

Local Development Framework
London Borough of Newham



**Regulation 30(1)(e) Statement
Representations received on the Core
Strategy Proposed Submission**

Addendum: Canning Town and Custom House
representations

Core Strategy Submission

June 2011

For further information please refer to the Council's website: www.newham.gov.uk

Alternatively, contact Spatial Planning and Regeneration Policy on 0208 430 2639

or email ldf@newham.gov.uk.

Canning Town & Custom House

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
108	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)	S4	Appendix 1 - Site S14	N/A	Support reference to leisure. However, argue the amount of anchor food floorspace and comparison floorspace should be flexible, leaving the applicant to justify additional floorspace if appropriate	No	
108	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)	S4	Appendix 1 -Site S14	N/A	No explanation of housing typology for site. Should refer to desirability of improved housing mix, as had in Choices.	No	See minor amendments proposed under this ID
131	London City Airport	Development interest (Private)/Local Business	S4	Appendix 1 -Site S28	Effective	Wish to see reference to residential use dropped, and employment use maximised given Cross Rail potential, as part of wider vision for the Docks.	No	
161	ExCeL London	Development interest (Private)/Local Business	S4	Appendix 1 -Site S28	Effective	Wish to see reference to office development in and around the proposed station, in the ExCeL estate and north of the station where opportunities arise. Policy insufficiently flexible to be effective.	No	Policy refers to a mix of business, commercial and business space in and around the station, which allows for office space. Does not refer to the wider ExCeL estate, other than acknowledging potential links with it, as this is not a strategic site.

167	ExCeL London	Development interest (Private)/Local Business	S4		Justified	Wish to see ExCeL acknowledged as a strategic site given its ongoing importance as an economic driver for the borough, as noted in various evidence base documents	Yes	Economic importance acknowledged as part of its designation as an employment hub E9 which allows for it to evolve accordingly, and potential associated with Custom House is referred to in S28.
391	Homes and Communities Agency	Development interest (public)	S4	Appendix 1 -Site S13	Justified	Does not allow for site to be continued in present retail warehouse use (at similar floorspace) complementing the uses proposed in the town centre, with potential for job creation and safeguarding, even with re-design which would allow for improved gateway to CT town centre.	No	
394	Crossrail Ltd	Development interest (semi public)	S4	Appendix 1 -Site S18	Justified, effective, consistent with national policy	Concerns re deliverability and flexibility, lack of credible evidence base for proposals and consideration of reasonable alternatives. Should be emphasising potential for residential led mixed use given proximity to town centre and station, with open space provided for as part of this, not prioritising open space provision, which doesn't provide for optimal use of the site.	Yes	
190, 185	English Cities Fund	Development interest (Private)	S4	Appendix 1 -Site S14	Justified	Wish to see S14 site boundary amended to exclude Rathbone Market scheme and have it acknowledged as another strategic site - out of synch with cited evidence base i.e.. the CTCH SPD and separate	No	

						planning permission		
294, 285	Quintain Estates and Development	Development interest - Private	S4	Appendix 1 -S08 - Thames Wharf	Soundness - not justified or effective	Seeks increased reference to residential on site to help deliver leisure and employment floorspace; suggests some hotel use may also be appropriate.	Yes	Site is included in housing trajectory amended figure (c.7900 - drafting error) but the housing capacity calculated takes into account the constraints. See Minor amendment re hotel use in J1 and in S08 in S3/S4.
467	Maxillia Properties	Development interest (private)	S4		N/A	Support the objectives of Policy S4; welcome the re-drawing of the Employment Hub boundary as shown	Unstated	
125	LTGDC	Statutory	S4	Appendix 1 -SITE S12 (former)	N/A	LTGDC support the designation of this site as a strategic site, and its removal from the town centre boundary. However the extent of SIL designation in the area needs to be clarified as maps on page 22 and page 82 show different designations.	No	Map correction made
126	LTGDC	Statutory	S4	Appendix 1 -SITE S13	N/A	Should change phasing to long term, as retail warehousing use likely to continue for some time. Should also refer to the enhanced residential potential on the site, should Manor Road be re-aligned next to the railway.	No	Not needed - already medium-long term. See also minor amendment under this ID

