

**PLANNING APPLICATION FOR DETERMINATION BY THE LTGDC
 REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING**

UDC CASE NUMBER:	LTGDC-07-175-FUL	DATE MADE VALID:	13/08/2007
APPLICATION NUMBER:	07/01359/LTGDC/LBNM	TARGET DATE:	12/11/2007

APPLICANT:	Lionheart Property Ventures Ltd
AGENT:	Biscoe + Stanton Architects
PROPOSAL:	Erection of part 5, part 8, part 11 storey building, comprising 135 flats and B1 (Business), A1 (Shops), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A4 (Drinking Establishments) floorspace
LOCATION:	Victoria House, 7 Caxton Street North, Canning Town, London E16 1JZ (formerly Moss Electricals)

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application proposes the redevelopment of the site and erection of a part 5, part 8 and part 11 storey building which would facilitate the provision of 135 flats and a total of 3,406sqm of commercial floorspace comprising of B1 (Business), A1 (Shops), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), and A4 (Drinking Establishments).
- 1.2 It should be noted that there are inconsistencies in the application documentation as to the proposed commercial uses. The description of development proposed by the developer on the application form indicates the commercial uses will comprise B1 (Business), A1 (Shops), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), and A4 (Drinking Establishments) uses, whereas Form 3 of the application form and the plans appear to indicate A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Restaurants and Cafes), A4 (Drinking Establishments), B1 (Business), B1c (Light Industry), and B2 (General Industry) uses. The application was advertised as per the description of development on the application form.
- 1.3 There are a number of issues for consideration, including the principle of development (given that the application site is located within a Principal Employment Area); the proposed design, layout and external appearance; density; quality of accommodation; impact upon neighbouring residential amenity; affordable housing; housing mix; parking, transport and access; amenity space and children's play space provision; energy and sustainability; and S106 obligations.

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

- 1.4 The proposals are considered to be unacceptable on a number of grounds. Officers are concerned in respect of the principle of development and particularly the quantum of residential units proposed, the density of development, and the proposed design, layout and external appearance. Concern is also raised with regard to the piecemeal nature of the proposed development and specifically that the development of this site in isolation may prevent the successful regeneration of the wider Caxton Street North area.
- 1.5 In addition to the above it is also considered that insufficient information has been submitted within the Transport Assessment to demonstrate that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the local road network. Similarly, in terms of car parking it is considered that insufficient information has been submitted in this regard to demonstrate that the proposal would not give rise to an unacceptable increase in the level of on-street car parking within the vicinity of the site.
- 1.6 Planning Officers at the London Borough of Newham assessed the application and reported it to the Development Control Committee on 3 December 2008 with a recommendation of refusal. Members at the London Borough of Newham agreed the recommendation, and as such Newham have formally recommended to the LTGDC that planning permission be refused.
- 1.7 It should be noted that the GLA has not issued a Stage 1 Report on this application.
- 1.8 It is considered that the proposal is not currently in an acceptable form to recommend a grant of planning permission. Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal.

2. SITE AND PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application site is located to the south of Canning Town centre on Caxton Street North where it adjoins the A1011 Silvertown Way Viaduct and is situated between Hoy Street to the north, Nelson Street to the south and Huntingdon Street to the east.
- 2.2 The application site is also directly adjacent to the Silvertown Way Regeneration Area, which lies on the main link between the Royal Victoria Docks and the centre of Canning Town.
- 2.3 The application site is roughly rectangular in shape, and occupies an area of approximately 0.43ha. The site is generally flat with a gentle slope from north to south and the western part of the site is set at a slightly lower level.
- 2.4 The site is currently occupied by a mixture of warehouse and depot buildings. As the site is located within an industrial area, there may be some contamination on the application site. The extent of any contamination would need to be established through an intrusive ground investigation. A desktop study was submitted with the application, however Environmental Health have recommended that a contaminated land condition is included with any grant of approval.

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

- 2.5 A full planning application has been submitted seeking approval for the demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a part 5, part 8 and part 11 storey building, comprising 135 flats and B1 (Business), A1 (Shops), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), and A4 (Drinking Establishments) floorspace.
- 2.6 It should be noted that there are inconsistencies in the application documentation as to the proposed commercial uses. The description of development proposed by the developer on the application form indicates the commercial uses will comprise B1 (Business), A1 (Shops), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), and A4 (Drinking Establishments) uses, whereas Form 3 of the application form and the plans appear to indicate A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Restaurants and Cafes), A4 (Drinking Establishments), B1 (Business), B1c (Light Industry), and B2 (General Industry) uses. The application was advertised as per the description of development on the application form.
- 2.7 The proposed design comprises three linked buildings, the highest on Caxton Street (11 storey), the lowest on Huntingdon Street (5 storey) and the third acting as an intermediary on Hoy Street (8 storey). The design and access statement, submitted with the application describes the scheme as contemporary. It also states that the scale and massing of the scheme has been designed taking the characteristics of the surrounding streets into account.
- 2.8 A total of 3,406sqm of commercial floorspace would be provided within the proposed scheme. The proposed mix of uses identified on the plans is as follows, although as stated above the proposed uses are inconsistent within the application documentation: -
- 269sqm on the lower and upper ground level for A2, A3 and A4 uses;
 - 1,120sqm on the lower, upper and first floors for B1 (Offices) and B1c (Light Industry);
 - 1,032sqm on the lower ground floor for B2 (General Industrial) and 985sqm within the basement for B1c (Light Industry).
- 2.9 The 135 proposed residential units would comprise 51 No. x 1 bed units, 62 No. x 2 bed units, and 22 No. x 3 bed units.
- 2.10 A total of 48 affordable units are proposed within the scheme, over the lower ground and upper ground levels, and levels 1 and 2. The 48 units would comprise 20 No. x 1 bed units, 18 No. x 2 bed units, and 10 No. x 3 bed units. In percentage terms, the proposed affordable housing provision would equate to 35.5%.
- 2.11 The remaining 87 units would be private flats which would comprise 31 No. x 1 bed units, 44 No. x 2 bed units, and 12 No. x 3 bed units over the top 7 floors (Levels 3-9).
- 2.12 With regards to car parking, 82 car parking spaces are proposed by means of the provision of 41 double stacker parking bays. 3 No. disabled car parking spaces are also provided. A further 14 No. parking spaces are proposed for motorcycles, and 154 spaces are proposed for bicycles. All of the parking facilities are provided at basement level.

