Thank you for including the MMO in your recent consultation submission. Please remove stakeholder@marinemanagement.org.uk from your database and address further communications to consultations.mmo@marinemanagement.org.uk.

The MMO will review your document and respond to you directly should a bespoke response be required. If you do not receive a bespoke response from us within your deadline, please consider the following information as the MMO’s formal response.

Response to your consultation

The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England’s marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO’s delivery functions are; marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing European grants.

Marine Licensing
Activities taking place below the mean high water mark may require a marine licence in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence. You can also apply to the MMO for consent under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in England and parts of Wales. The MMO is also the authority responsible for processing and determining harbour orders in England, and for some ports in Wales, and for granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours. A wildlife licence is also required for activities that would affect a UK or European protected marine species.

Marine Planning

As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. On 2 April 2014 the East Inshore and Offshore marine plans were published, becoming a material consideration for public authorities with decision making functions. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans cover the coast and seas from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. For further information on how to apply the East Inshore and Offshore Plans please visit our Marine Information System. The MMO is currently in the process of developing marine plans for the South Inshore and Offshore Plan Areas and has a requirement to develop plans for the remaining 7 marine plan areas by 2021.

Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO’s licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. For marine and coastal areas where a marine plan is not currently in place, we advise local authorities to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with their responsibilities.
with the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist.

Minerals and waste plans and local aggregate assessments

If you are consulting on a mineral/waste plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommend reference to marine aggregates is included and reference to be made to the documents below:

- The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England’s (and the UK) construction industry.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply.
- The Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply.
- The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply.

The NPPF informed MASS guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine. This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the role that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play – particularly where land based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.

If you wish to contact the MMO regarding our response please email us at consultations@marinemanagement.org.uk or telephone us on 0300 123 1032.

Kind regards,

Her Majesty’s Government – Marine Management Organisation
Lancaster House, Hampshire Court, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 7YH
Tel: 0300 123 1032
Fax: 0191 376 2681
Web: www.gov.uk/mmo
Twitter: @the_MMO
Facebook: /MarineManagementOrganisation

From: Planning Policy [mailto:LocalPlan@newham.gov.uk]
Sent: 23 July 2018 17:00
To: Stakeholder (MMO) <stakeholderMMO@marinemanagement.org.uk>
Subject: Local Plan Main and Minor Modifications Consultation
3 August 2018

Dear Sir / Madam

London Borough of Newham Council: Local Plan Main and Minor Modifications Consultation
SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID

National Grid has appointed Wood to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.

National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operates the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customers. National Grid own four of the UK’s gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.

Specific Comments - Proposed sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid infrastructure:

Electricity Transmission

- Modification 371 Site Ref GS218a (our reference ET232)
- Modification 300 Beckton Riverside (our reference ET233)

Please see enclosed plan referenced ET232 and ET233 at Appendix 1. The proposed sites are crossed by a National Grid high voltage electricity transmission overhead line.

National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. This is for two reasons, the amenity of potential occupiers of properties in the vicinity of lines and because National Grid needs quick and easy access to carry out maintenance of its equipment to ensure that it can be returned to service and be available as part of the national transmission system. Such access can be difficult to obtain without inconveniencing and disturbing occupiers and residents, particularly where properties are in close proximity to overhead lines.

National Grid seeks to encourage high quality and well planned development in the vicinity of its high voltage overhead lines. Land beneath and adjacent to the overhead line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the development of the site and can for example be used for nature conservation, open space, landscaping areas or used as a parking court. National Grid, in association with David Lock Associates has produced ‘A Sense of Place’ guidelines, which look at how to create high quality development near overhead lines.
and offers practical solutions which can assist in avoiding the unnecessary sterilisation of land in the vicinity of high voltage overhead lines.

Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ. The relocation of existing high voltage overhead lines will only be considered for projects of national importance which has been identified as such by central government.

The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. To comply with statutory safety clearances the live electricity conductors of National Grid’s overhead power lines are designed to be a minimum height above ground. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site.

‘A Sense of Place’ is available from National Grid and can be viewed at:
http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Senseofplace/Download/

Further information regarding development near overhead lines and substations is available here:
http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohl_final/pdf/brochure.htm

**General information:**

**Electricity Transmission**

National Grid has two high voltage overhead lines and 16 high voltage underground cables (listed below) within the London Borough of Newham’s administrative area. These form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Ref. Description</th>
<th>Line Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 262250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 270390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 270391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 264990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 263109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 263169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 263170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 263171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 263172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 263173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 263174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 263176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground cable 264975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity transmission assets via the following internet link:
http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/

The following substation is also located within the administrative area of London Borough of Newham Council’s

West Ham substation – 132kV

National Grid has provided information in relation to gas transmission assets via the following internet link:
http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/

National Grid requests that any High Pressure Major Accident Hazard Pipelines (MAHP) are taken into account when site options are developed in more detail. These pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Grid’s approach is always to seek to retain our existing transmission pipelines in situ.

National Grid may have a Deed of Easement for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid easement strip, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement. In the first instance please consider checking with the Land Registry for the development area. If further information is required in relation to an easement please contact Spencer Jefferies, Development Liaison Officer, box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com

If you require any further information in relation to the above please contact National Grid’s Plant Protection team via plantprotection@cadentgas.com

**Electricity Distribution**

SSE Power Distribution owns and operates the local electricity distribution network in London Borough of Newham Council. Contact details can be found at www.energynetworks.org.uk.

**Appendices - National Grid Assets**

Please find attached in:
- Appendix 1 provides maps of the sites referenced above in relation to the affected National Grid Transmission assets outlined above.

**Further Advice**

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please
do not hesitate to contact us. In addition the following publications are available from the National Grid website or by contacting us at the address overleaf:

- National Grid's commitments when undertaking works in the UK - our stakeholder, community and amenity policy;
- Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations - Requirements for Third Parties; and
- A sense of place - design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines.
- T/SP/SSW22 – Specification for safe working in the vicinity of National Grid high pressure gas pipelines and associated installations – requirements for third parties.
  http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=33968
- IGE/SR/18 – Safe working practices to ensure the integrity of gas pipelines and associated installations.
- HS(G)47 – Avoiding Danger from Underground Services.

Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Town Planner</th>
<th>Development Liaison Officer, National Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:n.grid@amecfw.com">n.grid@amecfw.com</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com">box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wood E&I Solutions UK Ltd  
Gables House  
Kenilworth Road  
Leamington Spa  
Warwickshire  
CV32 6JX  

National Grid House  
Warwick Technology Park  
Gallows Hill  
Warwick  
CV34 6DA

I hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

[via email]

Consultant Town Planner

cc. [email], National Grid
APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL GRID TRANSMISSION ASSETS AFFECTED
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Dear Sir / Madam

Thank you for consulting the Port of London Authority (PLA) on the London Borough of Newham’s consultation on the proposed Local Plan Main and Minor Modifications.

To confirm, the PLA has no further comments to make on the proposed modifications to the Local Plan.

Regards

Senior Planning Officer
Port of London Authority

London River House, Royal Pier Road
Gravesend, Kent, DA12 2BG
01474 562 305
07712 247 115
WWW.PLA.CO.UK

- Find out more: www.pla.co.uk/Thames-Vision
- Follow us on twitter: @LondonPortAuth
Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for allowing Thames Water Utilities (Thames Water) to comment upon the above. Thames Water are the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for the Borough and are hence a “specific consultation body” in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012.

