
Report to London Borough of Newham Council

by William Fieldhouse BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Date 18th August 2026

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended and applied by the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026)

Report on the Examination of “Our Newham Local Plan”

The Plan was submitted for examination on 18 July 2025.

The examination hearings were held between 2 December 2025 and 17 February 2026.

File Ref: PINS/G5750/429/11

Contents

Abbreviations used in this report.....	3
Non-technical summary.....	4
Introduction	6
Context of the Plan	8
Public Sector Equality Duty.....	9
Assessment of legal compliance.....	9
Assessment of soundness	12
Issue 1 – Viability.....	12
Issue 2 – Amount of development needed in the borough	13
Issue 3 – Spatial strategy (policies BFN1 and D4).....	17
Issue 4 – Neighbourhood and site allocation policies (part 2 of the Plan).....	21
Issue 5 – Housing land supply	33
Issue 6 – Homes (policies H2 to H11)	38
Issue 7 – Inclusive economy (policies J1 to J4)	44
Issue 8 – High streets (policies HS1 to HS8)	47
Issue 9 – Social infrastructure (policies SI1 to SI5).....	50
Issue 10 – Design (policies BFN2, D1 to D3 and D5 to D9)	53
Issue 11 – Climate emergency (policies CE1 to CE8)	55
Issue 12 – Green and water spaces (policies GWS1 to GWS5)	57
Other soundness matters	61
Viability revisited	63
Overall conclusion and recommendation.....	64
Schedule of main modifications	Appendix

Abbreviations used in this report

2004 Act	The Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)
2012 Regulations	The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)
The Council	London Borough of Newham Council
DLR	Docklands Light Railway
GLA	Greater London Authority
LIL	Local Industrial Location
MOL	Metropolitan Open Land
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SIL	Strategic Industrial Location
SINC	Site of Importance for Nature Conservation
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
sqm	square metres
TBZ	Tall Building Zone
TfL	Transport for London

Evidence and Examination Documents

All of the Council's supporting evidence submitted with the Plan along with documents that I issued, requested or accepted during the examination were published on the examination website. Each document has its own individual reference number such as IN1, SD003, EB008, etc. Where appropriate, I refer to documents by their reference numbers in this report.

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the "Our Newham Local Plan" provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the borough, provided that a number of main modifications are made to it. London Borough of Newham Council has specifically requested that I recommend any main modifications necessary to enable the Plan to be adopted.

Following the hearings, the Council prepared schedules of proposed modifications and changes to the policies map, and carried out sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment of them. The main modifications, changes to the policies map and updated sustainability appraisal and habitat regulations assessment reports were subject to public consultation between 26 May and 7 July 2026. In some cases, I have amended their detailed wording where necessary. I have recommended their inclusion in the Plan after considering the sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment and all the representations made in response to consultation on them.

The main modifications can be summarised as follows:

Plan part 1: Thematic policies

- Modify **strategic policies** H1 and J1 so that they look ahead to **2042** (15 years following adoption) rather than 2038.
- Modify the **housing target** in policy H1 from 51,425 to 53,784 homes between 2023 and 2038 to 45,611 to 53,954 homes between 2027 and 2042.
- Modify the stepped **housing trajectory** to include the London Plan target of 4,760 homes per year up to 2029 and capacity-based targets between 2029 and 2042.
- Modify policy H3 to delete the **affordable housing requirement** of 60% and refer to developments of ten or more homes providing affordable housing in accordance with the London Plan and a tenure mix of 65% social rent and 35% intermediate homes.
- Modify policy H8 to clarify the requirements relating to **purpose built student accommodation**.
- Modify policy H10 to refer to a need for 39 additional **Gypsy and Traveller pitches** between 2027 and 2037 (rather than 23) and clarify how this need is expected to be met.
- Modify the **industrial floorspace requirement** in policy J1 from 335,000 sqm between 2021 and 2038 to 418,000 sqm between 2021 and 2042.
- Modify policy J3 to clarify the approaches to **safeguarding employment floorspace capacity**.
- Modify the **office floorspace requirement** in policy J1 from 90,000 sqm between 2021 and 2038 to 105,000 sqm between 2021 and 2042.
- Modify policy D4 to set out how the approach to **tall buildings** is an integral part of the Plan's **three-dimensional spatial strategy** and to provide greater flexibility with regard to the height of tall buildings both within tall building zones and elsewhere.

- Modify policy BFN2 to set out a positive approach to **co-designed masterplanning** to achieving comprehensive development that is effectively coordinated with infrastructure delivery.
- Modify policy HS4 to clarify the requirements relating to development impacting on existing **indoor and outdoor markets**.
- Modify policies SI1 to SI4 to clarify the requirements relating to existing and proposed **social infrastructure** facilities.
- Modify some of the requirements relating to **energy efficiency, renewable energy** generation and **embodied carbon** in policies CE1, CE2 and CE3.
- Modify policies GWS1 and GWS2 to clarify the requirements relating to **green spaces** and **water spaces**.
- Delete the implementation text to policy T5 that states that certain specified changes in the use and function of **London City Airport** are un-mitigable and unacceptable.
- Delete policy W1 and W2 parts 1 and 2 to avoid inconsistency and unnecessary duplication with the **Joint East London Waste Plan**.
- Modify various other part 1 policies to ensure that they are sound.