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

- 2.13 In terms of amenity space provision, a communal amenity deck incorporating children's play space would be provided on Level 1, and private balconies would be provided throughout the development.
- 2.14 Taking the site area as 0.43ha and the total number of units as 135, the calculated density for the proposed development is 314 units per hectare. In terms of habitable rooms, given that there would be a total of 376 habitable rooms the density of development would equate to 874 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha).

3. MAIN ISSUES

3.1 The main issues for consideration in relation to this application are:

- Principle of development and mix of uses
- Density
- Design, layout, and external appearance
- Quality of accommodation – layout, orientation, and daylight
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Affordable housing
- Housing mix
- Parking, transport, and access
- Amenity space and children's play space provision
- Energy and Sustainability
- S106 Obligations

4. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

4.1 A planning application was submitted by the developer on 17 April 2007 for the erection of a part 4, part 8, part 11 storey building, comprising 138 flats and B1, A1, A2, A3, A4 floorspace (Planning Application 07/00329/LTGDC refers), however this application was withdrawn by the developer following discussions with the London Borough of Newham and LTGDC.

5. CONSULTATIONS/NOTIFICATIONS

5.1 **GLA** - The GLA have not prepared a Stage 1 Report on the planning application. The GLA case officer did however comment by e-mail on 3 December 2008 that without prejudice to any future Mayoral decision regarding the application, and on the basis of an initial officer level appraisal, the

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

application is contrary to the land use guidance for this area set out in the Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework and is not consistent with London Plan design policy, and as such the proposal would not comply with the London Plan.

- 5.2 **Environment Agency** - The Environment Agency originally objected on the grounds that no sequential test had been submitted. A sequential test was subsequently prepared and submitted by the London Borough of Newham. The Environment Agency has now withdrawn their objection to the application, subject to conditions.
- 5.3 **Design for London** - Objected to the application on a number of grounds, including the poor design quality of the scheme; the excessive height and bulk of the taller blocks; the lack of clarity and distinction between the entrances for the residential, industrial and ancillary uses (refuse and car parking); the unacceptable high proportion of single aspect north-facing flats; the quality of some of the internal accommodation and corridors; and the inadequacy of some of the private amenity space provision.
- 5.4 **English Heritage (GLAAS)** - Raised no objections, subject to a condition requiring the developer to secure a programme of archaeological work.
- 5.5 **National Grid** - No objections and commented that following an assessment of the information provided with the application, taking into account the proximity and sensitivity of the operational electricity transmission network and operational national gas transmission network, they concluded that the impact would be negligible.
- 5.6 **London City Airport** - London City Airport has stated that they are unable to comment fully on the proposed development because they require further information to be provided concerning the dimensions and maximum heights of buildings and plant (AOD); and the grid references of the proposed buildings on site. This information was forwarded to London City Airport by London Borough of Newham, however, no response has been received.
- 5.7 **Thames Water** - In terms of Water – they raised no objections but recommended an informative. With regard to Waste, again no objections were raised, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the installation of fat/oil/and grease filters within the proposed development.
- 5.8 **Transport for London**

Trip Generation and Impacts

TfL has concerns about the trip generation provided and requires further information and work on the analysis. The Transport Assessment (TA) does not assess the impact of the development on public transport. A modal split and assessment of capacity on public transport services is required. For the traffic generation, justification of the trip rate estimation and methodology should be provided. The trip rate analysis was undertaken using the TRICS database and there is no explanation of why TRAVL has not been used. The TRICS sites used to provide estimated trip rates must be identified and justified.

There are no comments on the trips arising from servicing and staffing requirements of the commercial and retail elements. Other area committed

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

developments are not mentioned in the trip assessment and should be considered.

As part of any S106 agreement, a commitment is needed to monitor local parking and traffic conditions following completion of the development and to fund any changes needed to parking controls. As the development will increase bus passenger demand, additional activity will occur at nearby bus stops. TfL requests that the developer audits all bus stops within 400 metres of the site and identifies measures required to upgrade them to current TfL accessibility standards. Based upon the results of this audit, the level of contribution required from the developer will be assessed.

London Buses

TfL is concerned about the impact that this development will have on local buses, particularly in conjunction with other committed developments in the area. Due to the significant additional demand from the Silvertown Quays development and others in the area, it is anticipated that route 474 is likely to operate over capacity such that passengers at Victoria House may not be able to get on buses. TfL London Buses has previously discussed with LB Newham the possibility of a new route connecting Canning Town to Silvertown and beyond. Some pump prime funding has been secured towards this from the Silvertown Quays development, but this does not cover the full cost of a new route. In line with the contribution secured from Silvertown Quays for this, TfL requests a S106 contribution of £41,000 from the developers of Victoria House towards the new bus service.

As well as the 474 on Silvertown Way, additional demands will be placed on routes 147 and 241 which operate to the north-east of the site. These are likely to be re-routed as a result of changes to the road layout proposed in the draft Canning Town Masterplan. The revised routings may require additional funding, and contributions from this development could also go towards this.

Car Parking

Given that the site is located in an area with good public transport access, TfL welcomes the reduction in car parking to 85 spaces, of which 3 will be disabled; however, confirmation is required regarding the allotment of spaces between the residential and commercial uses. A parking ratio of 0.63 spaces per residential unit or lower is acceptable in an area with a PTAL of 4; however, given the good public transport accessibility, further reductions are encouraged. As part of a restraint-based approach to parking, it is expected that the developers will agree with the Council that residents will be restricted from eligibility for on-street parking permits if parking restrictions are in place in the surrounding area. It is suggested that the car parking spaces be managed and/or sold separately to the units.

Cycle Parking

The increase in cycle parking to 154 spaces for the residential and commercial elements meets TfL's standards and is welcomed. TfL encourages some of these parking spaces to be on-street and, ideally, covered so that visitors cycling to the commercial development will have a place to park. Both the on-street and underground cycle parking should be secured and monitored. Further information is required regarding the security arrangements for the cycle

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

parking. TfL also encourages the provision of linkages, signage and cycle route information to facilitate use of the nearby London Cycle Network routes.

Travel Plan

TfL welcomes the measures laid out in the framework travel plan. However, more measures to support the pedestrian environment and facilities are recommended and should be provided.

Walking

Further information is required about the pedestrian facilities. In particular, this should include the width and quality of footways in and around the site, the type and quality of pedestrian crossings, and the condition of the subway including access, lighting, visibility, and repair. TfL would expect the developer to contribute towards bus stop accessibility, improvements to pedestrian facilities such as local signage and way finding, and improvements to the subways and footways around the site where these are deficient.