We have the following comments on the proposed amendments following our attendance at the hearing session:

**Mod Ref MM54 - 371a – Policies Map Site GS218a**
We support the change in relation to Beckton Sewage Treatment Works.

**Mod Ref MM28 – 245 – Policy INF4**
We support the amended wording.

**Mod Ref MM29 – 250b – Policy INF4**
We support the amended wording.

**Mod Ref 61 – Policy S5**
We support the amended wording.

**Mod Ref 67 – Policy S5**
We support the amended wording.

**Mod Ref 108 – Policy S8**
We support the amended wording.

**Mod Ref 216 – Policy INF1**
We support the amended wording.

**Mod Ref 242 – Policy INF4**
We support the amended wording.

**Mod Ref 250a – Policy INF4**
We support the amended wording.

**Mod Ref 294**
We support the amended wording.
I trust the above is satisfactory, but please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries.

Yours faithfully

Head of Property
Proposals for changes to the revised Newham Plan

Submissions from Friends of Queen’s Market (04/09/2019)

Link:

PAGE 13: S1 Spatial Strategy and Strategic Framework

1. Strategic Principles

1a:

CHANGE: ...overriding priority is to build and reinforce communities and places that work and to ensure that growth contributes to achieving convergence and personal and community resilience, with and new and existing communities, jobs, homes, services, spaces and facilities well integrated in connected, distinctive, successful, quality places.

OUR PROPOSAL: Our overriding priority is to build and reinforce communities and places that work and to ensure that development is community-led with full participation of local groups and people from the hinterland so that the growth contributes to achieving convergence and provision of affordable homes at social rent and low cost value for money shopping, with and new and existing communities, jobs, homes, services, spaces and facilities well integrated in connected, distinctive, successful, quality places.

PAGE 126: Justification

6.58:

CHANGE: ...in accordance with the overarching objectives of the Local Plan to create high quality places and successful communities and to optimise development.

OUR PROPOSAL: in accordance with the overarching objectives of the Local Plan to create high quality places and successful communities and to optimise development while retaining vibrant, vital and valued spaces (as per SP6) for the community.

PAGE 122: 1 Strategic principles (SP6 Successful Town and Local Centres)

1a: We welcome the addition of “…being successful in social and economic terms”

1b: CHANGE: “Town and local centres should act as community foci, showcases, employment hubs and as destinations through their particular character, offer and connectivity to their hinterlands.”

OUR PROPOSAL: Town and local centres should act as social spaces for Newham’s diverse communities, protecting existing jobs and serving the local community.
2b: 

CHANGE: ‘The importance of a high quality, accessible public realm and a series of features and public spaces that complement the centre’s commercial offer’

OUR PROPOSAL: ‘The importance of a high quality, accessible public realm with public seating and free water fountains, that is convenient for pedestrians and car drivers’

2c: 

CHANGE: ‘...flexible community spaces, ‘meanwhile’ uses, quality night-time economy...’

OUR PROPOSAL: ‘...flexible community spaces, encouraging small local businesses, and quality night-time economy that meets the needs of the local hinterland’

CHANGE: ‘residential dwellings in such centres as appropriate to their size and function, to add to their activity levels’

OUR PROPOSAL: ‘residential dwellings for social rent that helps to meet local housing need’

2d: 

CHANGE: ‘Maintaining a robust retail core whilst ensuring a variety of unit sizes, and in larger centres, markets to provide choice and meet local needs’

OUR PROPOSAL: ‘Maintaining a robust retail core whilst ensuring a continuation of retail offer, and in larger centres, street markets to be expanded to provide choice and to meet local needs’

Page 124: Justification

6.58: 

CHANGE: ‘... in accordance with the overarching objectives of the Local Plan to create high quality places and successful communities and to optimise development’

OUR PROPOSAL: ‘...in accordance with the overarching objectives of the Local Plan to create high quality, clean and socially inclusive places and to optimise community welfare’

Pages 124-125: Justification

6.60: 

CHANGE: ‘As per INF5, publicly accessible toilet provision will also be relevant to improving town and local centre accessibility and inclusiveness of their offer’

OUR PROPOSAL: As per INF5, publicly accessible 24-hour toilet provision with cleaning staff paid the London living wage to make local centre accessibility and inclusive’
6.61:

**CHANGE/ADD:** ‘… The London Plan SPG ‘Culture and the night time economy’ notes that Stratford is one 70 night time clusters across the city yet the borough has six town centres all of which could generate their own night time identity appropriate to their role and function’

**OUR PROPOSAL/ADD:** ‘This should be subject to community-led consultations where published results can be checked and justified on the need for night-time facilities in the six town centres’

**PAGE 320**

**d:**

**CHANGE:** ‘The need for Green Street town centre within the boundaries defined on the Policies map to maintain and develop its role and function both as a District Centre and a specialist ethnic centre, through improvements to accessibility, the growth and renewal of floorspace, creating a wider range of unit sizes and aiming to expand its comparison, community and quality leisure offer but retain its independent retailers’

**OUR PROPOSAL:** ‘The need for Green Street town centre to continue as a linear shopping experience and to maintain and develop its role and function both as a District Centre and a specialist ethnic centre, through improvements to existing public realm, affordable parking provision and accessibility with the growth and renewal of floorspace, creating a wider range of unit sizes and aiming to expand its comparison, community and quality leisure offer but retain its independent retailers’

**PAGE 402: Queens Market**

**CHANGE:** ‘Mixed use redevelopment comprising retail, including retention of market use, residential, and community uses (notably healthcare) and including retention of a viable market to provide a central focus for the site’s commercial and community role, as well as improvements to the site’s relationship with the wider town centre and adjacent station, where step-free access will be facilitated. Indicative residential typology - medium density, low family. heights of 8 to 12 storeys with potential for a step-up in height of up to 19 storeys at station and stepping down to the low-rise residential context’

**OUR PROPOSAL:** ‘Mixed use to continue comprising retail, i.e retention of market use including the existing shops and kiosks, residential i.e. the popular Hamara Ghar housing block, and community uses of both squares (with a cultural appropriate focus). Retention of the street market provides a central focus for the site’s commercial, welfare and community role. Indicative typology – low-rise street market with integrated public realm. 9 storey residential social housing block to be retained. Sensitive refurbishment is essential and community-led consultations required’
EMAIL AND POST: LocalPlan@newham.gov.uk
Local Plan Review Consultation
Planning Policy Department
London Borough of Newham
Newham Dockside
1000 Dockside Road
London
E16 2QU

13 September 2018

Dear Sir/Madam

LONDON BOROUGH OF NEWHAM LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: PROPOSED MAJOR & MINOR MODIFICATIONS
LAND AT BECKTON RIVERSIDE STRATEGIC SITE (SITE S01)
ST WILLIAM HOMES LLP (REPRESENTOR ID NUMBER 39)

On behalf of our client, St William Homes LLP, please find below representations in relation to the London Borough of Newham Local Plan Review: Main and Minor Modifications (July 2018). The representations relate to modification references 139; 141a, 299, 300 and Main Modification MM35.

Background

St William’s position in respect of the above site and the draft site allocation is set out in its representations in response to the Submission Draft Plan of January 2018. Following this submission and prior to the Examination in Public, a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) was agreed to inform the Inspector of areas of agreement between the Council, Mayor of London/TfL and National Grid/St William. I enclose a copy of the SoCG with this representation for ease of reference.