Plan part 2: Neighbourhood and site allocation policies

- Modify the introduction to part 2 of the Plan to clarify that **site allocation policies** will be applied flexibly in the determination of planning applications based on up-to-date assessments of need and viability in the context of relevant part 1 policies.
- Modify the title of each **site allocation map** to "indicative diagram" and clarify that masterplanning may demonstrate that an alternative layout could deliver outcomes consistent with the allocation policy and other policies in the Plan.
- Modify site allocation policy N13.SA3 **East Ham Gasworks** and indicative diagram to remove 1.8 hectares from the **Metropolitan Open Land** designation and clarify the development requirements.
- Modify policies N17 and N17.SA1 to clarify how the large scale mixed use development at **Beckton Riverside**, including the transformation of the Gallions Reach Shopping Park into a new town centre, will be coordinated and phased with the delivery of an extension to the Docklands Light Railway.
- Modify policy N14 Green Street to reflect the valuable contribution that **Queen's Market** plays within the district centre.
- Modify various other site allocation policies and / or indicative diagrams (including N2.SA1 **Silvertown Quays**, N2.SA4 **Thameside West**, N2.SA5 **Excel Western Entrance**, N7.SA1 **Abbey Mills**, N7.SA3 **Sugar House Island** and N8.SA7 **Rick Roberts Way**) to ensure that they are justified and effective.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the "Our Newham Local Plan" ("the Plan") in terms of section 20(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and as applied by regulation 4 and paragraph 2 schedule 1 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026. It considers whether the Plan is sound and compliant with the relevant legal requirements (including in terms of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, also as applied by regulation 4 and paragraph 2 schedule 1 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026.
2. Revised National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") published in December 2024 and amended in February 2025 includes a transitional arrangement which means that, for the purpose of examining this Plan, the policies in the version of the NPPF published in December 2023 apply. Paragraph 35 of that document advises that in order to be sound, a local plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
3. The transitional arrangements also mean that where the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) has been updated to reflect the revised NPPF, the previous relevant versions of the PPG apply for the purposes of this examination. Therefore, unless stated otherwise, references in this report are to the NPPF published in December 2023 and the versions of the PPG which were extant prior to the publication of the NPPF in December 2024.
4. The starting point for the examination was the assumption that the Council submitted what it considered to be a sound plan. The "Our Newham Local Plan", submitted in July 2025, is the basis for my examination¹. It is the same document as was published for consultation under regulation 19 in July 2024. A total of 335 representators responded to that public consultation in accordance with regulation 20, making a total of nearly 2,300 representations². In accordance with regulation 23, I have considered all of those representations as part of my examination of the Plan.

Main Modifications

5. In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act, the Council requested that I recommend any main modifications necessary to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound and / or not legally compliant and thus incapable of being adopted³. This report explains why my recommended main modifications are

¹ SD002a and SD002b.

² SD017 page 4.

³ Letter from Director of Planning and Development 18 July 2025 [SD001].

necessary. The main modifications are referenced in bold in the report in the form **MM1**, **MM2** etc, and are set out in full in the Appendix.

6. Following the examination hearings, the Council prepared schedules of proposed main modifications and changes to the policies map and carried out sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment of them. The main modifications, changes to the policies map and updated sustainability appraisal and habitat regulations assessment reports⁴ were subject to public consultation between 26 May and 7 July 2026.
7. I have taken account of the consultation responses in coming to my conclusions in this report and made some amendments to the detailed wording of the main modifications where these are necessary for consistency or clarity. None of the amendments significantly alters the content of the modifications as published for consultation or undermines the participatory processes and sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment that has been undertaken. Where necessary I have highlighted these amendments in the report.

Policies Map

8. The Council must maintain an adopted policies map which illustrates geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan. When submitting a local plan for examination, the Council is required to provide a submission policies map showing the changes to the adopted policies map that would result from the proposals in the submitted local plan. In this case, the submission policies map is the London Borough of Newham Local Plan Regulation 19 Policies Map 2024⁵.
9. The policies map is not defined in statute as a development plan document and so I do not have the power to recommend main modifications to it. However, a number of the published main modifications to the Plan's policies require further corresponding changes to be made to the policies map. In addition, there are some instances where the geographic illustration of policies on the submission policies map is not justified and changes to the policies map are needed to ensure that the relevant policies are effective.
10. These further changes to the policies map were published for consultation alongside the main modifications⁶. When the Plan is adopted, in order to comply with the legislation and give effect to the Plan's policies, the Council will need to update the adopted policies map to include all the changes proposed in

⁴ ED030 to ED033.

⁵ SD003.

⁶ ED031.

the submitted policies map and the further changes published alongside the main modifications.