Freight & Servicing

TfL has continuing concerns about the freight and servicing provisions for the development. In accordance with the London Plan, servicing should be provided off-street wherever practicable. The proposals for loading from an inset bay on Hoy Street and on-street waste collection from Caxton Street North do not accord with the London Plan requirements. These departures from policy have not been justified, especially given that the development is proposing a basement car parking area. Information is required about servicing for the retail and residential elements. TfL requests that a Servicing Management Plan (SMP) be developed for all elements of the development.

- 5.9 **Other Consultations** - In addition to the above, CABE, The Metropolitan Police, The Newham Primary Care Trust, and Action and Rights of Disabled People were consulted on the proposals on 21 August 2007, however no responses were received.
- 5.10 **LBN Land Panel** - The application was reported to Newham's Land Panel on 24 October 2008. Land Panel concurred with the London Borough of Newham's Planning Officer's views in respect of the proposed development.
- 5.11 **LBN Design Review Panel** - The application has not been reported to the London Borough of Newham Design Review Panel.
- 5.12 **LBN Environmental Health** - Raised no objections in principle, but conditions are recommended relating to matters including air quality, noise impact, contaminated land, and external lighting.
- 5.13 **LBN Forward Planning and Transportation** - Objected to the proposed development on a number of grounds, including the principle of development, density, and on the grounds that insufficient information in a number of respects had been submitted with the application.
- 5.14 **Other Consultees** - In addition to the above, London Borough of Newham also consulted Housing and Public Protection, Landscape Services, Canning Town Regeneration, Regeneration, and Environmental Engineering on the proposals,

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02
however no responses were received.

6. APPLICATION PUBLICITY

- 6.1 Site Notice Expiry: 19/09/2007
- 6.2 Press Notice Expiry: 19/09/2007
- 6.3 Neighbour Notification: 11/09/2007

7. REPRESENTATIONS

- 7.1 74 No. adjoining occupiers were notified of the application by letter. An advertisement was also published in the Newham Recorder and site notices were displayed. A total of 2 responses were received concerning the proposal. These are summarised as follows:

Individual Comment:

A letter dated 13 September 2007 was received from the proprietor of Twilight Nightspot (previously known as Club TJs) raising concerns that there was no prior consultation with regard to this development, which incorporates the above property. Concern was also raised that the business which operates as a wine bar providing entertainment and live music, which is popular with local people, may have to close if the planning application is granted.

A letter dated 18 September 2007 was received from Rosslyn Motors who have objected to the application on the grounds that the area is designated for light industrial use. Concern was also raised in respect of the lack of sufficient parking provision and inadequate existing drainage within the area, which would be exacerbated by the proposed development of 135 flats.

Response to Comment:

The lack of consultation from the developer to the leaseholder is a matter for the two parties and not a material planning consideration in this case.

Similarly, in respect of the concern that the wine bar may close in the event that planning permission is granted, this is a civil matter between the developer and the proprietor of Twilight Nightspot.

Officers share the same concerns in respect of the principle of development and the potential for increased on-street car parking.

With regard to drainage, Officers would comment that Thames Water raised no objections to the proposal in this regard and in any case, if planning permission was granted for the development, the proposal would have to comply with the Building Regulations in this respect.

8. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

8.1 Planning Policy Guidance

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

Supplement to PPS1: Planning and Climate Change
PPS3: Housing
PPG4: Industrial, Commercial Development and Small Firms
PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
PPG13: Transport
PPS22: Renewable Energy
PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control
PPG24: Planning and Noise
PPS25: Development and Floor Risk

8.2 The London Plan (consolidated with Alterations since 2004)(adopted February 2008):

Policy 2A.1 Sustainability Criteria
Policy 2A.5 Opportunity Areas
Policy 2A.6 Areas for Intensification
Policy 2A.7 Areas for Regeneration
Policy 2A.10 Strategic Industrial Locations

Policy 3A.1 Increasing London's Supply of Housing
Policy 3A.2 Borough Housing Targets
Policy 3A.3 Maximising the Potential of Sites
Policy 3A.5 Housing Choice
Policy 3A.6 Quality of New Housing Provision
Policy 3A.8 Definition of Affordable Housing
Policy 3A.9 Affordable Housing Targets
Policy 3A.10 Negotiating Affordable Housing in Individual Private Residential and Mixed-Use Schemes
Policy 3A.11 Affordable Housing Thresholds
Policy 3A.17 Addressing the Needs of London's Diverse Population
Policy 3A.18 Protection and Enhancement of Social Infrastructure and Community Facilities
Policy 3A.23 Health Impacts

Policy 3B.1 Developing London's Economy
Policy 3B.2 Office Demand and Supply
Policy 3B.3 Mixed Use Development
Policy 3B.4 Strategic Industrial Locations
Policy 3B.11 Improving Employment Opportunities for Londoners

Policy 3C.1 Integrating Transport and Development
Policy 3C.2 Matching Development to Transport Capacity
Policy 3C.3 Sustainable Transport in London
Policy 3C.17 Tackling Congestion and Reducing Traffic
Policy 3C.21 Improving Conditions for Walking
Policy 3C.22 Improving Conditions for Cycling
Policy 3C.23 Parking Strategy

Policy 3D.13 Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation Strategies
Policy 3D.14 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation

Policy 4A.1 Tackling Climate Change
Policy 4A.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy 4A.4 Energy Assessment

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

Policy 4A.6 Decentralised Energy: Heating, Cooling and Power
Policy 4A.7 Renewable Energy
Policy 4A.12 Flooding
Policy 4A.14 Sustainable Drainage
Policy 4A.16 Water Supplies and Resources
Policy 4A.17 Water Quality
Policy 4A.19 Improving Air Quality
Policy 4A.20 Reducing Noise and Enhancing Soundscapes
Policy 4A.33 Bringing Contaminated Land into Beneficial Use

Policy 4B.1 Design Principles for a Compact City
Policy 4B.2 Promoting World-Class Architecture and Design
Policy 4B.3 Enhancing the Quality of the Public Realm
Policy 4B.5 Creating an Inclusive Environment
Policy 4B.6 Safety, Security and Fire Prevention and Protection
Policy 4B.8 Respect Local Context and Communities
Policy 4B.9 Tall Buildings – Location
Policy 4B.10 Large-Scale Buildings – Design and Impact
Policy 4B.15 Archaeology