The SoCG sets out clearly an agreed position in respect of the site allocation; the quantum and location of SIL land; TfL/DLR’s requirement for an increased depot capacity; and the Joint Waste Plan Schedule 2 site. The Proposed Major & Minor Modifications follow on from this agreed Statement and discussions at the Examination and seek to adjust the Policy allocation to reflect the agreed position. Our client appreciates this attempt to adjust the Policy to accord with the agreed position, however wishes to make further representation as set out below to ensure that the wording of the final Policy is clear.

There are two particular areas where further clarity would be helpful:

- Provision or otherwise of a waste facility;
- The approach to the masterplanning of the land proposed to be removed from SIL (see plans B1 and B2)
Waste Site

In short, the draft amendments could benefit from a degree of clarity (or correction to address a drafting error) and to be clear that if a waste facility is not provided within the retained SIL, it could be provided elsewhere in the Borough (within SIL). In addition, on application, there is the opportunity to demonstrate that a facility is no longer required within the SIL element of the Strategic Site (S01) therefore freeing the site for mixed-use development. The proposed modifications do not provide for the option of off-site provision, which was agreed with the Council in the SoCG.

The text of Draft Policy S01 has been revised in the Main & Minor Modifications as follows (amendments shown in blue):

“There is scope to incorporate the JWP identified strategic safeguarded waste management capacity development site within a comprehensive redevelopment, either through the inclusion of a waste facility on remaining SIL; alternatively should it be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for such a facility in that location as per INF3. or where lack of demonstrated, as a further opportunity for residential led mixed use.”

We would suggest that the text as amended ends abruptly and requires a conclusion to the end of the final sentence. As stated, it was agreed through the SoCG that the Policy text would allow for either the waste facility to be located within the SIL; or elsewhere in the Borough; or in the event that there is no proven need that it is not provided at all.

We would therefore suggest the Policy text be updated as follows (our additions in red):

“There is scope to incorporate the JWP identified strategic safeguarded waste management capacity development site within a comprehensive redevelopment, either through the inclusion of a waste facility on remaining SIL, either on site or elsewhere in the Borough; alternatively should it be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for such a facility in that location as per INF3, then the need to incorporate waste management capacity shall not arise, and the land developed as a further opportunity for residential led mixed use development. or where lack of demonstrated, as a further opportunity for residential led mixed use.”

SIL

St William welcomes the confirmation of the amended SIL boundary (Main Modification Reference MM35). However, we would suggest that the policy would benefit from clarity as to the application of Policy J2 and the criteria at J2 (3)(a) in the master planning of the land shown as white, i.e. without employment designation, including that land removed from SIL as designated in the adopted local plan.

The text of Draft Policy S01 has been revised in the Main & Minor Modifications as follows (Modification reference 299) (amendments shown in blue):

“New Strategic Infrastructure including an expanded DLR depot to meet growth needs, and river crossing(s), together with the existing CHP plant and legacy gas pressure infrastructure will be accommodated within the site, minimising its spatial impact, where possible allowing for Managed Intensification (and limited release) of associated SIL as per Policy J2 and/or development of further SIL uses. The quantum and functionality of other SIL south of the river crossing safeguarding in the southern part of the site will be protected, but could be re-located to better effect, securing improved land use transitions and integration given potential compatibility with the DLR depot, neighbouring SIL and bridge footprints.”
Further, the Proposals Map accompanying the S01 Policy text has been updated to reflect Map B1 and B2 agreed through the SoCG, which our client supports. These plans show the proposed revisions to the SIL designation. The land that is not proposed to be subject to SIL designation is shown as ‘white’.

However, the ‘white land’ is still identified in yellow as SIL (Subject to Managed Release) on Figure 4.2 supporting Policy J2. Likewise, Table J.b identifying the SIL locations should make clear that only part of the Beckton Riverside site remains subject to SIL designation.

This inconsistency should be rectified. I attach with this letter Map B3 showing our suggested amendment to Figure 4.2 accompanying Policy J2 hatched in red.

The SoCG confirmed the agreed position that “....There is no specific requirement for employment uses outside of the SIL area” (see first bullet point page 3). This is the SIL area as now proposed to be designated in the emerging local plan.

This is clear and unambiguous. However, the proposed main modifications could be construed as applying the principle of ‘Managed Release’ not just to the additional land proposed for release from SIL at the modifications stage (coloured red on Map B2) but all the land released from SIL as designated in the adopted local plan. The draft local plan, once adopted, will replace the adopted local plan. The policies map will likewise be replaced. Therefore, the SIL related policies in the emerging plan (and indeed the London Plan), will and should only apply to the SIL as designated in the emerging Plan, once adopted.

The SoCG confirmed that only the third and fourth criteria of J2 (3) applied in relation to the area which has removed from SIL (as per Maps B1 and B2: the “red land” as identified by Map B2 of the SoCG). These relate to master planning matters. These can be expressly referred to in Policy S01 and this avoiding the potential for confusion by referencing ‘managed release’.

It is important to appreciate that the designation of land for employment purposes gives rise to further policy considerations and therefore it is important that the designation of the site is clear.

In respect of the text accompanying Policy S01, we would suggest revision as follows in red to ensure clarity as follows:

"Mixed use delivering new neighbourhoods centred on a Major town centre and new station and wider transport hub, new and expanded Strategic Infrastructure and other SIL uses. The new neighbourhoods and town centre – comprising residential, pedestrian and cycle links through the site and to the river, proportionate open space and other green infrastructure that opens up the riverside access including space that adds to MOL, retail, leisure, supporting community uses notably primary and secondary school provision, and other employment generating uses – will be delivered through a masterplanned approach, including partial Managed Release of SIL, appropriate buffering of remaining SIL, and re-formatting and diversification of the existing retail park around the new transport hub, preferably moving it south. In undertaking this master planning exercise for all land south of the river crossing safeguarding, regard should be had to the criteria of Policy J2:2b and J2:3a.

New Strategic Infrastructure including an expanded DLR depot to meet growth needs, and river crossing(s), together with the existing CHP plant and legacy gas pressure infrastructure will be accommodated within the site, minimising its spatial impact, where possible allowing for Managed Intensification (and limited release) of designated associated SIL as per Policy J2 and/or development of further SIL uses. The quantum and functionality of other SIL south of the river crossing safeguarding in the southern part of the site will be protected, but could be relocated to better effect, securing improved land use transitions and integration given potential compatibility with the DLR depot, neighbouring SIL and bridge footprints.
I trust the above is helpful and please do not hesitate to contact me should there be any matters arising.

Yours faithfully

Senior Planning Partner

cc: St William Homes LLP

Enc. Statement of Common Ground, dated June 2018
Map B3 - Proposed Amendment to Figure 4.2 Policy J2 Mapping
SIL (Subject to Managed Release) [J2] yellow annotation to be removed and land to no longer be designated as SIL in accordance with revised Strategic Site SO1 mapping.
Dear Sir/Madam

LONDON BOROUGH OF NEWHAM LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: PROPOSED MAJOR & MINOR MODIFICATIONS
STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION S11, PARCELFORCE (MM39, REF. 317A)
ST WILLIAM HOMES LLP (REPRESENTOR ID NUMBER 39)

On behalf of our client, St William Homes LLP, we write to confirm support for the representation submitted in relation to the above site by Deloitte on behalf of National Grid Property. A copy of this representation, dated 13th September 2018, is enclosed for ease of reference.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should there be any matters arising.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted]
Senior Planning Partner

cc: [Redacted] : St William Homes LLP
    [Redacted] : St William Homes LLP

Enc. Deloitte representation letter, dated 13th September
Dear Sir/Madam,

**London Borough of Newham Local Plan Review – Modifications Consultation**

**Strategic Site Allocation S11, Parcelforce (MM39, ref. 317a)**

I write on behalf of National Grid Property (NGP) in respect of their landholdings at Bromley-by-Bow gasworks (Strategic Site Allocation S11, Parcelforce), regarding the above Local Plan Review Examination, and the main and minor modifications consultation, published on 23rd July 2018.

