

## Planning Committee Report

---

### London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

#### Emerging Planning Policy in the Lower Lea Valley: Newham Core Strategy – further consultation on “Schedule of Post Submission minor changes to the Core Strategy Submission draft”

#### Report of the Director of Planning

---

#### 1. Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report sets out the proposed LTGDC response to the London Borough of Newham’s Core Strategy further consultation on “Schedule of Post Submission minor changes to the Core Strategy Submission draft” which have been published for consultation. The changes are available to view on the Newham website:  
<http://www.newham.gov.uk/Planning/LocalDevelopmentFramework/CoreStrategyExaminationinPublic.htm>
- 1.2 As the LTGDC does not have policy or plan making powers, it is essential that the interests of the Corporation are reflected wherever possible in emerging planning policy of constituent boroughs to assist in the delivery of the Development Corporation’s objectives.
- 1.3 The LTGDC Planning Committee has responsibility for considering policy documents and providing LTGDC’s formal response. The Core Strategy submission draft has not been reported to LTGDC’s Board because there was not an appropriate Board meeting to report to within the short six week consultation period.

#### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Committee **Agree** that the Director of Planning respond to the consultation with comments as set out in sections 5 to 8 of this report and any additional comments made by members at the meeting.

#### 3. Background

- 3.1 LTGDC have commented at a number of stages in the development of the Core Strategy, most recently on the Submission Draft in March 2011.

- 3.2 There were a limited number of areas where LTGDC officers did not feel that the submitted Core Strategy fully reflected comments made. These were Environment (open space), Site S07 Sugar House Lane and Site S09 Pudding Mill Lane. LTGDC also supported London Borough of Newham in their policy stance on Strategic Industrial land (SIL) land release and consolidation of wharves and Site S18 Limmo. LTGDC officers therefore took part in the Examination in Public (EIP) that took place in September, and submitted Statements to the Inspector for him to consider. These statements are attached at Appendix 1 to this report for information.
- 3.3 The EIP was a valuable opportunity to discuss the issues. Newham have made a number of changes to the Core Strategy following the EIP. Officer's commentary and a suggested LTGDC response to these changes is set out below (LTGDC response in *italics*). Comments are limited to those matters which LTGDC made representations on at the EIP.

#### **4. SIL and Release and consolidation of wharves.**

- 4.1 LTGDC attended the EIP in a supportive capacity. Since the EIP, the GLA have published their strategic wharves review. The LTGDC propose to respond to the wharf study to say that they support the proposal that the two wharves on the Lea – Priors and Mayer Parry - and Sunshine Wharf, west of Lyle Park, on the Thames are no longer safeguarded. . It also notes that with regard to Manhattan Wharf continuing to be safeguarded, there is clear reference to the Thameside West study and the potential for a consolidated wharf along this part of the Thames, which could affect the status of this wharf in the future. This comment has already been made to the Inspector as he asked for any comments on the wharves review study by 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2011.

#### **5. Environment [open space]**

- 5.1 Newham have made a number of changes to the text of the core strategy at the EIP in response to the comments made by LTGDC. LTGDC are supportive of the changes to the text. LTGDC understood that Newham were planning to prepare a new map to be read alongside policy INF6 Green Infrastructure, which would show new park areas in the borough. However, the Map 19 Open Space Deficiency has been updated to show the route of phase 1 of the Lea River Park more clearly. The later phases of the park are not shown. Also not shown is the proposed new publicly-accessible Metropolitan Open Land at Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park in legacy. Given that the MOL at the Queen Elizabeth Park and the Lea River Park are listed as the first key priority in policy INF6, the omission of a clear plan showing these new open spaces in a document that it intended to set out the development of the Borough to 2027 is a significant oversight. Officers therefore suggest LTGDC respond to the consultation as follows:
- 5.2 *LTGDC support the changes to and new text of the Core Strategy which provides more information on the Lea River Park. LTGDC welcome the updating of Map 19 to show the route of phase 1 of the Lea River Park.*

*However, LTGDC object to the omission of the later phases of the Lea River Park (specifically Twelvetrees Crescent, Mill Meads, Limmo in Canning Town), and the open spaces of the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. LTGDC consider that a new map should be prepared showing phase 1 of the Lea River Park and the new open spaces listed above and any other of the priorities that can be mapped as set out in policy INF6 Green Infrastructure.*

*5.3 Map 19 is also unclear. For example LTGDC are unclear as to the implications in policy terms of the designation "Area Covered by out of Borough Park Catchment". More explanatory text should be provided alongside this map.*