Policy 5C.1 The Strategic Priorities for North East London
Policy 5C.3 Opportunity Areas in North East London

Policy 6A.4 Priorities in Planning Obligations
Policy 6A.5 Planning Obligations

8.3 London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2001 and saved from 27 September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary of State):

Policy S1 Community Safety and Crime Reduction
Policy S2 Community Benefit/Planning Obligations
Policy S3 Quality of Development
Policy S4 Sustainable Development
Policy S5 Priority Development Nodes
Policy S6 Mixed Use Development
Policy S9 Environmental Quality: Design Issues
Policy S10 Environmental Quality: Neglected, Derelict and Vacant Land
Policy S12 Environmental Quality: Improvements in Key Areas
Policy S19 Housing: Extending the Range of Housing Choice
Policy S20 Housing: Inclusion of Affordable Housing in New Housing Schemes
Policy S22 Housing: Mix and Density
Policy S23 Housing: Improvement of Public and Private Dwellings and Residential Environment
Policy S24 Employment: Meeting the Council's Regeneration Objectives
Policy S27 Employment: Restrictions on Change of Use of Land and Premises
Policy S28 Employment: Quality of Development
Policy S35 Transport: Encouragement of Alternatives to the Motor Car
Policy S37 Transport: Improvement of Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists
Policy S39 Leisure, Recreation and Open Space: Reducing Overall Deficiency in Open Space
Policy S40 Leisure, Recreation and Open Space: New Children's Play Areas

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

Policy EQ11 Species Protection
Policy EQ15 Inclusion of Tree Planting in New Development
Policy EQ18 Promoting Urban Quality
Policy EQ19 Urban Design Considerations
Policy EQ20 Design Considerations: Residential Areas
Policy EQ21 New Development: Landscaping
Policy EQ25 Access
Policy EQ26 Safety
Policy EQ27 High Buildings: Control
Policy EQ28 High Buildings: Design Considerations
Policy EQ43 Archaeology: Investigation, Excavation and Protection
Policy EQ45 Pollution
Policy EQ46 Air Quality Management
Policy EQ47 Noise Impact Statement
Policy EQ48 Noise - Sensitive Development
Policy EQ49 Contaminated Land: Assessment, Remediation and Monitoring
Policy EQ54 Promoting Sustainable Waste Management
Policy EQ61 Recycling
Policy EQ62 Protection of the Flood Plain and Urban Washlands
Policy EQ63 Surface Water Disposal

Policy H5 Conversion/Redevelopment From Other Commercial Uses
Policy H6 Affordable Housing
Policy H9 Affordable Housing: Retention
Policy H13 Promoting Quality in Housing
Policy H14 Promoting Choice in Housing
Policy H15 Housing Mix
Policy H17 Housing Design and Layout

Policy EMP1 Employment Growth
Policy EMP2 Small Businesses
Policy EMP3 Quality of Employment Development
Policy EMP4 Principal Employment Areas: Preferred Uses
Policy EMP5 Principal Employment Areas: Design Specifications
Policy EMP6 Diversification and Strengthening of Economy

Policy T1 New Development: Environmental Impact
Policy T2 New Development: Public Transport Accessibility
Policy T3 New Development: Highway Capacity
Policy T5 Preferred Modes of Transport
Policy T10 Road Hierarchy: Relation to Development Proposals
Policy T14 Design to Minimise Road Accidents in New Development
Policy T19 Improvement of Conditions for Pedestrians
Policy T24 Access by Cycle and Cycle Parking
Policy T26 Motorcycle Parking

Policy OS8 Green Space in New Housing Development
Policy OS12 Children's Play Facilities in New Housing Developments

8.4 Other Relevant Planning Policies & SPG's

Mayor of London:

The London Plan Sub-Regional Framework: East London

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02
Draft SPG: 'Industrial Capacity' (2007)

SPG: 'Housing' (November 2005)

SPG: 'Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment' (April 2004)

SPG: 'Sustainable Design and Construction' (May 2006)

SPG: 'Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation' (March 2008)

London Borough of Newham:

SPG: 'Environmental Sustainability Checklist for Major Development'

SPG: 'Residential Planning Guidelines'

SPG: 'Access'

Other:

Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework (January 2007)

Canning Town Masterplan Framework

CABE and English Heritage 'Guidance on Tall Buildings' (July 2007).

9. ASSESSMENT OF MAIN ISSUES

9.1 Principle of Development and Mix of Uses

9.1.1 There are a number of policy considerations affecting this site. The application site falls within London Borough of Newham's Proposal Area 'emp5 Tidal Basin area' and as such is situated within a Principal Employment Area (PEA). The main policy consideration is Policy EMP4 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which states that within Principal Employment Areas the retention and expansion of industrial and warehouse uses is supported and that proposals for residential and retail development will be strongly opposed.

9.1.2 The proposed development represents a departure from the London Borough of Newham's UDP given the proposal for a residential-led mixed use development on the site.

9.1.3 Policy EMP1 of the UDP states that the Council will seek to protect land and premises suitable to remain in employment-generating uses and will resist development that will not create job opportunities within areas identified for employment use.

9.1.4 Paragraph 5.32 of the UDP identifies that many small businesses in Newham have difficulty in finding accommodation that suits their needs in terms of size,

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

affordability, flexibility of tenure, and the provision of supporting business services. Policy EMP2 of the UDP states that the Council intends to increase the amount of work space available to small firms by encouraging the subdivision of larger industrial premises which are no longer required in their present form.