This consultation response follows engagement with the London Borough of Newham (LBN), and both oral and written representations to the Local Plan Review Examination. These representations have focused on three aspects of Strategic Site Allocation S11, Parcelforce:

- The Council’s intent that development within S11 is employment-led;
- The requirement for an assessment and appropriate viable strategy for the Grade II listed gasholders;
- That the indicative height for development fails to reflect the need for proposals to be optimised through detailed design studies.

**Employment-led allocation (MM39, ref. 317a)**

The Council’s introduction of reference to the creation of “a new neighbourhood”, is welcomed. This addition was made in response to discussion at the Examination Hearing about the expected predominance of residential uses within a development project on the Bromley-by-Bow gasworks site.

However, we consider that there is an inconsistency between the requirement for employment-led development and the overall requirement to create a new neighbourhood. This inconsistency could lead to confusion in the minds of the planning authority, consultees, applicants and other stakeholders, who may not understand how these twin objectives should be delivered.

The introduction in MM8 of a definition of “employment-led” development in the context of Policy J2 is acknowledged. However, as set out in oral representations to the Hearing, a narrow interpretation of this definition could have the effect of severely restricting the delivery of alternative uses on the site.

It is recognised that the Stephenson Street application (ref. 17/01847/OUT) for mixed use development on the adjoining site, and within the same S11 site allocation, has adopted a broad interpretation of this definition. In this example, it is clear that there has been a positive approach between the Council and
applicant to incorporate employment uses where they are not the predominate use. However, whilst MM8 gives an implied flexibility, there is no certainty of that approach being replicated in the future, particularly in the event that LBN planning officers and/or political control changes.

For clarity and certainty in the drafting of the Local Plan, such that it is clearly written and unambiguous (NPPF, 2018, para.16), we continue to recommend that S11 is amended to explicitly refer to both residential and employment uses. This amendment would provide greater clarity about what is expected in order to create a new neighbourhood on the site.

“Employment-led Mixed-use residential and employment development (linking to existing Cody Road industrial uses) that contributes to the creation of a new neighbourhood...”

Heritage strategy (MM39, ref. 317a)

The proposed text, requiring the assessment of and an appropriate viable strategy for the Grade II listed gasholders, is welcomed. Our previous representations have advocated reference to be made to the requirements for the role of the gasholders to be weighed against public benefits, in accordance with the tests set out within the NPPF 2018, particularly paragraph 195.

The proposed Main Modification does not go so far to include this. We therefore seek that the Inspector considers whether or not the Main Modification wording would accord with the NPPF. He should consider if the allocation would provide sufficient flexibility to enable partial or complete removal of the gasholders, if it is not viable to retain them, and if the public benefits outweigh the harm.

Indicative heights (MM39, ref. 317a)

As set out in our hearing statement (6 June 2018, it remains our view that the delivery of optimised development on this site will require consideration of building height, density and impact on surrounding assets as part of a detailed design study, with the scale and mass of development articulated architecturally.

We therefore recommend that reference to the requirement for a design-led approach, as set out in Policy SP4, is explicitly referenced within S11 – alongside the indicative heights sought by the Council:

“...existing homes on Manor Road and the requirement for a design-led approach as set out in Policy SP4.”

We trust that the above comments are helpful in finalising the amendments to Strategic Site Allocation S11 and ensuring that the allocation provides sufficient flexibility and clarity to bring forward the benefits of development on the gasworks site.

Yours sincerely

For Deloitte LLP

cc: Mr. I. Kemp
Dear Sir or Madam,

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: ‘MAIN AND MINOR MODIFICATIONS’ CONSULTATION RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF SILVERTOWN HOMES LTD

These representations have been prepared on behalf of Silvertown Homes Ltd (SHL) and set out comments in response to the Local Plan Review ‘Main and Minor Modifications’ Consultation July 2018.

They follow previous representations made by SHL during Regulation 18 and 19 consultation stages, as well as statements and verbal evidence presented during the Examination Hearings in June 2018. This previous commentary remains valid and should be considered by the Local Authority and Inspector alongside this letter.

REPRESENTATIONS

SHL have reviewed the consultation documents and their comments are set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOD REFERENCE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89 and 90 (paras 6.38c and 6.39)</td>
<td>Although put forward as ‘clarification’ changes by the Local Authority, it is considered that the amended/additional text in these paragraphs changes their tone, making them less flexible and more restrictive. As per our previous representation in relation to SP4 and its supporting text, by placing an arbitrary limit on the height of development outside of the tall building area, rather than allowing a design led approach, the Local Authority is unintentionally stopping the full potential of sites in the borough and efficient use of existing land and future efficient use of land throughout the development plan period, which is contrary to the NPPF. This is particularly significant given the housing crisis in London and the housing delivery numbers the new London Plan proposes for Newham. The Local Authority already acknowledge this challenge in this Local Plan by signing up to an early review to potentially increase housing numbers. The wording of Policy SP4 confirms the Local Authority's intention for tall buildings in the Borough, confirm that Strategic Sites “are regarded as suitable locations in principle for tall buildings..” and confirms the detailed design scrutiny tall building proposal will need to be considered against in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
order to satisfy the policy. The amendments/additions to the above paragraphs undermine this.

In these terms, it is considered that the change to para 6.38c is not appropriate and should be reworded as follows (in line with our previous request during the Examination Hearings):

“"In line with this policy approach to a hierarchy of places in the borough, Stratford Metropolitan and Canning Town town centre are therefore distinguished by them being the areas in the borough where new tall buildings over 20 storeys should be focused, supported by additional tall buildings of lesser height. Tall buildings over 20 storeys will also be considered appropriate on Strategic Sites SO8 and SO9 to mark this key ‘gateway’ location and this existing and emerging tall buildings character area. The particular formations of these centres and gateway location should be clearly related to the place-making transformation plans for these centres articulated in spatial policies and site allocations and subject to the further tests set out in this policy, and the wider design policies of SP1, SP3, SP5, SP7 and SP8. The remaining town centres may also be appropriate for tall buildings as identified by the Strategic Sites allocations, but these will be lower overall less significant in number and in height than those in Stratford and Canning Town."

Furthermore, the additional sentence at param6.39 is not necessary and should be removed.

We trust that SHL’s representations will be taken into account by the Local Authority and Inspector in finalising the Local Plan Review.

Confirmation of receipt would be appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]
Director

Enc.

Cc. - Silvertown Homes Ltd

- Silvertown Homes Ltd
Dear Sir/Madam,

London Borough of Newham Local Plan Review – Modifications Consultation
Strategic Site Allocation S11, Parcelforce (MM39, ref. 317a)

I write on behalf of National Grid Property (NGP) in respect of their landholdings at Bromley-by-Bow gasworks (Strategic Site Allocation S11, Parcelforce), regarding the above Local Plan Review Examination, and the main and minor modifications consultation, published on 23rd July 2018.

