

**GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY**  
Development & Environment Directorate

City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA  
Switchboard: 020 7983 4000  
Minicom: 020 7983 4458  
Web: [www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)  
**Our ref:** PDU/2235MC04  
**Your ref:** PA/09/02574  
**Date:** 19 May 2010

**Amy Cooper**  
Development & Renewal  
Town Planning  
Tower Hamlets Council  
Muberry Place (AH) Anchorage House  
PO Box 55739  
5 Clove Crescent  
London E14 1BY

Dear Ms Cooper,

**Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008**

**Land South of Otis Street and Three Mills Lane, East of the A13 and North of the Railway Line**  
**Local Planning Authority Reference: PA/09/02574**

I refer to the copy of the above planning application, which was received from you on 21 December 2009. On 27 January 2010 the Mayor considered a report on this proposal, reference PDU/2235/01 and subsequently published his statement as required under Article 4(2) of the Order.

At that time the Mayor raised a number of strategic matters that required further work. As you know, since then, both the authorities and key stakeholders have been meeting with the design team and the applicant to discuss changes to the application and I write to update you on the current amendments proposed. Previously the Mayor raised concerns on six strategic policy areas. The update is considered below in brief on each of the areas raised by the Mayor. I should remind you that the following comments represents the views of officers only and as such should not prejudice any view that Mayor may take on this application.

**Retail**

The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation commissioned an independent review of the Retail Assessment and Supplementary Retail Assessment. The review confirms there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed increase in retail floorspace. It also confirms, following supplementary material that the sequential test has been satisfied and that the increase in retail floorspace can be accommodated without having a significant adverse impact on the vitality and

viability of existing and proposed town centres; and that any impacts are offset by the considerable regeneration benefits to the site and the surrounding area.

GLA officers consider that scale and impact has been satisfactorily considered in accordance with the requirements of the UDP, the London Plan and national planning policy. It is acknowledged, however, that phase 1 will not, in itself, result in a fully developed district centre. In the context of such a complex approach to assembly of the site and decommissioning of the existing store, it is not expected that all component parts of a fully developed district centre would be delivered upfront. The Corporation is, however, negotiating along side Tower Hamlets Council and the GLA on securing the other component parts of the development to ensure the scale of store is commensurate to the other essential component parts associated with a successfully functioning district centre. In particular the delivery of community facilities (Ideas Store), transport improvements, affordable housing, open space and land for the school which the Mayor will expect to form part of the section 106 package.

### **Affordable housing**

The affordable housing offer is 26% by habitable rooms. This will be split as 75/25 Social/intermediate. In unit terms this represents 106 units (79 social rent, 27 intermediate).

A joint approach was undertaken to assess the viability of this case and following invitations to tender the Corporation appointed an independent valuer to provide advice on the reliability of the applicant's development appraisal. This process of scrutiny has resulted in amendments to the applicant's submission and has informed the affordable housing offer and section 106 negotiations and Heads of Terms. The GLA has been advised that the independent valuers uphold the broad approach, but subject to future review and re-appraisal.

As with other strategic applications that involve a significant build periods the need for a review mechanism is essential in policy terms. The GLA has negotiated details on other key strategic applications and will expect this to be agreed in draft to a suitable degree. Final reporting on this matter by the independent valuer and the mechanism to be used for review should be submitted to the GLA for consideration before the application is referred back to the Mayor.

### **Urban design and access**

The change to the main central block arrangement re-locating the petrol station is a significant improvement. There is however a considerable level of detail missing, which is a result of the outline permission being sought. On this basis officers request continued involvement including consultation with Design for London on all reserved matters submissions, in particular the detailed design of the tall building. An alternative would be a design review panel with agreed terms of reference that meet to consider each subsequent submission (membership to be determined).

The purpose of the panel would be to take forward a number of the more detailed outstanding design matters that would need to be addressed at the detailed design stage. These matters have been raised with the Corporation and the applicant during recent discussions.

## **Energy**

The GLA raised a number of technical matters at the consultation stage. Since then, the applicant's approach has been amended and the GLA has had positive discussions regarding the overall energy strategy. There remain however some further points of clarification that are required, as set out below.

The potential for connecting into external district heating networks has been considered. The only existing nearby communal system is at the St. Andrews Hospital site, but discussions between the various stakeholders have indicated that there is insufficient capacity in the existing St. Andrews Hospital plant to supply the new development. The applicant has investigated the plans for new district heating networks that may reach the area of the new development in future and appears open to connecting into these should the opportunities arise. No further information in this particular regard is required.

The applicant believes that there is no scope for an energy centre capable of supplying a site wide district-heating network in phase 1 of the development. The primary reasons used in this regard are the lack of available space and, where there is available space, this space is located within an identified flood zone area. However, the applicant has confirmed that a gas fired combined heat and power unit (CHP), serving the Tesco Store, will be contained within this space in phase 1 of the development.