- 9.1.5 Policy EMP6 of the UDP encourages proposals for new employment uses that will contribute positively to the diversification and strengthening of the local economy and Policy EMP7 of the UDP is supportive of new business and industrial development provided that no unacceptable environmental nuisance is caused to adjoining residential areas, and that there will be no adverse impact on surrounding occupiers, the local traffic, or environmental conditions. Policy EMP8 of the UDP generally supports proposals for warehouse development within principal employment areas and in locations with good access to the strategic road network.
- 9.1.6 Principal Employment Areas are essential to ensure adequate provision of employment-generating work space within the borough. The loss of designated employment land may be considered acceptable but only where there would be overriding community gain. Whilst the UDP supports the loss of redundant warehousing to residential use in certain circumstances, there should not be conflict with Policies EMP1 and EMP2. The proposed development should also be able to sustain as many jobs as the existing land use.
- 9.1.7 Policy H5 indicates that the Council will encourage the redevelopment of redundant commercial premises for housing, particularly where regeneration benefits will be delivered. The loss of the designated employment space needs to be balanced against the housing and regeneration benefits of the development. However, the Council should only consider the release of designated employment space where such benefits are exceptional and significantly contribute to community gain and strategic policy aims.
- 9.1.8 The development of 162 residential apartments and commercial uses which was approved on the corner of Shirley Street and St Luke's Square is a material consideration in this case, given that both sites are covered within the same emp5 designation within the UDP. Although Officers recommended approval of that application, it was very much an on-balance recommendation. Officers considered that the proposal would be an efficient regeneration of the site, in accordance with the aspirations of the Canning Town and Custom House Masterplan SPG. The loss of the PEA employment space was justified against the net increase in employment floor space created and the Council's emerging Draft Core Strategy policy context at the time. Officers also identified a number of other clear benefits in favour of the application, which included the high quality design of the scheme in relation to the Grade 1 Listed Church adjacent to the site, the basement parking, and the decanting benefits.
- 9.1.9 The Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework (LLVOAPF) further identifies the application site within an area designated as 'Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS)'. Within this area, development of non-industrial uses should be resisted, and the more efficient use of sites through intensification and rationalisation of activities should be promoted.
- 9.1.10 It should be noted that the Shirley Street/St Lukes Square proposal discussed above is designated as an 'Other Industrial Area' within the LLVOAPF. 'Other Industrial Areas' are industrial areas that are seen as having potential to

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

accommodate a proportion of non-industrial uses, whilst still maintaining existing industrial capacity, typically areas that have good public transport accessibility, especially those within or on the edge of town centres. Non-industrial uses could be introduced into such an area without incurring an overall net loss of industrial capacity through more efficient use of sites.

- 9.1.11 In respect of the detailed proposals for this current application, the application has been held in abeyance for a considerable amount of time, pending the completion of a study into the wider Caxton Street North area. This study was commissioned by the London Borough of Newham, the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC), the Greater London Authority (GLA) and Design for London (DfL) to guide the interpretation of policy for this area. The study examined three options for how the area could be developed and appraised each of the options. The results of the study were that a residential-led mixed use development could be acceptable on the site, but importantly that a comprehensive development approach for the area was needed. The study also underlined a concern that each of the three options put forward were on the verge of economic viability, which heightens the need for a comprehensive approach for the regeneration of this area. The study has not been publicly consulted on.
- 9.1.12 Taking into account all of the above, against the current adopted planning policy background there is a policy objection to the proposed development. Although the Caxton Street North study examined the opportunity of a residential-led mixed use development, the study has not been adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance by the Council and therefore only limited weight can be attributed to it.
- 9.1.13 While the principle of a residential-led mixed use development was examined within the study, it should be noted that the residential development proposed within the current application is significantly higher in terms both of number and density than what was advocated within the study. The application is also seeking to develop this site in isolation, which again would be contrary to the findings of the Caxton Street North study, which very clearly advocated a comprehensive approach to the regeneration of this area. Moreover, it is considered that the development of this site in isolation would represent piecemeal development which would undermine any future proposals to regenerate the wider Caxton Street North area.
- 9.1.14 In terms of the London Borough of Newham's Local Development Framework it is important to note that the Preferred Options and Core Strategy which was partially used in 2006 to justify the application for 162 residential units and commercial uses on the corner of Shirley Street and St Luke's Square (06/00054/LTGDC refers), has since been abandoned. The Council's 2008 Core Strategy - Issues and Options document, which is currently out for consultation until December 2008, indicates a preference for mixed use development around the Canning Town area within all three of the published options. However, in this regard it is important to note that the Local Development Framework and Core Strategy are still at a very early stage in their development and as such, it is therefore considered that only limited weight can be attributed to the emerging planning policy context.
- 9.1.15 In the case of this application, given the other areas of objection to the proposed scheme (as detailed within the following sections of this report) and the need for a comprehensive development approach for the wider Caxton Street North area

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

(as advocated within the Caxton Street North study) it is considered that the proposed development would not deliver the regeneration benefits necessary to warrant a departure from the Council's adopted policies, and moreover that most weight should be given to the adopted policies contained within the Council's Unitary Development Plan, the LLVOAPF, and the London Plan.

9.1.16 This policy stance would also be consistent with the two decisions for residential-led mixed use proposals at the nearby Concorde House site, which shares a number of similarities with this current application. It would also be consistent with the appeal decision in respect of the first application for the Concorde House site which was refused planning permission by the LTGDC, with that decision being subsequently upheld at appeal. The Planning Inspector concluded that there was no sound justification for permitting a predominantly residential development on a site which was protected for industrial use and to do so would be contrary to the adopted policies of the UDP, namely Policies S27 and EMP4, and at odds with the thrust of the LLVOAPF, and that the other material considerations did not outweigh the harm in this respect. The Planning Inspector also considered that to allow the development against the current planning policy context, would create an unfortunate precedent which could further undermine and erode an area which is currently protected for employment-generating uses.

9.1.17 It is considered that allowing a residential-led mixed use development within this area of Locally Significant Industrial Sites could result in a conflict between the existing industrial / employment uses surrounding the site and the proposed residential use. Such a conflict between uses could have a detrimental impact on the future of the area of Locally Significant Industrial Sites. Accordingly, the site is not considered appropriate for residential development.

9.2 Density

9.2.1 Based on Table 3A.2 of the London Plan (Density matrix – habitable rooms and dwellings per hectare), the application site would be categorised as a site within an urban area. Given that the site has a PTAL rating of 4, the density of the development should range between 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare. With an average of 2.70 habitable rooms per unit, the density of the development should range between 70-260 units per hectare.

9.2.2 The density of development is instead in excess of this range at 314 units per hectare and 874 habitable rooms per hectare. Accordingly, the proposals do not conform with the density matrix. As such, it is considered that the density of the development proposed is excessive and would represent overdevelopment of the site. Moreover, it is also considered that the design of the scheme is not of an exceptional quality to allow higher than normal density on the site.

9.3 Design, Layout and External Appearance

9.3.1 There are a number of relevant policies within the Unitary Development Plan which seek to ensure that the design, layout and external appearance of proposed new developments are acceptable. These are outlined below.