This consultation response follows engagement with the London Borough of Newham (LBN), and both oral and written representations to the Local Plan Review Examination. These representations have focused on three aspects of Strategic Site Allocation S11, Parcelforce:

- The Council’s intent that development within S11 is employment-led;
- The requirement for an assessment and appropriate viable strategy for the Grade II listed gasholders;
- That the indicative height for development fails to reflect the need for proposals to be optimised through detailed design studies.

Employment-led allocation (MM39, ref. 317a)

The Council’s introduction of reference to the creation of “a new neighbourhood”, is welcomed. This addition was made in response to discussion at the Examination Hearing about the expected predominance of residential uses within a development project on the Bromley-by-Bow gasworks site.

However, we consider that there is an inconsistency between the requirement for employment-led development and the overall requirement to create a new neighbourhood. This inconsistency could lead to confusion in the minds of the planning authority, consultees, applicants and other stakeholders, who may not understand how these twin objectives should be delivered.

The introduction in MM8 of a definition of “employment-led” development in the context of Policy J2 is acknowledged. However, as set out in oral representations to the Hearing, a narrow interpretation of this definition could have the effect of severely restricting the delivery of alternative uses on the site.

It is recognised that the Stephenson Street application (ref. 17/01847/OUT) for mixed use development on the adjoining site, and within the same S11 site allocation, has adopted a broad interpretation of this definition. In this example, it is clear that there has been a positive approach between the Council and
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Your ref: National Grid Property (Representation ref. 24)
applicant to incorporate employment uses where they are not the predominate use. However, whilst MM8 gives an implied flexibility, there is no certainty of that approach being replicated in the future, particularly in the event that LBN planning officers and/or political control changes.

For clarity and certainty in the drafting of the Local Plan, such that it is clearly written and unambiguous (NPPF, 2018, para.16), we continue to recommend that S11 is amended to explicitly refer to both residential and employment uses. This amendment would provide greater clarity about what is expected in order to create a new neighbourhood on the site.

"Employment-led Mixed-use residential and employment development (linking to existing Cody Road industrial uses) that contributes to the creation of a new neighbourhood...”

Heritage strategy (MM39, ref. 317a)
The proposed text, requiring the assessment of and an appropriate viable strategy for the Grade II listed gasholders, is welcomed. Our previous representations have advocated reference to be made to the requirements for the role of the gasholders to be weighed against public benefits, in accordance with the tests set out within the NPPF 2018, particularly paragraph 195.

The proposed Main Modification does not go so far to include this. We therefore seek that the Inspector considers whether or not the Main Modification wording would accord with the NPPF. He should consider if the allocation would provide sufficient flexibility to enable partial or complete removal of the gasholders, if it is not viable to retain them, and if the public benefits outweigh the harm.

Indicative heights (MM39, ref. 317a)
As set out in our hearing statement (6 June 2018, it remains our view that the delivery of optimised development on this site will require consideration of building height, density and impact on surrounding assets as part of a detailed design study, with the scale and mass of development articulated architecturally.

We therefore recommend that reference to the requirement for a design-led approach, as set out in Policy SP4, is explicitly referenced within S11 – alongside the indicative heights sought by the Council:

“...existing homes on Manor Road and the requirement for a design-led approach as set out in Policy SP4.”

We trust that the above comments are helpful in finalising the amendments to Strategic Site Allocation S11 and ensuring that the allocation provides sufficient flexibility and clarity to bring forward the benefits of development on the gasworks site.

Yours sincerely

For Deloitte LLP

cc: Mr. I. Kemp
Dear Sir / Madam

LONDON BOROUGH OF NEWHAM
LOCAL PLAN MAIN AND MINOR MODIFICATIONS CONSULTATIONS

These representations are submitted on behalf of Aberdeen Standard Investments, owners of Gallions Reach Shopping Park.

These representations have been submitted pursuant to the London Borough of Newham’s Local Plan Main and Minor Modifications consultation, following the examination of the Local Plan at the hearing in public which took place in June 2018.

Local Plan Main and Minor Modifications Consultation

We have previously submitted representations pursuant to the Local Plan Review Submission Version, and in response to the ‘Matters and Issues’ put forward by the Inspector.

These representations submitted only provide comments on modifications which have been proposed and published Post-Submission, as a result of points raised during hearings in public.

INF5 – Town Centres

As per our previous representations to the Inspector, in order to enable Gallions Reach to evolve to become a major town centre (in accordance with the draft allocation), it is important to ensure that the requirements are not too prescriptive in terms of when there will be an increase in floorspace or the exact mix of uses that will be proposed.

This matter (Matter 4) was discussed during the hearing in public, and as a result, additional text has been inserted into the supporting text of Policy INF5, as follows:

14 September 2018

Planning Department
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Email: localplan@newham.gov.uk
The proposed wording aligns with our previous representations, and discussions during the hearing in public. The text provides further clarification on the data which informs Policy INF5, and clarifies that the most recent evidence will be used, to ensure the plan is current. The proposed modifications are therefore fully supported in terms of providing additional clarification, and ensuring that floorspace requirements are based on up to date evidence.

Policy H1 – Family Housing

Point 6.5 of the previously published Inspector’s Note queried the proposed family housing policy. Point 6.5 stated that:

“Is the 39% target for family housing on sites of 10+ dwellings justified and realistic? Should the target be more flexible, for example set out as a range, and should the definition of family housing include 2 bed properties?”

Draft Policy H12 of the emerging London Plan states that “Boroughs should not set prescriptive dwelling size mix requirements (in terms of number of bedrooms) for market and intermediate homes”. The supporting text to Policy H12 states at paragraph 4.12.2 that:

“Policy H12 Housing size mix sets out all the issues that applicants and boroughs should take into account when considering the mix of homes on a site. Boroughs should not set policies or guidance that require set proportions of different-sized (in terms of number of bedrooms) market or intermediate units to be delivered. Such policies are inflexible, often not implemented effectively and generally do not reflect the optimum mix for a site taking account of all the factors set out in part A of Policy H12 Housing size mix. Moreover, they do not necessarily meet the identified need for which they are being required; for example, larger units are often required by boroughs in order to meet the needs of families but many such units are instead occupied by sharers. In addition, local and strategic housing need figures for market homes will be heavily influenced by the assumptions made in the assessment about the level of under-occupation in the private sector. It should be noted that in terms of delivering mixed and inclusive communities, a neighbourhood
may currently have an over-concentration of a particular size of unit and a new development could help redress the balance.”

This matter was discussed during the examination, where it was suggested, on behalf of Aberdeen Standard Investments, that further flexibility was incorporated into the policy.

The Main and Minor Modifications Consultation does not however propose any changes to Policy H1. This is disappointing in view of the queries raised by the Inspector and matters discussed during the hearing (Matter 6). The proposed wording currently reads as follows;

```
c.  Secure the delivery of a mix and balance of housing types, including a significant increase in family housing to replace that lost to conversion, through requiring seeking 39% of the number of new homes on all sites capable of delivering 10 units or more being to be 3 bedroom homes for families, subject to the appropriate mix and tenure considerations in Box H1 below.
```

The reference to ‘requiring’ is too prescriptive, and does not allow for any flexibility or considerations such as viability or market demand.

To reiterate our previous representations, the proposed 39% target for market family housing across the entirety of the plan period is prescriptive, and does not allow for flexibility in terms of changing trends. This is contrary to the draft London Plan, which encourages local planning authorities to allow for flexibility in terms of the private market sector.