127	LTGDC	Statutory	S4	Appendix 1 -Sites, S14, S15, S16, S18	N/A	Support	No	
127	LTGDC	Statutory	S4	Appendix 1 -Site S17	N/A	LTGDC understand that proposals for high density residential are coming forward on this site. It would appear that the existing and proposed land use designation column and the indicative housing typology are in contradiction to each other .	No	Housing typology is a site based average reflecting mix of uses.
107	Bouygues	Development interest (private)	S4	Appendix 1 -Site S14	N/A	Support, but suggest map of SPD sites is included, acknowledging the different sub areas within the site.	No	SPD is a subsidiary document to the UDP and Core Strategy, and some site directions have been altered given the passage of time and review of borough-wide spatial strategy. It was therefore decided not to confuse matters by directly referring to the SPD sites within the CS.
477	Friends of the Earth - London	Interest group (environment)	S4	Appendix 1 -Site S08	Unspecified	PSZ could be enlarged, further affecting this site, (contrary to LCA's submission) if appeal decision upheld. This, together with traffic impacts from the proposed Silvertown Crossing, calls into question the appropriateness of housing numbers cited for the community forum area.	Yes	

444	Lower Lea Valley Regional Park Authority	Statutory consultee	S4		Unspecified	Support reference to Bow Creek Ecology Park, but should also be recognised with an enhanced open space designation in the schedule.	No	See minor amendment proposed under this ID
129	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)	S4	Bullet point 1	N/A	Suggests site specific circumstances should be referred to in housing mix specification.	Unstated	See minor amendments proposed under this ID
129	Bouygues	Development interest (private)	S4	Bullet point 2	N/A	Should remove reference to re-modelling of roundabout as scheme now uncertain.	Unstated	See minor amendments proposed under this ID. Latest information is that a revised scheme is going ahead.
292	Quintain	Development interest (private)	S4	Bullet point 1	Justified, effective	Reference to 35:65 affordable to market split without reference to viability is unsound. Policy also implies it refers to whole community forum area, whereas housing policy states it applies only to SPD area.	Yes	See minor amendments proposed under this ID
120	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)	S4	S14 (in policy and schedule)	n/a	Should refer to proximity to transport hub, and refer to enhanced public realm rather than re-modelled roundabout, given that this scheme is uncertain.	No	See minor amendments proposed under this ID. Latest information is that a revised scheme is going ahead.
286	National Grid	Statutory consultee	S4	10.8	Justified	Wishes to see reference to undergrounding of power lines (it is presumed it is high voltage overhead power lines that is referred to) removed, as not generally viable. Should reference guidance re design in the vicinity of such lines, which is what is generally a more viable method through which to address them.	Yes	See minor amendments proposed under this ID.

317	Port of London Authority	Statutory consultee	S4	Appendix 1 -S08	Justified, consistent with national policy, not in general conformity with London Plan	1. Not in general conformity with London Plan re reference to reconfiguration of wharfage - LP specifies any consolidation should be to improve cargo handling, not free up river frontage.	Unstated	See minor amendments proposed under this ID
317	Port of London Authority	Statutory consultee	S4	Appendix 1 -S08	Justified, consistent with national policy, not in general conformity with London Plan	2. No evidence base to suggest wharf could be re-located onto Carlsberg Tetley site, though no objection to this in principle.	Unstated	See minor amendments proposed under this ID
317	Port of London Authority	Statutory consultee	S4	Appendix 1 -S08	Justified, consistent with national policy, not in general conformity with London Plan	3. No capacity for consolidation of Thames Wharf onto Peruvian wharf (Thameside West) given its handling capacity is already safeguarded.	Unstated	See minor amendments proposed under this ID
124	LTGDC	Statutory consultee		Appendix 1 S11 Parcelforce	N/A	Not clear whether mixed use includes residential, should be clarified. Various mapping consistency issues.	No	See above ID122 and sufficient clarity exists residential is possible if constraints can be overcome.