9.3.2 Policy H13 states that all proposals for new housing development will be assessed in terms of the quality of their design, taking into account their context, form, function and materials. It also states that for large new housing developments of over 40 units, the Council will encourage innovative design

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

and contribution to the Council's regeneration objectives, and where this can be demonstrated, the Council will, where possible, accept some relaxation in its normal standards of density, parking and amenity space.

- 9.3.3 Policy H17 states that planning applications will be assessed in terms of the design and relationship of the development to the character of the surrounding area; their ability to provide a satisfactory level of privacy, outlook, natural lighting, private amenity space, and parking provision; community safety and cohesiveness; energy efficiency; and physical accessibility for all members of the community.
- 9.3.4 Policy EQ19 states that all new development proposals will be assessed having regard to layout, function and form of the spaces created between buildings; arrangements for vehicular and cycle access, parking and pedestrian movements; scale and bulk in relation to the plot size and surroundings; materials and details of design including landscaping; safety, security and privacy of the development and its surroundings; and the aesthetic quality in terms of the intrinsic design of the proposal and its relationship to its surroundings.
- 9.3.5 Policy EQ27 states that the Council will resist high buildings (that exceed the equivalent of four/five storeys in height) in residential areas; conservation areas; on the edge of the green belt; and on the edge of metropolitan open land where it would adversely affect its setting and character.
- 9.3.6 In addition, Government Guidance in the form of PPS1 advocates that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted.
- 9.3.7 In this case, the proposed scheme is considered to have a poor quality design and external appearance. The submitted elevations fail to comply with the London Plan Policy 4B.1 as they are not considered to be attractive, and nor do they inspire, excite or delight. Design for London have also formally objected to the application on a number of grounds, including the poor design quality of the scheme, the excessive height and bulk of the taller blocks, the lack of clarity and distinction between the entrances for the residential, industrial and ancillary uses (refuse and car parking), the unacceptable high proportion of single aspect north-facing flats, the quality of some of the internal accommodation and corridors, and the inadequacy of some of the private amenity space provision.
- 9.3.8 Overall it is considered that the architectural quality of the scheme is poor. The Design and Access Statement describes the scheme as contemporary, however it is unclear how the concept of a contemporary scheme has been distilled and conveyed within the detailed design, or indeed what aspects of the scheme are contemporary.
- 9.3.9 The Design and Access Statement also states that each of the four site frontages have particular characteristics that have strongly influenced the layout and design of the proposal. However, the submitted design results in an incoherent design approach, to the extent that the individual elements of the scheme fail to come together as one unified and coherent development. For instance, the vertical steel and glass exterior of the northeast elevation, is in complete contrast and at odds with the rest of the proposed development.

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

9.3.10 Design for London has commented that the design quality throughout the scheme is poor and that little consideration has been given to the future context. There is also a lack of clarity regarding the choice of materials, the use of colour, and the treatment of the elevations. In terms of massing and land use, Design for London raised concerns that the block fronting Caxton Street North is inappropriately high in this setting and that the quality of the building is not considered to be acceptable to justify this disparity. In general, the footprints of the taller buildings in the scheme are considered to be too large, thereby creating overly bulky building masses. This is particularly the case with the building on Caxton Street North, thereby adding to the negative effects of its excessive height.

9.3.11 The window arrangement within the scheme fails to create any hierarchical arrangement or any real visual interest within the elevations. Similarly, the design approach to the window openings differs on each of the primary street frontages. Again, with reference to the northeast elevation, the random window arrangement is not reflected within the rest of the scheme.

9.3.12 In this regard it is considered that the proposed scheme would fail to achieve the high quality form of development that the adopted policies of the UDP, LLVOAPF, and London Plan require.

9.4 Quality of accommodation – Layout, Orientation, Daylight

9.4.1 Of the 135 residential units proposed, 92 of the units would be single aspect and a total of 35 would be north-west, north, or north-east facing. In light of the above, given the high proportion of single aspect units, coupled with the large number of units facing in a northerly direction, it is considered that the proposed development would create unsatisfactory living accommodation where future residents would not receive adequate natural light into their homes.

9.4.2 Furthermore, the application site is located on the south-east edge of the UDP Proposal Area emp5. The Employment Land Review considered that this area has the potential for the intensification of employment uses. 9 out of the 19 units/sites within Proposal Area emp5 are home to potentially bad neighbour uses, which comprise manufacturing and motor vehicle operations. As such it is considered that the introduction of a sensitive land use, such as residential, into this locality in isolation, would fail to create a satisfactory living environment for future residents. In addition, the design of the proposed scheme also creates an unsatisfactory situation in terms of the entrances into the development. For example, within the submitted design there are industrial vehicular access points right next to the residential entrances, which would not provide a good environment for either use, or end user. As such it is considered that the proposal fails to provide an acceptable quality of accommodation and is contrary to the Policy 4B.1 of the London Plan and Policies H13, H17, and EQ19 of the UDP.

9.5 Impact Upon Neighbouring Amenity

9.5.1 Policy H17 of the UDP seeks to ensure that, amongst other things, a satisfactory level of privacy can be achieved within new residential development. In addition, Policy EQ19 states that safety, security and privacy of the development and its surroundings will be assessed within all new developments.

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

9.5.2 In this case, no detailed analysis has been provided by the developer to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact upon nearby residential properties. As such it is therefore considered that insufficient information has been submitted in this regard to demonstrate that the proposed development would be acceptable.

9.6 Affordable Housing

9.6.1 Policy 3A.9 of the London Plan requires 50% affordable housing provision, with a tenure split of 70:30 social housing/intermediate provision. The developers have offered affordable housing provision of 35.5% with a tenure split of 60:40 social housing/intermediate provision. No financial appraisal has been submitted with the application, and therefore it is considered that insufficient information has been submitted with the application to justify the level of affordable housing provision offered by the developer.

9.7 Housing Mix

9.7.1 Policy H15 of the UDP states that subject to other policies in the plan, the Council will permit developments of 40 or more dwellings which provide a mix of dwelling sizes appropriate to a specific site, having regard to the characteristics of the site, its relationship to the surrounding area, the nature of the development proposed, and marketing considerations. Within the supporting text that precedes Policy H15, the UDP states that no more than 10% of units should be provided as small studio flats; a wide variety of size and types of housing will be encouraged; and at least 15% of the units should be houses of four or more bedrooms.

9.7.2 The Council's Residential Planning Guidelines SPG (2001) also requires a mix of dwelling types and sizes. It states that schemes of 20 or more dwellings should not have more than 10% as studio flats, and should have a mix of non-family and family dwellings, the latter with gardens. For schemes of 40 or more dwellings, the SPG states that in addition to the above criteria, at least 30% should be family houses with gardens, of which half should have 4 or more bedrooms.