In view that the wording of the policy is prescriptive and therefore contrary to the draft London Plan, we do not consider the proposed policy to be “sound”, and we would reiterate that the wording of the policy is revised to allow for flexibility in the mix requirements for market sector housing and to allow the market sector housing to be led by demand, which can be demonstrated in up to date evidence such as the local planning authorities SHMA.

We would suggest that flexibility, to allow for factors such as site-specific considerations, could be achieved through the following wording:

```
“Secure the delivery of a mix and balance of housing types, including a significant increase in family housing to replace that lost to conversion, through seeking 39% of the number of new homes on all sites capable of delivering 10 units or more being 3 bedroom homes for families, subject to the appropriate mix and tenure considerations below.;”
```

Closing

We trust that the above observations will be taken into consideration. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Montagu Evans

Montagu Evans LLP
Dear Sophie

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended);
Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007;
Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012

RE: Newham Local Plan Review – Main Modifications

Thank you for consulting the Mayor of London on the proposed Main Modifications to Newham’s draft Local Plan following the Examination Hearing sessions. As you are aware, all development plan documents must be in general conformity with the London Plan under section 24 (1)(b) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Mayor provided comments on the Submission version of the draft Newham Plan on 16 January 2018 (reference: LDF25/LDD12/CG01) and agreed a Statement of Common Ground on Beckton Riverside Strategic Site with the London Borough of Newham, National Grid and Transport for London on 31 May 2018 and on Thameside West SIL / Silvertown Landing with the London Borough of Newham on 26 June 2018.

The Mayor has considered the proposed Modifications and does not consider that they alter his opinion that the draft Newham Local Plan is in generally conformity with the London Plan. However, he is disappointed to see that no Modifications have been suggested to address his concerns regarding the de-designation of MoL and open space. The lack of designation of these parcels of land could allow substantial development within a MoL / open space setting.

The Mayor has afforded me delegated authority to make more detailed comments on his behalf, as set out below. Representations from Transport for London (TfL), which the Mayor endorses, are included within this response.

Sophie Donaldson
Policy Manager
London Borough of Newham
Newham Dockside
1000 Dockside Rod
London
E16 2QU

Sent by email to: localplan@newham.gov.uk

Department: Planning
Your reference: LDF25/LDD12/CG02
Date: 12 September 2018
## Mayor’s detailed response to the proposed modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Section or heading</th>
<th>Main Mod Ref</th>
<th>Mayor’s and TfL’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 Monitoring section</td>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Once, the new London Plan is published Newham will be monitored against the revised housing target set out in that plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability and Climate Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC5, implementation para</td>
<td>MM22</td>
<td>Welcome the additional sentence to acknowledge air quality impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF1b para 209b</td>
<td>MM23</td>
<td>Welcome the additional text on Beckton Riverside expanded DLR depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF2, 2e</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>The Mayor is concerned that proposed modification will weaken the commitment to facilitate more cycling and is inconsistent with the London Plan policy on cycle parking. The original wording ‘is in line with the London Plan and local context’ should be reinstated. It should be noted that cycle sharing caters for a different market of cycling and is better suited to spontaneous, rather than regular cycle trips. This is made clear in the draft London Plan paragraph 10.5.9. Furthermore, new models of cycle sharing are at a very early stage and their continued presence over the lifetime of new developments should not be relied upon to provide access to cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF2 implementation para 6.217a</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Welcome the additional text on car parking standards. One typo to correct “car-parking” for “car parking” to read “…and the opportunity costs of space for car parking whilst factoring in wider considerations…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF3, 3b</td>
<td>MM26</td>
<td>Welcome the requirement for Site Waste Management Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glossary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Intensification</td>
<td>MM50</td>
<td>Amend to read: Managed Intensification: is the [conditional] process of intensifying policy-compliant employment uses [floorspace plus yardspace] on identified areas of designated employment land, [i.e. Strategic Industrial Locations and Local Industrial Locations] in accordance with the criteria in policy J2:3b, such that capacity is increased but the spatial footprint or spatial impact of employment land/industrial floorspace is reduced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ensuring no net loss of functionality), as part of a plan-led and managed approach to employment land that supports economic growth.

Reason: To acknowledge that the provision of industrial floorspace is not solely about employment/jobs, but about the functioning of London’s economy and the servicing of its population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managed Release</th>
<th>MM51</th>
<th>Amend to read:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managed Release</strong>: is the [conditional] process of releasing identified areas of designated employment land and/or industrial floorspace [including undesignated industrial sites of 0.1ha or more or operational floorspace of 1000 sq m or more as per policy J2: 2f] for redevelopment to other uses typically including residential, in accordance with the criteria in policy J2:3a, as part of a plan-led and managed approach to employment land that supports economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason: As per MM51 above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managed Transition</th>
<th>MM52</th>
<th>Amend to read:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managed Transition</strong>: is the [conditional] process of managing the spatial and temporal/process transition of identified areas of designated employment land, [i.e. Local Mixed Use Areas] to ‘lighter’ employment generating uses (often from more traditional heavier industries) that are more compatible with residential development, in accordance with the criteria in policy J2:3a, as part of creating a mixed use borough and the securing of employment land that is better aligned with contemporary business needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason: As per MM51 above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the above definitions, Newham may like to consider including definitions for **Employment Land** and **Employment Hubs**.
If you would like to discuss any of my representations in more detail, please contact Celeste Giusti (020 7983 4811) who will be happy to discuss any of the comments.

Yours sincerely

Chief Planner

Cc: London Assembly Constituency
Chair of London Assembly Planning Committee
National Planning Casework Unit, DCLG
TfL
Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for notifying Sport England about the main and minor modifications to the Newham Local Plan.

Planning Policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process and providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type and in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means positive planning for sport, protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated approach to providing new housing, employment land and community facilities is important. The London Borough of Newham’s Local Plan should therefore reflect national policy for sport as set out in the above document with particular reference to the NPPF, paragraphs 96 and 97, to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy.

Sport England aims to ensure positive planning for sport by enabling the right facilities to be provided in the right places based on robust and up-to-date assessments of need for all levels of sport and for all sectors of the community. To achieve this aim our planning objectives are to protect sports facilities from loss as a result of redevelopment, enhance existing facilities through improving their quality, accessibility and management and to provide new facilities that are fit for purpose and meet demands for participation now and in the future. You will also be aware that Sport England is a statutory consultee on planning applications affecting playing fields. Further detail on Sport England’s role and objectives within the planning system can be found at http://www.sportengland.org/planningforsport

Sport England have assessed the proposed main and minor modifications to the Local Plan and have no comments on these changes. However, Sport England notes that the Local Plan still does not afford the appropriate protection for playing fields (playing pitches are including within community facilities but no playing fields) in an area where the Playing Pitch Strategy states there is not a surplus. In this respect the NPPF, paragraph 97, specifies that playing fields should not be built on unless certain criteria is met. One such criterion is that sport and recreation building and land, including playing fields, should only be built on unless an assessment is undertaken that clearly shows the land is surplus and not because it has been on the market for 6 months as stated in Local Plan Policy INF8 3. e. ii. Furthermore, Local Plan, paragraph 6.272a, suggests that qualitative improvements could be accepted as a ‘replacement’ facility although the NPPF, paragraph 97 requires replacement provision in terms of quantity, quality and in a suitable location. Sport England, therefore, consider that the Local Plan is contrary to the National Policy and is therefore not sound.