**6. Site S07 Sugar House Lane**

*6.1 LTGDC agreed a statement of common ground prior to the EIP and are happy with the changes now proposed to this designation which accord with LTGDC's previous comments.*

**7. Site S09 Pudding Mill Lane**

*7.1 LTGDC agreed a statement of common ground prior to the EIP and are happy with the changes now proposed to this designation which accord with LTGDC's previous comments.*

**8. Site S18 Limmo**

*8.1 LTGDC support the minor amendments to the text of this designation made during the course of the EIP.*

## **Appendix 1: LTGDC Hearing Statements to the EIP**

### **Matter 3 Employment**

23 and 24

SIL and release and consolidation of wharves.

The LTGDC with the GLA, PLA, LB Newham and other stakeholders over several years worked on the Thameside West study regarding safeguarded wharves in that area. It considered how the existing arrangement of these wharves could be reconfigured to maintain the current capacity for the movement of goods/materials whilst releasing some sites for other development – up to 40% of current SIL designation. The current piecemeal arrangement of wharves does not assist this agreed release of designated employment land for residential led regeneration.

The difference of opinion between the GLA and the borough may be resolved by the ongoing discussions relating to both the review of wharves that Newham has commissioned and the GLA review of its safeguarded wharves policy linked to agreement on the total amount of employment land to be released. East Beckton may be a possible alternative site for a major wharf or it may not. The important consideration is to provide clarity on two aspects as soon as possible. Firstly, where the appropriate capacity for river borne goods/materials is to be provided given the implications for owners of sites in the area and potential CPO action if the necessary land can not be secured by agreement. Secondly to fully clarify which sites can be released for residential led regeneration given other key policies in the Core Strategy.

### **Matter 4 Environment**

29

LTGDC have made various comments on the Core Strategy related to the new Lea River Park. Some of these have been incorporated, and Newham have suggested that maps will be updated to show all of the park areas as set out in the Lea River Park Design Framework, May 2008. LTGDC have been managing the implementation of the Lea River Park since 2007, although it has been a long held aspiration to complete the strategic link from the Lea Valley Regional Park to the Thames, through the creation of a route along the river Lea and new park areas. LTGDC received a letter from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government dated 15 August 2011, saying that he was minded to confirm the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (Lea River Park – Phase 1) and (Lea River Park – Phase 1A) compulsory purchase orders 2010, subject to modifications in the schedule attached to the inspectors report. Confirmation of the CPO means the first phase of the Lea River Park, which is a wide and generously sized traffic-free parkland route which will act as the central spine to which existing and future park areas can be connected, can now be implemented. Future phases include the creation of new park areas at Twelvetrees Crescent (once the gas works are decommissioned), Mill Meads, Limmo in Canning Town (when the site is no longer needed for construction of

Crossrail) as well as new park areas in London Borough of Tower Hamlets. Three Mills Green has already been enhanced by the LVRPA. The Core Strategy should fully reflect the proposals for the Lea River Park, as set out in the Design Framework, Compulsory Purchase Orders, the Lower Lea Valley OAPF (2007) and the East London Green Grid (2008).

LTGDC are concerned that unless the Core Strategy reflects these proposals, it will not be effective in helping to implement this important project.

### **Matter 5 Stratford**

**35**

Site S07 – Sugar House Lane.

The designation for this site is not effective.

The current proposal that the site should accommodate low density housing is not accepted as it will not maximise the development potential of the area and does not accord with the proposals in the Corporation's Land Use and Design Brief which is being recommended for approval to the Corporation's Board on 5<sup>th</sup> September. Newham officers have been fully involved in the preparation of this document, and it is anticipated that it will be adopted as SPD by Newham in due course. It is also considered that the projected housing numbers for this area in the draft OLSPG could not be achieved under a "low density" designation.

**36**

Site S09 – Pudding Mill Lane.

The designation for this site is not justifiable.

The Corporation is still of the view that an employment land use designation should be maintained for the western most part of the area given environmental conditions arising from proximity to the A12, the portal and viaduct for Crossrail plus the very long historical use of those sites for general industries and associated contamination of the land. A general "residential and business mixed use with supporting retail and community uses" does not provide such clarity. The Core Strategy already identifies sufficient amounts of land for housing where environmental conditions are better.

### **Matter 7 Canning Town**

44 Please see our statement in relation to Matter 4, 29.