Context of the Plan

11. Newham is an inner London borough situated between three rivers: the Lea to the west, Thames to the south and Roding to the east. Historically, industry and large scale infrastructure were located along the rivers, with various residential neighbourhoods served by town and district centres in between. In recent decades, historic industrial areas and docks have been redeveloped with homes, modern workspaces, shops, leisure uses and community facilities.
12. The borough is generally well served by rail, underground and Dockland Light Railway (DLR) stations although parts have relatively low public transport accessibility. It is crossed by a number of strategic roads, and London City Airport is situated in the Royal Albert Dock. Air quality is poor in much of the borough.
13. The population is young, very ethnically diverse and rapidly increasing - expected to grow to over 465,000 by 2030. Nearly 14,500 new homes were built in the five years to 2022, but average house prices are around £420,000 – 14 times annual earnings – and private rents now represent 65% of average wages. Around 50% of the population is in poverty after housing costs have been taken into account, and over 25% of the wards are in the 20% most deprived in the country.
14. There are nearly 14,000 business registered in the borough, and the number of jobs has increased significantly in the last ten years or so, particularly in retail and business support sectors. However, average wages are relatively low compared to other parts of London.
15. There are various greenspaces in the borough, including part of the Lee Valley Regional Park, along with significant water spaces including the former docks. However, over 80% of the land area is built up, and only 7% is accessible greenspace meaning that there are significant shortages for the existing population.
16. The north west part of the borough, including Stratford, was part of the London Legacy Development Corporation although planning powers were transferred back to the Council in 2024. Three Opportunity Areas identified in the London Plan are wholly or partly in the borough: Olympic Legacy, Poplar Riverside, and Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside.
17. When adopted, the Plan will supersede all of the policies in the Newham Local Plan 2018, the Newham Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document

2017 and the London Legacy Development Corporation Local Plan 2020. It will then form part of the statutory development plan for the Borough along with the London Plan and the East London Joint Waste Plan.

Public Sector Equality Duty

18. An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out during the preparation of the Plan⁷. This finds that there are policies which, while not focussed on people who share protected characteristics, could have significant positive effects including through the provision of a range of housing, employment, green infrastructure, transport and community infrastructure. It concludes that the Plan exhibits due regard to the Council's Public Sector Equality Duty.
19. Notwithstanding that, a number of concerns were raised in representations made under regulation 20 about the impact of the Plan on persons who share relevant protected characteristics. I consider those issues in relevant sections of this report as part of my assessment of the soundness of relevant policies.
20. I have had due regard to the aims expressed in s149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. This has included my consideration of several issues during the examination including policies relating to social value and health impact assessments (BFN3), design standards (D1), social infrastructure (SI1 to SI5), meeting the housing needs of different members of the community, including the elderly, people with disabilities and Gypsies and Travellers (H1 to H11), and play and informal recreation for all ages (GWS5).

Assessment of Legal Compliance

General conformity with the London Plan

21. The Greater London Authority (GLA) advised the Council in August 2024 that it was the Mayor's opinion that the Plan is not in general conformity with his Spatial Development Strategy (the London Plan 2021) for two reasons relating to housing targets and affordable housing. However, subject to the main modifications recommended in this report, I am satisfied that the Plan is in general conformity with the London Plan 2021 as required by section 24 of the 2004 Act. The GLA has confirmed that the Mayor shares that view⁸.

⁷ SD006 and SD007.

⁸ GLA response to main modifications (letter dated 7 July 2026).

Local development scheme

22. The Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Council's local development scheme.

Public consultation

23. The Council's Regulation 22 Consultation Statement demonstrates that the consultation carried out during the preparation of the Plan was in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement 2022⁹ as required by section 19(3) of the 2004 Act.

Sustainability appraisal

24. An Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA), incorporating sustainability appraisal, strategic environmental assessment, health impact assessment and equalities impact assessment, was carried out during the preparation of the Plan and a report and non-technical summary were published alongside the Plan in July 2024¹⁰. This describes the reasonable alternatives that were identified and appraised and explains why the Council considers there were no reasonable alternatives for certain parts of the Plan.
25. The IIA was updated during the examination to consider the main modifications¹¹. This concluded that the main modifications do not significantly affect the findings of the assessment carried out during the preparation of the Plan.
26. I am satisfied that the IIA complied with the necessary legal requirements, and that it adopted a systematic approach based on proportionate, adequate evidence. Where relevant, I return to the IIA, including its assessment of the reasonable alternatives, in my assessment of soundness issues later in this report.

Habitat regulations assessment

27. A Habitat Regulations Assessment was carried out to inform the Plan¹². The screening found that significant effects are not likely on a number of protected sites in and around London but could not be ruled out for the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) in terms of air quality and recreational pressure. An appropriate assessment was therefore undertaken in relation to

⁹ SD017 section 1.

¹⁰ Newham Local Plan (Regulation 22) Integrated Impact Assessment (Final Report)

¹¹ ED032.

¹² SD008.

that site. This found that, subject to the mitigation measures that are required by policies in the Plan (including T3 transport behaviour change and GWS3 part 7), there would be no adverse impacts on the integrity of the SAC.

28. The Habitat Regulations Assessment was updated to consider the main modifications¹³. This concluded that the modifications strengthened the Plan's approach to protecting the Epping Forest SAC such that it would not lead to adverse effects on the integrity of any protected sites.
29. Overall, therefore, I am satisfied that the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) have been complied with.

Strategic priorities

30. The Council's strategic priorities for the development and use of land in the borough are set out in the Vision and Objectives section in part 1 of the Plan. These are addressed by strategic policies in the Plan, as well as by policies in the London Plan and East London Joint Waste Plan. I am, therefore, satisfied that the development plan, taken as a whole, includes policies to address the strategic priorities for the development and use of land in the borough¹⁴.