In addition to the above, the Local Plan does not specifically address indoor sport provision or enhancements to existing outdoor facilities (subject to need).

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Planning Manager

T: 020 7273 1631
M: 07920560435
F: 020 7273 1981
E:
Tate & Lyle Sugars have made responses to earlier consultations of the plan. Therefore we will limit our responses to subsequent modifications and/or issues that have arisen during the Examination in Public.

**Strategic Industrial Land, Thameside East SIL and Strategic Site S04 – North Woolwich Gateway**

Tate & Lyle Sugars own around 50 acres of strategic industrial land (SIL) in the Royal Docks. The maintenance and protection of strategic industrial land and the economic activity that takes place on it is a major priority for our business. We acknowledge there is an acute need for housing in Newham and there is an extensive ongoing process of regeneration specifically focused on the Royal Docks. We are supportive of both these ambitions and believe the Local Plan is largely successful in striking the right balance between homes and jobs, between space for businesses and new homes in Newham. Broadly, we believe the plan as it currently stands meets the soundness tests.

Nonetheless we feel it is important to reemphasise the need to protect SIL and the associated jobs and economic activity it supports. The vast majority of land – around 47 acres – is a contiguous site in the Thameside East SIL. Our land covers the area between the River Thames and Factory Road, as far East as the scrap metal yard/Standard Industrial Estate and as far West as Thames Road Industrial Estate. Please refer to attached map for clarity. Around ¾ of it is used directly for sugar refining and associated activities. In addition we have a number of tenants including a bus garage, a plant and machinery hire company, a container storage social enterprise and East London’s largest foodbank.

Thameside East SIL is a vital reservoir of SIL and as the major landowner, with a 140 year history of continual operation at this site, we are very concerned about threats to the SIL status. In regards to Thameside East SIL we believe the plan is sound and support the modifications as they stand.

We note that following the hearings suggestions have been made to

1) An update to proposed Policy J2 (b) to reference North Woolwich Gateway alongside Canning Town Riverside, Beckton Riverside and Silvertown Landing as one of the sites where there is scope for some limited further release through intensification of SIL uses;

2) An extension of the North Woolwich Gateway boundary further west to include the SIL at Standard Industrial Estate; and

3) An update to the supporting text for Strategic Site S04 to allow for Managed Intensification to be considered (without losing industrial capacity) on the SIL land within the allocation as part of a comprehensive masterplan

We unequivocally oppose these suggestions. These suggestions make neither planning nor economic sense. We wholeheartedly support the response of the Newham Council ([Note for the Inspector concerning Strategic Site S04](#)).

Thameside East SIL already has extensive managed release contained within the plan, at Connaught Riverside Strategic Site S23. If the above further suggestions were implemented, we believe they could endanger future of the entire Thameside East SIL designation. Ultimately we believe these
could pave the way for residential planning applications on the direct border of our landholdings, endangering our ability to operate and destroying SIL integrity.

It is worth noting that we own the freehold to 8 Factory Road (previously Loon Fung Chinese Supermarket) and this a vital part of our operations in the Royal Docks. This is the Western boundary for both the Rockwell and CBRE sites. 8 Factory Road is a busy, noisy, business critical warehouse. Currently half of the warehouse is used to store packaging materials for our smaller Lyle’s Golden Syrup Factory located approximately a mile West in the Thameside West SIL. These packaging materials are used in a new £7.5million bottling line installed in 2017 which created around 20 jobs. The other half of the warehouse is used to manage bulk stocks of food grade brown sugars. In other words, this warehouse plays a crucial role to our business operations across 2 areas of SIL in Newham. There simply is not the scope for “managed SIL release” on or near our border. To be effective and justified in line with the soundness tests the local plan should be seeking to actively support inward investment and job creation.

We share the concerns of the council on the deliverability of any Masterplan around these land ownerships. As a major landowner directly bordering two of the sites we have not been consulted on these suggestions. We would not support any plans which sought to release any area of land from SIL designation, even if it intensification elsewhere aimed for no net loss of SIL floorspace. SIL intensification can take place without release and it is well known there is extensive demand for SIL within London and vast amounts of SIL have been lost in recent years.

Thameside East provides a single large viable area of SIL. It provides a number of different industrial uses; an “anchor” traditional industrial landowner, open storage, modern industrial units with extensive well-configured yard space, a bus garage, warehousing and a safeguarded wharf. As is, it could be the subject of industrial intensification and development projects, without any need for SIL release. It also has extensive river frontage making it a plausible location for future river freight and logistics activity.

The extension of Strategic Site 04 and the potential for SIL release should be rejected. This would render the plan unsound and is not justified in planning terms.

**Modifications 126 and 141c - Agent of Change**

Tate and Lyle Sugars note there have been proposed modifications to text around new employment generating developments and the agent of change principle in this context following the Council’s consideration of the Inspector’s Matters and Issues. The two clearest examples are copied below for ease of reference (taken from schedule of proposed modifications SD11). We are particularly concerned about this wording, particularly if applied to development on SIL. SIL land is specifically allocated “to ensure that London provides sufficient quality sites, in appropriate locations, to meet the needs of industrial and related sectors.” The types of activity that take place on SIL land are often noisy, dirty, dusty etc...They can be potentially be perceived nuisance causing, antisocial and unneighbourly if residential (or other inappropriate land uses) are too close to them. Indeed this is part of the very reason SIL designations exist; to try and concentrate such activities in specific areas and minimise conflicts with other types of land use. It is important to understand that for certain types of SIL activities (e.g. aggregates recycling, sugar refining, scrap metal merchants) there simply are not “modern design, supply chain specification (e.g. re delivery modes) and engineering techniques” necessarily available “to also optimise neighbourliness and minimise off-site spatial impacts.” The idea that new technology can simply offset some of the potentially antisocial aspects of industrial activity is not always going to be viable.
For the plan to be considered sound – in accordance with national planning policy criteria – we believe this point should be taken into account. The Local Plan should explicitly recognise it. The London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework are both clear that the planning process needs to take into account existing industrial activity and should not lead to unreasonable restrictions, costs, burdens or growth limitations on existing businesses. Therefore we would suggest the following textual amends below in red.

**Sub-section/ Policy No. or Map/ Paragraph no: J1, Justification section, paragraph 6.84a**

Resultant commitments and Agent of Change principles will be secured by appropriate conditions and legal agreements. In order for employment-generating uses to benefit from neighbourliness and Agent of Change, presumptions however, they should be acting reasonably and lawfully within the existing consents and permissions. Equally, where new employment-generating development occurs, the assumption is that, where possible, the opportunity should be taken through modern design, supply chain specification (e.g. re delivery modes) and engineering techniques to also optimise neighbourliness and minimise off-site spatial impacts (noise, odour, vibration etc.) as per SP8. It is acknowledged that for some forms of industrial activity this will not be possible as they inherently have off-site spatial and environmental impacts (e.g. noise, odour and air quality impacts) irrespective of modern technological, design and engineering developments. In these cases, applications for new employment generating development should still be supported.

