River Park Design Framework (May 2008) section C5. Future consideration needs to be given to development adjacent to the park to ensure it both assists delivery and compliments the appearance and operation of the Park. Site 5 on page 30 of the consultation document needs to be much clearer in the AAP; making provision for a park-led regeneration scheme that celebrates the industrial heritage of the area.

Q.52 If the gas holders are no longer used, should their historic value be celebrated through lighting, interpretation and providing more accessible open space?

The Gas Holders and the surrounding area are identified as a key part of the Lea River Park. Their retention and utilisation for other uses which would not prejudice the delivery of this part of the park would be strongly supported. Please refer to the answers given to Questions 49 & 51 also. The AAP should ensure this key site and all those identified within the Lea River Park Design Framework are safeguarded to further the timely delivery of the park.

Q.53 Does West Ham provide an ideal location for one of these carbon challenge sites due to its good public transport connections, new pedestrian and cycle routes and available land?

The consultation document suggests a ‘Carbon Challenge’ site in the West Ham section – however the site ‘C’ shown on the plan is Sugar House Lane.

LTGDC support the principle of low carbon development in general. The Development Corporation questions the appropriateness of the initiative in the Sugar House Lane area since ‘Carbon Challenge’ schemes are primarily new build led proposals. A conservation led approach has been identified for the northern area of Sugar House Lane. Significant masterplanning and land use analysis has been undertaken to guide how the area could develop in the future. The AAP should identify the necessary policies for this area and safeguard key sites.

Q.54 Are you able to place the suggested crossing options [listed on page 31] in order of priority with 1 the most important and 5 the least important?

The priorities for the Development Corporation are listed in response to Questions 13 and 18 above.

Q.55 What kind of shops do you think would make Canning Town more attractive and allow it to become a more successful centre?

The LTGDC support the adopted Canning Town SPD (2008) and the scope and location of retail provision identified within it. The specific type of shop will change as the area grows and develops. The Development Corporation supports the comment on page 25 – relating to the need to focus growth on existing centres with a range of facilities and good access to public transport.

Ease of access, public realm, range of shops and other facilities will influence the success of Canning Town. The SPD seeks to focus retail and leisure uses close to Canning Town station and improve the convenience and appearance of the area. Such improvements will help increase footfall and therefore are more likely to attract a broader range of retailers to the area.

Q.56 Should we encourage a major food store to the town centre?

The LTGDC support the adopted Canning Town SPD and the scope and location of the retail provision identified within it. Any major food store should be within Area 7 as identified in the Masterplan. The LTGDC support this as the preferred location.

Q.57 Should the existing independent shops be supported to remain in the town centre?

The retention and success of independent shops is important in maintaining a vibrant major centre. The LTGDC would support any reasonable initiative that would seek to support independent shops.

Q.58 Do you have any suggestions as to what would encourage more people to shop in Canning Town

Ease of access, an attractive public realm, a good range of comparison shops and other complementary facilities will help encourage people to shop at Canning Town. A local loyalty scheme / discount card (similar to those used in market towns to increase local patronage) could also assist along with better place making including the development of a Canning Town brand.

The SPD envisages retail and leisure uses broadly around Canning Town interchange and an improved access and appearance through the area including Rathbone Market. The new public space will help bring a natural focus to Canning Town will help reinforce develop its retail position.

Q.59 What kind of facilities could Canning Town support that would encourage a more vibrant night-time offer for residents?

An improved public realm, open space and food/drink and leisure opportunities linked with additional retail units would add vibrancy to Canning Town. An increase in the local population would help support this additional uses. The LTGDC supports the principle of a more vibrant night life and believe this will be achieved through the delivery of the masterplan adopted in the Canning Town SPD. The focus of uses around a new attractive square will create a place people are more likely to want to linger in, enhancing the food and drink market and evening economy.

Q.60 Do you agree that these proposals [improvements to the market square, better access to Barking Road and Canning Town station] will help make Rathbone Street market more successful?

The LTGDC support the proposed improvements as identified in the Canning Town SPD. Improvements to the public realm along Barking Road would assist in making the area more attractive to shoppers.

Q.61 Do you think that access needs to be improved, and if so how?

Access in and around Canning Town is difficult. The LTGDC is working closely with Newham to radically improve the situation. The proposed removal of the roundabout will release land and improve access for pedestrians and cyclists. Additional improvements are identified in the Canning Town SPD, these include access improvements to Custom House, the future Crossrail station and the Royal Docks are strongly supported.

Q.62 Do you agree that improvements to the existing roundabout would help to improve connections across Canning Town and open up land for development and public realm improvements?

The LTGDC strongly supports the removal of the roundabout and the slip roads. The reconfiguration of the junction and associated redevelopment of the surrounding land will compliment the changes to Canning Town. This project needs to be clearly shown in the AAP; the removal of the roundabout will make more efficient use of the space, releasing land for development. The likely development parcels should be shown in the AAP to help bring forward development.

Q.63 Do you agree that by redeveloping Bidder Street and Cody Road, this would create good locations for these types [small/medium affordable] of work space?

The provision of affordable workspace across the LLV is supported in principle. Several businesses are already located in Bidder Street and Cody Road and these should be retained where possible. These occupiers should not be adversely affected by unspecific proposals. The AAP will need to map the key employment land/locations and how these are best distributed within the AAP area.

Q.64 Do you agree that Canning Town would be a good location for a new ‘Innovation Centre’?

The LTGDC would support this concept in principle as part of a balanced employment space strategy. It is important that an assessment of demand is undertaken and that any proposed start up/ innovation centre does not compete with possible starter workspace elsewhere. A business case would be required prior to the project being progressed.