Climate change

31. The Plan includes various policies relating to climate change including green and water spaces (GWS1 to GWS4), transport (T1 to T3) and climate emergency (CE1 to CE7), as do the London Plan and East London Joint Waste Plan. I am, therefore, satisfied, that the development plan, taken as a whole, includes policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the borough contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change as required by section 19(1A) of the 2004 Act.

Superseded policies

32. The Plan does not state which, if any, policies in the existing adopted development plan it intends to supersede. It is, therefore, necessary to modify the Introduction to the Plan to state that it replaces the Newham Local Plan 2018, the Newham Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document 2017 and the London Legacy Development Corporation Local Plan 2020 in their entirety. This will ensure compliance with regulation 8(5) [MM2].

¹³ ED033.

¹⁴ Section 19(1B) of the 2004 Act.

Other legal requirements

33. The Plan complies with all other relevant legal requirements, including in the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations.

Assessment of Soundness

Main Issues

34. Taking account of all the representations, the written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings, I have identified 12 main issues upon which the soundness of the Plan depends. This report deals with these main issues. It does not respond to every point or issue raised by representors. Nor does it refer to every policy or allocation in the Plan.

Issue 1 – Is the Plan informed by viability evidence prepared in accordance with national policy and does that evidence indicate that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine the viability of development during the plan period?

35. Local plans should be informed by a proportionate assessment of viability that takes into account all relevant policies, and local and national standards, including the cost implications of the Community Infrastructure Levy and section 106 contributions. The assessment should demonstrate that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability¹⁵.
36. The Council's Local Plan Viability Assessment (April 2024)¹⁶ tested the impact of the main policies which may have an impact on viability using a residual land value and development typology approach in accordance with national planning guidance. However, the vast majority of the allocations in the Plan will involve complex development schemes due to their scale, previous and current uses, multiple ownerships, contamination and other physical constraints meaning that a plan-led approach to assessing viability is particularly challenging. The Council sought to address this through testing over 140 different development scenarios against three different benchmark land values. Clearly, different assumptions about development costs and values, developer profits and benchmark land values result in different outputs and conclusions.
37. The viability assessment does not make an allowance for abnormal costs which are likely to be significant for many of the allocated sites – there are examples of such costs adding up to £400 million to some schemes (around 15% of total costs)¹⁷. However, the approach taken by the Council was reasonable as it

¹⁵ PPG ID:10 (2019).

¹⁶ EB099.

¹⁷ EWS022 St William Homes.

would be difficult to justify any particular abnormal cost for all of the development typologies and because it is a factor that should properly be taken into account in determining the price paid for land.

38. Overall, I am satisfied that assumptions made in the Council's viability assessment were reasonable and based on proportionate, up-to-date evidence. In that context, it is highly significant to note that the assessment indicates that most types of development meeting all of the policy requirements in the Plan, including 60% affordable housing, would not be viable. The developments proposed on most of the allocations are shown to have negative residual land values, with substantial shortfalls against relevant benchmark land values in many cases. Abnormal costs for some sites would be likely to further undermine viability.
39. As submitted, therefore, the Plan is not sound meaning that various modifications are required to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that the development proposed can be viably developed over the plan period. I address those as relevant through my consideration of subsequent main issues, and return to the issue of viability towards the end of this report

Conclusion

40. I therefore conclude on this issue that the Plan is informed by adequate, proportionate and up-to-date viability evidence prepared in accordance with national policy. However, that evidence, along with other evidence before me, indicates that the total cumulative cost of relevant policies would undermine the viability of development during the plan period. Main modifications are, therefore, required to various policies to address that soundness issue; these are set out under subsequent main issues as relevant.

Issue 2 – Are the amounts of housing, industrial, office and retail development that the Plan identifies as being needed justified and consistent with the London Plan and national policy?

Plan period

41. The submitted Plan's strategic policies relating to housing, industrial, office and retail development needs cover the period to 2038 (from various different base dates). As the Plan is likely to be adopted before 31 March 2027, this means that those strategic policies would look ahead 11 years following adoption, rather than a minimum of 15 years as expected by national policy. This is a significant soundness issue that needs to be rectified by modifying the relevant strategic policies and, where necessary, other parts of the Plan so that they look ahead to 2042 [MM1]. I consider the implications of this for the housing, industrial, office and retail development requirements below.