9.7.3 In the case of the proposed development, the mix of units would comprise 51 No. x 1 bedroom units (38%), 62 No. x 2 bedroom units (46%) and 22 No. x 3 bedroom units (16%). In this case, given the reliance upon one and two bedroom units, the proposal fails to provide a sufficient number of larger family units, and as such the proposal is considered to be contrary to the above-mentioned policy criteria.

9.8 Parking, Transport and Access

9.8.1 Policy EQ19 of the UDP states that arrangements for vehicular and cycle access, parking and pedestrian movements will be assessed within all new development proposals.

9.8.2 The vehicular access for the residential element is proposed on Hoy Street to the north-west, from which the access ramp to the basement car park will connect. Access for collection of commercial and domestic waste will also be from this frontage. Vehicular access to the commercial space is proposed from Nelson Street.

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

- 9.8.3 The development proposes 82 car parking spaces by means of the provision of 41 double stacker parking bays. 3 No. disabled car parking spaces are also provided. A further 14 No. parking spaces are proposed for motorcycles, and 154 spaces are proposed for bicycles. All of the parking facilities are provided at basement level. The developer has indicated that the allocation between commercial occupiers and residential occupiers will be by agreement.
- 9.8.4 Three lifts would be provided within the proposed scheme to serve the residential units, including the basement car park. A dedicated lift will also give access to all levels of the commercial space.
- 9.8.5 The proposed car parking provision would represent 63%, which in this case is considered to be adequate given the proximity of the site to Canning Town Station and the site's PTAL rating of 4. While no objections have been raised to the quantum of car parking spaces proposed, London Borough of Newham Transportation have expressed concerns in respect of the proposed mechanism for achieving this level of provision, namely the double stacking of cars, given that the applicant has not provided any details of how this proposed system would work. The Transport Assessment briefly mentions that the applicant is seeking a mechanism that enables the top cars to be removed without interfering with the parked car below. In the absence of this information it is considered that the proposal could give rise to an unacceptable increase in the level of on-street car parking within the locality.
- 9.8.6 London Borough of Newham Transportation have also raised concerns in respect of the submitted Transport Assessment, which has not been substantially revised since the earlier withdrawn planning application (07/00329/LTGDC refers). Specifically, Transportation have raised concerns that the submitted Transport Assessment makes no reference to service vehicles and how these will access the site, which is contrary to the emphasis that the Council places upon off-street service facilities.
- 9.8.7 In terms of trip generation, traffic flows and impacts, London Borough of Newham Transportation disagree with the developer's assertion that there would not be any noticeable impact on the local road network as a result of the proposed development. This is on the basis that the potential trip generation/impact of the existing uses of the site, as calculated using trip rates from TRICS, may be less than what actually pertains on site due to the absence of any on-street parking controls in the vicinity of the site. Transportation would therefore require a traffic survey of the roads bordering the site to be undertaken in order to ascertain the current volumes of traffic to compare with the predicted vehicle trips from the development. In the absence of this information it is considered that insufficient information has been submitted by the developer to demonstrate that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the locality in this respect.
- 9.8.8 In addition to the above, the submitted Transport Assessment also included no assessment of the Caxton Street North/George Street/Silvertown Way Viaduct signalised crossing to ascertain its ability to cope with the extra traffic as a result of the proposed development. Furthermore, the developer has provided no analysis of traffic related, personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the area, which is contrary to the Council's requirements for Transport Assessments for developments of this size.
- 9.8.9 Detailed engineering drawings of the proposed vehicular access from Hoy

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

Street, indicating sight lines and distances from existing junctions (i.e. Hoy Street/Caxton Street North junction), were not submitted with the planning application and therefore it is considered that insufficient information has been submitted in this regard.

- 9.8.10 In light of the above, London Borough of Newham Transportation have recommended that planning permission for this development be refused as insufficient/inaccurate information has been provided by the developer.
- 9.8.11 Transport for London has also raised a number of concerns regarding the transport related proposals and their concerns are outlined in Paragraph 5.8 of this report.

9.9 Amenity Space and Children's Play Space Provision

- 9.9.1 Policy H17 of the UDP requires an appropriate provision of private amenity space for dwellings. The SPG 'Residential Planning Guidelines' advises that the following private amenity standards should be aimed for:

1 bedroom dwellings – 100 sqm of communal garden for up to 4 dwellings and 15 sqm for each additional dwelling.

2 bedroom and 3 bedroom dwellings – 25 sqm per dwelling.

On the basis of the guidance set out in the SPG 'Residential Planning Guidelines', 3,205 sqm of private amenity space should be provided within the development.

- 9.9.2 The Mayor of London's SPG 'Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation' provides guidance on providing for the play and recreation needs of children and young people under the age of 18 and the use of benchmark standards. This SPG highlights the need to provide adequate children's play space in new residential developments.
- 9.9.3 The scheme proposes private balconies throughout the development, as well as a communal amenity space on Level 1 which incorporates children's play space. The private amenity space and children's play space provision within the scheme is, however, considered to be insufficient given the proposed number of residential units and is therefore contrary to Policy H17 of the UDP, the SPG 'Residential Planning Guidelines', Policies 3D.13 and 4B.1 of the London Plan, and the Mayor's SPG 'Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation'.
- 9.9.4 It is considered that the inadequate provision of private amenity space and children's play space, coupled with the poor existing environment that surrounds the application site, would result in a poor quality and unacceptable living environment being created for future residents.

9.10 Energy and Sustainability

- 9.10.1 A sustainability report which examines various renewable energy technologies, energy and water efficiency options, sustainable construction and waste management practices, and microclimate issues, was submitted with the planning application.

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

9.10.2 The statement identifies that renewable energy technologies are feasible for the development, although there are no specific details of how the Mayor's energy target will be met. A range of feasible energy sources are identified including wind turbines, biomass, and photovoltaics.

9.10.3 At the time of submission of the application, the Mayor's energy target was for developments to achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 10% from on site renewable energy generation, but this target has now risen to 20%.

9.10.4 Conditions would be required on any permission granted to secure an appropriate level of on site renewable energy generation.