Further details of the energy centre space within which the gas CHP will be located need to be provided. Specifically, the proposed floor area for the energy centre and the kit to be installed (including top-up gas boilers capable of meeting the top-up heat demand not provided by the gas CHP). A drawing showing this space and the plant it will contain should be provided.

It is not clear from the information provided that each of the individual buildings and dwellings in the development will be linked into a single district heating network serving the whole development at the point of end state. A clear commitment in this regard needs to be provided and this should be secured through condition or within the section 106.

The applicant is proposing to use biofuel as a fuel. Further details regarding the proposed use of biofuel should be provided including; details of the type of biofuel that would be used, information on possible biofuel suppliers, information on the sustainability credentials and carbon intensity of the biofuel envisaged to be used.

In summary, there has been considerable progress on the original proposal, however some further work is required which officers consider can be resolved before the application is referred back to the Mayor.

## **Climate change**

The opportunity for inclusion of a green roof for the superstore has been rejected. The roof design has been brought forward with other sustainability and design objectives and the applicant argues that maintaining the form proposed means that it cannot support a green or brown roof. The policy seeks these to be included, where feasible. The GLA would therefore expect other blocks in the masterplan to utilise the opportunity for green and brown roofs where there are no such design constraints. This matter should be conditioned by the Corporation.

## **Transport**

### *Car parking:*

TfL notes and welcomes that car parking for the residential elements have been reduced by 50 spaces to 143. This total including the retail would be 418 spaces.

### *Trip generation:*

With the initial assessment the applicant surveyed the trips to the existing foodstore and added a percentage to this to account for the extended store based on a 112% increase in net sales area. This methodology was based on before and after surveys from other Tesco Stores. As this study was not supported by survey data TfL did not accept the trips rates. Following discussions with TfL, it was agreed that higher trip rates should be modelled. It was acknowledged that the higher trip rates would be unlikely to come about without the introduction of an all movements junction, as the existing Tesco store under trades and with a new junction, north bound traffic on the A12 would have a much more attractive route to the development.

### *Junction design:*

TfL can therefore confirm that a workable all movements junction design has been found that can accommodate the higher trip rates than those contained in the original transport assessment. As stated in the initial report to the Mayor, TfL expects the junction to be delivered by the applicant as soon as is practicable, having regard to the embargo on works to the Olympic Route Network in 2011 and that it should be delivered prior to the further phases of any development, including the proposed housing. The requirements for detailed design, phasing, funding and delivery should be fully defined in any section 106 agreement and TfL welcomes ongoing discussion about this matter.

Until the new all movements junction is delivered, access to the first phase of the development only, comprising the new food store, would remain from A12 Hancock Road slip road. Although this arrangement is not ideal, it is likely that the new store would not operate at its full potential due to problems of access and that trip rates would be suppressed. Subject to the outcome of monitoring, there may be a requirement to carry out minor changes on the slip road and such a requirement could be included in the section 106 agreement.

### *Bus routing:*

TfL has worked with the applicant to identify appropriate bus routing, stopping and standing within the development. Prior to the delivery of an all movements junction, the development should provide a two bus stand for route 488, which also acts as the 488 set down stop, and a 28-metre stop for route 108 (southbound only) and 488 pick up. In order to maximise interchange opportunities with Bromley by Bow station these should be located at the western end of Imperial Street.

With the all-movement junction, the two-bus stand/stops would need to be re-located on Imperial Street eastbound. This would enable wider bus connections to be established such as linking this development into the existing Bromley by Bow area along St Leonard's Street and potentially to Stratford High Street/town centre. In addition this requires a single 19 metre bus stop on Imperial Street westbound.

### *Subway:*

TfL is working with the applicant to resolve structural and design issues associated with the provision of an enhanced and widened subway leading to Bromley by Bow station. The applicant's

commitment to delivering the subway improvements prior to the opening of the store is welcomed and should be secured by Grampian condition.

*Underground:*

Provided that appropriate planning conditions are attached in order to safeguard the impact of the development on London Underground's infrastructure, TfL have no further objections with regards to this matters.

If the Corporation subsequently resolves to grant permission on the application, it must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order and allow him fourteen days to decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the Corporation under Article 6 to refuse the application. The Corporation should therefore send me a copy of any representations made in respect of the application, and a copy of any officer's report, together with a statement of the decision the Corporation proposes to make, a statement of any conditions the Corporation proposes to impose and (if applicable) a draft of any planning obligation it proposes to enter into and details of any proposed planning contribution.

If the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation resolves to refuse permission it need not consult the Mayor again (pursuant to Article 5(2) of the Order), and the Corporation may therefore proceed to determine the application without further reference to the GLA. However, the Corporation should still send a copy of the decision notice to the Mayor, pursuant to Article 5 (3) of the Order.

Please note that the Transport for London case officer for this application is Patricia Charleton, telephone 0207 1264617.

Yours sincerely,



**Giles Dolphin**  
Assistant Director – Planning

cc Colin Lovell, TfL