Housing requirement

42. Policy H1 states that Newham will enable a net increase of between 51,425 and 53,784 homes between 2023 and 2038. Paragraph 3.174 explains that the target range is capacity-derived based on planning permission figures; design-led capacity testing of site allocations; capacity assumptions from the GLA 2017 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment; capacity assumptions from lapsed application sites; and capacity assumptions on small sites set out in the London Plan.
43. The Table following paragraph 3.174 in the Plan sets out a stepped trajectory with different annual delivery targets for the periods 2023 to 2028, 2028 to 2033, and 2033 to 2038. Paragraph 3.175 explains that the targets for those periods reflect the expected trajectories for the sites in the identified housing land supply.
44. Whilst national policy expects local plan housing requirements to be based on an objective assessment of housing need, the capacity-based approach used in the Plan is consistent with the London Plan and therefore justified in principle. The use of a target range is also justified and consistent with national policy¹⁸ as it sets a minimum requirement but also an ambition to optimise capacity by taking account of specific information on a number of sites based on developer intentions and/or infrastructure improvements that are not certain. Furthermore, the use of a stepped trajectory is also consistent with national planning policy guidance¹⁹ and justified provided that it reflects the London Plan ten year target to 2029²⁰ and up-to-date evidence of when the capacity is likely to be realised thereafter (most of which will be on large, complex site allocations, some requiring significant infrastructure improvements).
45. However, the specific figures in the target range and stepped trajectory in the submitted Plan are not justified as they do not include the London Plan target to 2029; are not based on the most up-to-date evidence; and they do not look ahead at least 15 years following adoption as required by national planning policy.
46. The London Plan sets a target of 47,600 homes in Newham between 2019 to 2029²¹ or an average of 4,760 per year.

¹⁸ PPG ID: 68-027-20190722.

¹⁹ PPG ID: 68-021-20190722.

²⁰ London Plan policy H1 part A states that Table 4.1 sets the ten-year targets for net housing completions that each local planning authority should plan for and that Boroughs must include these targets in their development plan documents.

²¹ Including 14,800 homes in the part of the London Legacy Development Corporation that is in Newham.

47. The Council's latest comprehensive housing land supply evidence relates to 1 April 2025²². This evidence includes up-to-date information from planning permissions and proportionate, design-led capacity testing of allocations²³ along with other information referred to in paragraph 3.174 of the Plan summarised above. I consider the individual components of the identified land supply later in this report, but in summary I am satisfied that the evidence is adequate, proportionate, up-to-date and consistent with the London Plan and national planning policy guidance.
48. This latest evidence identifies total capacity for 52,612 to 57,870 homes between 2025 and 2042 of which 45,611 to 53,954 are expected to be delivered between 2027 and 2042 (the 15 years following adoption).
49. To reflect the above, policy H1 needs to be modified **[MM49]** to set a target of 45,611 to 53,954 homes between 2027 and 2042 and a stepped trajectory that includes the London Plan target up to 2029 and capacity-based annual figures for the remaining periods to 2042:
- Phase 1a 2027-2029 4,760 homes per year
 - Phase 1b 2029-2032 2,542 homes per year
 - Phase 2 2032-2037 2,631 homes per year
 - Phase 3 2037-2042 3,062 homes per year
50. The reasoned justification needs to be modified **[MM50]** to reflect the above, provide information about expected delivery from different sources over the plan period and also to state that:
- The London Plan target also applies up to 2027 (for the avoidance of doubt, as the modified Plan targets look ahead from adoption as expected by national policy).
 - There has been a shortfall in delivery against the London Plan target of 10,966 homes between 2019 to 2025 and that the trajected completion figures indicate that the shortfall from 2019 is expected to increase to a total of 16,570 by 2027.
 - The five year requirement will be calculated using the relevant annual rates in the stepped trajectory which are based on the lower end of the target range²⁴.

²² EWS026a (November 2025), ED7 to ED9 (November 2025) and ED18 (December 2025).

²³ Newham Characterisation Study 2024 and Tall Building Annex 2024 [EB8 to EB27].

²⁴ PPG ID: 68-026 and 027-20190722.

51. The implementation text H1.1 needs to be modified to clarify that net non-self-contained accommodation counts towards meeting the housing targets based on the ratios in relevant policies in the Plan or London Plan [MM51].
52. The modifications I have described above to policy H1 and associated reasoned justification and implementation text are necessary to ensure that the Plan includes a justified and effective housing requirement that is consistent with the London Plan and national planning policy.

Industrial floorspace requirement

53. Paragraph 3.1 and policy J1 refer to a need to deliver 335,000 sqm of industrial floorspace up to 2038. This is based on past trends in job delivery, rather than past changes in the amount of industrial floorspace or sectoral economic forecasts both of which would be likely to underestimate future requirements. To be consistent with national policy and reflect the up-to-date evidence, the requirement needs to be modified to 418,000 sqm between 2021 and 2042 [MM44]. Table 12, summarising the need for and supply of industrial floorspace needs to be modified accordingly [MM45].

Office floorspace requirement

54. Paragraph 3.1 and policy J1 refer to a need for 90,000 sqm of office floorspace up to 2038. This is based on economic forecasts and represents the most positive assessment of potential future need. To be consistent with the approach taken to industrial development and to reflect the up-to-date evidence, the requirement needs to be modified to 105,000 sqm between 2021 and 2042 [MM44]. Table 11, summarising the need for and supply of office floorspace, needs to be modified accordingly [MM45].

Retail floorspace requirement

55. Paragraph 3.1 in the Plan refers to an identified need for an additional 25,973 sqm of retail floorspace to 2038. This is justified by the Retail and Leisure Study²⁵ and consistent with national policy which expects local plans to identify the amount of retail development that is likely to be needed looking at least ten years ahead.

²⁵ ED29 and ED30.

Conclusion

56. Subject to the main modifications described above, the amounts of housing, industrial, office and retail development that the Plan identifies as being needed are justified and consistent with the London Plan and national policy.