9.11 S106 Obligations

9.11.1 The developer has indicated a S106 offer as follows, although no financial appraisal has been provided to indicate the viability of the scheme:

- £10,000 per residential unit along with a further £350,000 for wider public realm improvements within the area, improvements to routes to the town centre and schools, and subsidised entry for new businesses to the new employment space in the building.
- 35.5% affordable housing
- Local labour initiative
- Green travel plan
- Pavement improvements.

10. CONCLUSIONS

10.1 The proposed development is considered to be unsatisfactory in a number of respects, including the principle of development, overdevelopment of the site, and poor design and external appearance. It is also considered that insufficient and inadequate information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of air quality, noise, contamination, ecology, and its impact upon the local road network.

10.2 It is considered that the proposal in its current form would have a detrimental impact upon the locality and would therefore be contrary to the adopted policies of both the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan.

10.3 It is further considered that allowing a residential-led mixed use development within this area of Locally Significant Industrial Sites could result in a conflict between the existing industrial / employment uses surrounding the site and the proposed residential use. Such a conflict between uses could have a detrimental impact on the future of the area of Locally Significant Industrial Sites. The proposal is contrary to the Canning Town proposals set out in the LLVOAPF and is not considered appropriate for residential development.

Meeting: 8 January 2009

Agenda Item: 3

Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

10.4 The application is recommended for refusal.

11. REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. By virtue of the site's location in a designated Principal Employment Area (PEA) and its designation as a Locally Significant Industrial Site, the proposed residential-led mixed use development would undermine the objectives of the strategic policies of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan and the Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Framework (LLVOAPF) which seek to safeguard land and premises suitable to remain in employment-generating uses. The proposals are therefore likely to have a detrimental impact on London's strategic ability to provide suitable industrial locations for the benefit of the wider economy, employment, logistics and transportation importance. It is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policies S27, S28, EMP4, EMP5 and EMP6 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2001 and saved from the 27th September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary of State), Policies 2A.10, 3B.1 and 3B.4 of the London Plan (adopted February 2008), and the Canning Town proposals set out in the Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework.

2. The design, layout and external appearance of the proposed development lacks sufficient architectural quality and visual interest, and as such would result in an unacceptable form of development that would appear as a discordant feature in the street scene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality and contrary to the regeneration objectives for the area. It is therefore considered that the proposal is contrary to Policies S3, S9, EQ19, EQ20, H13 and H17 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2001 and saved from the 27th September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary of State) and Policies 4A.3 and 4B.1 of the London Plan (adopted February 2008).

3. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring residential amenity in terms of loss of natural light and overshadowing. It is considered that the proposal is contrary to the 'Residential Planning Guidelines' SPG and Policies EQ19 and H17 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2001 and saved from the 27th September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary of State) and Policy 4B.1 of the London Plan (adopted February 2008).

4. The proposed development by reason of excessive density would represent overdevelopment of the site, contrary to Policy 3A.3 of the London Plan (adopted February 2008). The density of the proposed development, namely 314 units per hectare or 874 habitable rooms per hectare, is in excess of the density range of 70-260 units per hectare and 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare, as prescribed within Table 3A.2 of the London Plan (Density matrix – habitable rooms and dwellings per hectare) for a scheme that would comprise mostly of flats, in an urban location and with a PTAL rating of 4.

5. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to justify the level of affordable housing provision offered by the developer contrary to Policy 3A.9 of the London Plan (adopted February 2008) which requires 50% affordable housing provision, with a tenure split of 70:30 social housing/intermediate provision. The developers have offered an affordable housing provision of 35.5% with a tenure split of

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

60:40 social housing/intermediate provision. No financial appraisal has been submitted with the application.

6. The proposed development fails to provide a sufficient variety of housing types and sizes and in particular fails to provide a sufficient number of larger family sized units for which there is an identified need in the Borough contrary to Policy H15 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2001 and saved from the 27th of September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary of State) and Policy 3A.5 of the London Plan (adopted February 2008).

7. The proposed development fails to provide sufficient private amenity space and children's play space for future residents in an area which has poor environmental conditions, given the surrounding industrial uses, resulting in a poor quality and unacceptable living environment being created for future residents contrary to the standards of the Local Planning Authority. These impacts have not been mitigated by an exceptional standard of design. As such, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to the 'Residential Planning Guidelines' SPG, Policies EQ19, EQ20, EQ45, EQ46, H14 and H17 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2001 and saved from the 27th of September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary), Policies 3D.13, 4A.20 and 4B.1 of the London Plan (adopted February 2008), and the Mayor of London's SPG 'Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation'.

8. The standard of residential accommodation that would be created within the proposed development would be of a poor quality, which would include a large number of north-facing single aspect flats that would receive little or no natural light. These impacts have not been mitigated by an exceptional standard of design and as such the residential development proposed is not acceptable due to the resulting impacts on the amenities of future residents of the development, which would be compounded by the poor quality of the internal accommodation proposed. As such, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to the 'Residential Planning Guidelines' SPG, Policies EQ19, EQ20, EQ45, EQ46, H14 and H17 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2001 and saved from the 27th of September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary), and Policies 4A.20 and 4B.1 of the London Plan (adopted February 2008).

9. Insufficient and inadequate information has been included within the supporting Transport Assessment which accompanied the planning application to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact upon the local road network. In addition, insufficient information has been provided within the application in respect of the proposed mechanism for the double stacking of cars within the development, which is required in order to facilitate the provision of adequate off-street car parking for the proposed development. In the absence of this information it is considered that the proposal could give rise to an unacceptable increase in the level of on-street car parking within the vicinity of the site, to the detriment of the locality. The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies T1, T2, T3, T10 and EQ19 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2001 and saved from the 27th September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary of State) and Policy 3C.1 of the London Plan (adopted February 2008).

Meeting: 8 January 2009
Agenda Item: 3
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC02

10. Insufficient and inadequate information has been submitted to assess issues relating to air quality, noise, and contamination. Furthermore, there has been no discussion of ecological impacts. The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies EQ46, EQ47, EQ48, and EQ49 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2001 and saved from the 27th September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary of State) and Policies 4A.19, 4A.20, 4A.33, and 3D.14 of the London Plan (adopted February 2008).

CASE OFFICER: Adele Williamson

Appendix 1 – Site Location Plan

Appendix 2 – Existing Site Photographs

Appendix 3 – Proposed Floor Plans

Appendix 4 – Proposed Elevations

Appendix 5 – Proposed Sections

Appendix 6 – Concorde House Appeal Decision (06/01172/LTGDC refers)