**Sub-section/ Policy No. or Map/ Paragraph no: J2, Implementation section, paragraph 6.93b**

6.93bii In requiring release sites to achieve Neighbourly Development (as per SP8) the assumption would be that uses to benefit from Agent of Change would be operating reasonably and lawfully and overtime if they in turn propose further development, that, if possible, this should reflect the potential of modern design and supply chain specification to improve environmental performance and neighbourliness. It is acknowledged that for some forms of industrial activity this will not be possible as they inherently have off site spatial and environmental impacts (e.g. noise, odour and air quality impacts) irrespective of modern technological, design and engineering developments. In these cases, applications for new employment generating development should still be supported.
Thames Refinery Landholdings

• Freehold owned site approx. 50 acres in size
• Strategic Industrial Land
• Safeguarded Wharf used for raw sugar deliveries

• The largest cane refinery in Europe
• One of largest private sector employers in Newham
Dear Sirs

We act for Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Limited (representor number 042) and here respond to Main Modification 6.

We retain the concern expressed in our Response to Inspector’s Question 4.3(v) on the arbitrary definition of “quality leisure”.

The first sentence of Technical Criteria 3 (a) (ii) could be deleted to avoid implicit judgement without any impact on the policy.

Generally, the Main Modification improves the clarity of the policy, but in respect of Criteria 3 (b) (iii-iv) seems to complicate it.

If a proposal results in three or more specified uses within 400m of each other, its 400m radius must also overlap with theirs.

So, Criteria 3 (b) (iv) renders Criteria 3 (b) (iii) superfluous and is, in fact, more restrictive in using overlap instead of distance.

We are not sure this was intended, but to work alongside Criteria 3 (b) (iii), Criteria 3 (b) (iv) could maybe use a 200m radius.

If the intention of including “proposed” units is to include “committed” or “permitted” units, then these latter terms are clearer.

We would be pleased to discuss this further with an officer on the phone or by email should it assist.

Regards

MA MRTPI
Director

0115 849 1234
0771 778 8374

SSA Planning
PO Box 10201
Nottingham
NG9 9FZ
14 September 2018

Our Ref: TfL Com Dev/Planning/BH/LB
Your Ref: Newham Local Plan Main and Minor Modifications Consultation

Planning Policy Team
Newham Dockside
1000 Dockside Road
London, E16 2QU

By email: localplan@newham.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: Newham Local Plan main and minor modifications consultation**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on main and minor modifications to the Draft Local Plan, including site allocations. These representations should be made available to the Inspector and should be read in conjunction with our previous letters of 13 April 2017 (issues and options stage) and 16 January 2018 (Regulation 19 stage), which we attach again for convenience.

We reiterate that our representations reflect the views of the Transport for London Commercial Development (TfL CD) planning team in its capacity as a significant landowner in the Borough and do not form part of any response from TfL City Planning. Our colleagues in TfL City Planning may provide a separate response to this consultation in respect of TfL-wide operational and land-use planning / transport policy matters as part of their statutory duties.

TfL CD has significant concerns regarding the wording of and modifications to the Limmo Strategic Site Allocation (Local Plan ref S18). As it is currently written, we consider the site allocation to be unsound as it has not been positively prepared and it is not consistent with the planning policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, London Plan or Draft London Plan.

With respect to land uses, the proposed allocation states: “High quality accessible open space on the peninsula, together, on the eastern side of the station, with town centre uses, new bus station and residential, facilitating an increase in transport hub capacity and through connections.”

As stated in the previous TfL CD response to the Regulation 19 consultation (16 January 2018), this is inappropriately worded because it gives the wrong impression with respect to the balance of open space and housing on this site. Importantly, the proposed allocation fails to recognise the primary role of the Limmo Peninsula as a strategic housing site that will meet objectively assessed housing need. The Local Plan should conform to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, adopted London Plan, and Draft London Plan in terms of optimising housing delivery.
on appropriate sites. The current drafting also wrongly implies that only the “eastern side of the station” is allocated for residential use, rather than the Peninsula itself.

While it is certainly TfL CD’s intention for the site to be of an exemplary design and a legacy for London, high quality open space will be provided as a local amenity and also to provide an appropriate setting for the buildings on the site, rather than as the primary use of the site.

The wording of the draft allocation is unsound in its current form and should have been modified. As it stands, the policy is unsound because: it has not been positively prepared in order to address the nationally recognised housing crisis (which is most acutely felt in London), the allocation as high quality accessible open space has not been justified, and it is inconsistent with national and London-wide planning policies.

For example, the NPPF (2018) makes clear that the Government’s objective is “significantly boosting the supply of homes”. Indeed, the recent (27 July 2018) letter to the Mayor of London from Rt Hon James Brokenshire, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, makes clear that even the challenging targets for housing delivery in the draft London Plan are insufficient “including in the short term”. In this context it is clearly inconsistent with national planning policies for there to be any doubt that a major brownfield housing opportunity site, such as Limmo, should be developed primarily for housing.

Housing need is particularly acute in east London. The Limmo Peninsula is a key strategic site in the Custom House and Canning Town Area, where the need for housing has effectively doubled since the last iteration of the emerging Local Plan (from 7,950 homes to 15,608 homes according to the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan).

The allocation as presently drafted is also inconsistent with government requirements to optimise housing development on brownfield sites, for eg. NPPF paragraph 117:

“117. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land.”

And paragraph 118:

“118. Planning policies and decisions should… c) give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land; d) promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively.”

In line with national policy, the focus of development of the Limmo site should be to deliver housing with high quality open space to support residential development. To conform with national policy, the site allocation should be altered to reflect the need to optimise housing delivery.
The current wording of the policy is also inconsistent with the policies of both the adopted and draft versions of the London Plan, which require optimisation of housing delivery, particularly in accessible locations.

Current London Plan policies 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply and 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential encourage the delivery of residential development on brownfield land in areas with high public transport accessibility levels (PTAL). Draft London Plan policies D6 Optimising Housing Density encourages the delivery of housing in areas with high PTAL ratings and policy H1 Increasing Housing Supply states that boroughs should “optimise the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites through their development plans and planning decisions, especially sites with existing or planned public transport access levels (PTALs) 3-6 or which are located within 800m of a Tube station, rail station or town centre boundary.” The sites PTAL rating of 5-6a and location in close proximity to a town centre means it is suitable for the optimisation of residential development and the above policies are not reflected within the current wording of the site allocation.

TfL CD also considers Local Plan Modification 324 to be unsound. This alters the phasing of the site allocation from “medium term” to “medium to long term”. TfL CD has made clear to the Council that this site will become available for phased, housing-led development later this year, following the conclusion of Crossrail works for the delivery of the Elizabeth Line. TfL CD is currently marketing the site with a view to working in partnership to commence housing delivery by 2021. In this context, Modification 324 is unsound because it does not reflect the potential for early housing delivery and is therefore inconsistent with national policy to prioritise housing delivery in the short term.

TfL CD has been unable to view the Council’s ‘Statement of Consultation’ document, which we understand contains the Council’s responses to the representations made by TfL CD. We have tried to view this on a number of computers and using a number of different web browsers, but on each we have received the message that the file is corrupt and it has not downloaded. We have requested a copy of this document from the Council but have been told that it is too large to send to us by email. We would be grateful if you could please make alternative arrangements for us to view this document. Pending this, and our consideration of whether the ‘Statement of Consultation’ contains any information relevant to our review of the main and minor modifications (or the lack thereof) we would reserve the right to make further representations in due course. We will do so within five working days of the ‘Statement of Consultation’ being made available to us.

We hope that these representations are helpful and we look forward to working with the Council over the coming years to deliver a high quality, housing-led, mixed use scheme at Limmo. If you need any further information or would like to discuss any of the issues raised in our representations, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully
Acting Planning Manager, Commercial Development
Transport for London

Tel: 020 3054 8146