Issue 3 – Does the Plan set out an appropriate spatial strategy for Newham, taking into account reasonable alternatives, in the context of the London Plan?

Reasonable alternative spatial strategies

57. The Council identified and appraised four alternative spatial strategies during the preparation of the Plan:
- Continuing the approach set out in the adopted local plan.
 - Directing significant levels of high-density growth to all neighbourhoods.
 - Directing significant levels of growth to the metropolitan centre of Stratford and three Opportunity Areas identified in the London Plan.
 - The spatial strategy set out in the submitted Plan as expressed in policy BFN1 and other relevant part 1 policies, particularly D3 and D4, and the neighbourhood and site allocation policies in part 2 of the Plan (which I consider under main issue 4 below).
58. I have no reason to conclude that any of those options were not reasonable for the purposes of sustainability appraisal, or that any other patently reasonable spatial strategies for the borough were overlooked.

Neighbourhoods

59. The Plan's spatial strategy is structured around 17 defined neighbourhoods based on the Newham Characterisation Study 2024²⁶ (which contains detailed analysis of the historic development, functional character, urban morphology, socio economic characteristics, and opportunities for change in all parts of the borough) as well as public engagement and feedback. The spatial strategy aims to ensure that each neighbourhood is well connected, accessible and inclusive, providing social, civic and economic essentials often within 15 minutes' walk or cycle.

Policy BFN1

60. Policy BFN1 part 1 directs significant levels of growth to:

²⁶ EB008 to EB022.

- Six neighbourhoods (N1, N2, N3, N4, N5 and N17) in the Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area.
 - Two neighbourhoods (N6 and N7) in the Poplar Riverside Opportunity Area.
 - The N8 Stratford and Maryland neighbourhood in the Olympic Legacy Opportunity Area.
61. Policy BFN1 part 2 expects development to make best use of land in all parts of the borough; supports tall buildings in tall building zones (TBZs), most of which are in the three Opportunity Areas; and supports incremental change in the neighbourhoods outside the Opportunity Areas (N9 to N16).

Transform, enhance and conserve areas

62. Policy D3 sets out design-led approaches to optimising site capacity in the different parts of the borough which are identified as either transform, enhance or conserve areas. The transform areas are concentrated in the nine neighbourhoods in the three Opportunity Areas, whereas most of the built-up parts of the other eight neighbourhoods are identified as enhance areas within which modest uplifts in density are expected. The conserve areas include designated conservation areas, areas of special townscape value, and the settings of listed buildings.
63. For clarity, and therefore effectiveness, the transform, enhance and conserve areas need to be identified on the neighbourhoods map in part 2 of the Plan [MM93].

Tall buildings

64. Policy D4 states that tall buildings, defined as those at or over 21 metres in height, will only be acceptable, subject to design and masterplanning considerations, in the 22 designated TBZs listed in Table 1, indicated on a map in part 1 of the Plan, and designated on the policies map. For each TBZ, Table 1 sets out maximum height ranges (up to 32, 40, 50, 60, and 100 metres) along with further guidance and prevailing height ranges within each area.
65. This is based on the Newham Characterisation Study and, in particular, the Tall Buildings Annex 2024 which sets out detailed analysis of existing and emerging tall buildings in and around the borough along with wider townscape and other considerations²⁷. The Study identified the TBZs based on that analysis, public transport accessibility levels, and the Plan's emerging spatial strategy including the transform areas, site allocations, and town and local centres.
66. In most respects the approach set out in policy D4 is justified and consistent with London Plan policy D9 which expects local plans to define tall buildings (no less than 18 metres in height) and identify specific locations where they may be

²⁷ EB023 to EB027.

an appropriate form of development. Some of the building heights in policy D4 differ from those in the existing adopted plan. However that, in principle, is justified by the proportionate and up-to-date evidence referred to above. The inclusion of TBZ2 Green Street is consistent with that evidence and the approach taken elsewhere in the borough due to it being within a district centre and highly accessible by public transport.

67. However, setting maximum heights within TBZs, and not allowing any tall buildings outside those defined areas, represents an inflexible approach that is at odds with policies BFN1, BFN2 and D1 which require a design-led approach that responds to site character and context, makes best use of land and optimises capacity. Furthermore, there is evidence that has become available since 2024 about emerging character and evolving context²⁸, including from planning permissions and applications, that suggests taller buildings may be appropriate within some TBZs than allowed by the Plan, and in some other locations.
68. As submitted, therefore, policy D4 is not justified, nor will it be effective in helping to deliver the spatial strategy. Policy D4 therefore needs to be modified **[MM17 to MM19]** to:
- Clarify that tall buildings must contribute positively to a coherent townscape and skyline by reflecting the borough-wide spatial strategy:
 - focussing the tallest buildings in the Stratford Central, Canning Town and West Ham Station TBZs;
 - ensuring a sensitive transition from those highest clusters;
 - supporting densification in Opportunity Areas which aim to improve public transport accessibility;
 - managing heights to take account of sensitive contexts and London City Airport;
 - marking key locations in town and local centres with high accessibility to public transport; and
 - supporting industrial intensification in strategic industrial locations.
 - Refer to "appropriate" rather than "maximum" heights, and in the further guidance column replace "up to" with "approximately" and express prevailing heights as being "generally" within the stated range.
 - Amend the boundaries of, and increase the heights referred to in, some of the TBZs. I have amended the TBZ11 height referred to in MM18 published for consultation to correct an error and ensure consistency with allocation policy N2.SA2 as modified.

²⁸ London Plan paragraphs 3.9.2 and 3.9.3.

- Allow tall buildings outside TBZs in certain defined circumstances, consistent with the borough-wide spatial strategy.
69. I have amended the modification to policy D4 part 2 published for consultation [MM17] to refer to developments being "broadly" consistent with the appropriate heights set out in Table 1. This is to avoid an unjustified and ineffective degree of prescription (as "consistent with" could be interpreted as meaning "equal to" the specified heights).
70. The reasoned justification and the TBZ map in the Plan need to be modified to reflect the modifications to policy D4 [MM20 and MM21], as does the policies map. Consequential changes are required to policy BFN1 part 2(b) [MM4] and the site allocation policies to ensure that they are consistent with the modifications to policy D4 (the latter are identified under main issue 4).
71. These modifications ensure that the Plan sets out a justified approach to tall building developments that will be effective in optimising site capacity, delivering transformation, and accommodating significant amounts of development in appropriate parts of the borough in a way that contributes positively to a coherent townscape and skyline.
72. I have considered all of the suggestions about the tall building zones and heights made in response to the main modifications consultation and do not consider that any further changes need to be made in response to those to ensure that the Plan is sound.
73. Subject to the modifications I have described above, the Plan sets out an effective and justified three-dimensional spatial strategy by identifying different parts of the borough for transformation, enhancement or conservation, and setting out a clear approach for accommodating tall buildings of different heights in particular locations. This is consistent with the London Plan and national policy which states that where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that developments make optimal use of site potential.

Conclusion

74. Subject to the main modifications set out above and elsewhere in this report, including to the neighbourhood and site allocation policies in part 2 of the Plan, I am satisfied that the Plan sets out an appropriate spatial strategy for Newham, taking into account reasonable alternatives, in the context of the London Plan.

Issue 4 – Are the neighbourhood policies and site allocation policies in part 2 of the Plan justified and do they provide an effective framework for preparing and determining planning applications in the context of the Plan's borough-wide three-dimensional spatial strategy?

75. Part 2 of the Plan sets out a vision and policy for each of the 17 neighbourhoods in the borough based on the findings of the Newham Characterisation Study 2024 and the overall spatial strategy. Detailed policies are also set out for each of the 45 site allocations, containing development principles, design principles, infrastructure requirements and guidance on phasing and implementation. Each allocation is accompanied by a map indicating the site's context and key elements of the potential layout of development.

Soundness issues relating to all or some neighbourhood policies and site allocation policies

76. In most respects, the neighbourhood and site allocation policies and supporting information are justified by the evidence and provide an effective, detailed framework for preparing and determining planning applications in all parts of the borough and specifically on the site allocations within the context of the Plan's three-dimensional spatial strategy. However, a number of main modifications are required to relevant policies and the reasoned justification in part 2 of the Plan to ensure that is so:

- Clarify which sections of each neighbourhood chapter are policies, rather than reasoned justification or other supporting information [MM3].
- Indicate the transform, enhance and conserve areas referred to in policies on the neighbourhoods map and refer to these in paragraph 4.3 [MM93 and MM94].
- Clarify in paragraph 4.3 that site allocation policies will be applied flexibly in the determination of planning applications based on up-to-date assessments of need and viability in the context of relevant part 1 policies [MM94].
- Amend the title of each site map to "indicative diagram". Include text to explain that they illustrate how the policy principles and requirements might be implemented whilst recognising that this will be determined through co-designed masterplanning in accordance with policy BFN2 which may demonstrate that an alternative layout could deliver outcomes consistent with the allocation policy and other policies in the Plan [MM92 and MM94].
- Amend the key to the site maps (indicative diagrams) to clarify whether the "sensitive edge" identified for each allocation is due to nearby heritage

assets, low rise context, pollution and/or infrastructure [**MM100, MM103, MM106, MM109, MM112, MM120, MM124, MM127, MM129, MM130, MM138, MM140, MM141, MM143, MM147, MM150, MM155, MM158, MM161, MM163, MM165, MM167, MM169, MM178, MM180, MM181, MM183, MM184, MM186, MM189, MM193, MM196, MM197, MM201, MM210, MM211 and MM212**].

- Amend references to tall building heights, to be consistent with the modifications to policy D4 [**MM96, MM110, MM116, MM132, MM134, MM145, MM152, MM156, MM164, MM171, MM175 and MM177**].
- Change "open space" to "green space" and "2038" to "plan period" and refer where relevant to policies GWS1, GWS2 and/or GWS3, to be consistent with part 1 of the Plan [**MM95, MM98 and MM174**].
- For neighbourhoods containing or adjoining the docks (N1, N2, and N3) add reference in the neighbourhood policy to protecting and enhancing the quality of the docks and access to them, and to supporting suitably located and scaled waterfront amenities, including moored vessels [**MM99, MM104 and MM123**].
- For allocations adjoining a dock or river, add reference to tall buildings being set back from water spaces to avoid or minimise overshadowing and further justification to ensure consistency with policy D4 [**MM97**].
- Where relevant, amend neighbourhood policies to refer to developments addressing airport height constraints in line with policy T5 [**MM99, MM104, MM123, MM126, MM137 and MM215**].
- Where relevant, amend neighbourhood policies to refer to the provision of appropriate mitigation and buffering between residential and industrial uses [**MM104, MM126 and MM187**].
- For relevant allocations, refer to existing overhead transmission lines [**MM118, MM188, MM190, MM191, MM199 and MM203**].
- For relevant allocations, clarify that the requirement for an automated vacuum waste collection system is subject to viability [**MM107, MM113, MM117, MM148 and MM222**].
- For relevant allocations, amend the phasing and implementation timing (short, medium or long term) to reflect the latest housing trajectory and other available evidence [**MM102, MM114, MM125, MM136, MM139, MM153, MM157, MM162, MM168, MM173, MM176, MM179, MM185 and MM192**].

77. Those and other relevant modifications, collectively, will ensure that the Plan as a whole provides a clear but flexible, and therefore effective, framework to facilitate a viable form of development on each site allocation. They will allow site specific requirements relating to matters such as the provision of green and play spaces, schools and other social infrastructure, and protection of SINCS, to be addressed thoroughly through co-designed masterplanning and the preparation and assessment of planning applications. The modified indicative diagrams provide useful information about how the allocations - many of which are large, complex sites that will be delivered in phases - could be developed in a coordinated and comprehensive way whilst providing an appropriate level of flexibility.
78. I have deleted modifications MM108, MM111, MM128, MM131, MM133, MM142, MM149, MM166, MM205 and MM213 published for consultation. That is because the requirements relating to waste water infrastructure for those site allocations are justified and should be retained in the Plan for effectiveness.

Other soundness issues relating to specific neighbourhood policies and site allocation policies

79. In addition to the above, there are a number of matters that I need to address in relation to the following neighbourhood policies and site allocation policies.

N1.SA1 North Woolwich Gateway

80. Policy N1.SA1 needs to refer to the provision of bus stops and stands on Pier Road to reflect the latest evidence and to be effective **[MM101]**.

N2.SA1 Silvertown Quays

81. This is a large site expected to deliver around 4,500 homes by 2042 along with employment uses and an extension to the existing Silvertown local centre on North Woolwich Road. In order to ensure the development helps support the visitor economy in this part of the borough (as well as serve the increased number of local residents), the local centre defined on the indicative diagram and policies map needs to be extended across the site to the Royal Victoria Dock which will be crossed by a new bridge to Custom House **[MM105]**. This will ensure the allocation policy is consistent with policy HS1, the Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area Planning Framework, and the Council's latest evidence²⁹. The requirement relating to improvements to Pontoon Dock Station needs to be modified to be justified and effective **[MM107]**.

²⁹ ED025 Town Centre Network Review Methodology Paper January 2026.

N2.SA2 Lyle Park West

82. This site is expected to deliver around 800 homes, employment uses, social infrastructure, green space and a neighbourhood parade on North Woolwich Road close to Silvertown DLR station. The modifications described above and elsewhere in this report - including in relation to the indicative site diagrams, relationship between allocation policies and part 1 policies, and co-designed masterplanning - will ensure that the proposal can be effectively implemented having regard to the height of tall buildings, industrial buffering with the factory on Knights Road, the location of main town centre uses, and the provision of green space and play space (including through an extension to Lyle Park which is a justified requirement as it will ensure that future residents have access to a useable, high quality facility).

N2.SA4 Thameside West

83. This site is expected to deliver around 5,000 homes, a new local centre, social infrastructure, green space and a new DLR station. Whilst the proposal will involve the redevelopment of some existing employment uses on the site, the extent of the SIL shown on the indicative site diagram and policies map is justified as replacement provision within the site is not expected to be made until the 2030s (when a revised boundary can be established as appropriate). For effectiveness, a modification is required to clarify that there should be no net loss of industrial floorspace and the function of the SIL should be protected having regard to policy J3 [MM115].

N2.SA5 Excel Western Entrance

84. Policy N2.SA5, and the indicative site diagram, need to be modified to clarify the requirement relating to the existing Royal Victoria Square, the extent of the existing public open space, and the proposed green space provision as part of the proposed development [MM119, MM121 and MM122]. This will ensure the policy is justified, effective and consistent with the London Plan policy G4 size guidelines for public open space.

N4.SA4 Limmo

85. This 6.7 hectare site is expected to deliver around 700 homes, a minimum of 2 hectares of green space, and a new pedestrian bridge. Given the relatively isolated nature of the site and the shortage of existing green space, the requirements for a bridge and a reasonably-sized, useable public park (consistent with London Plan policy G4 size guidelines for public open space) to be provided within the allocation are justified. The modifications described elsewhere in this report - including in relation to policies BFN2, BFN4, D4 and

GWS1 - mean that there is a realistic prospect of the proposed development and essential infrastructure being viably delivered.

N4.SA5 Canning Town Riverside

86. Policy N4.SA5 needs to be modified to clarify the requirement relating to the river wall [MM135]. This will ensure the policy is justified and effective.

N7.SA1 Abbey Mills

87. Policy N7.SA1 relates to a 7 hectare site that includes a large existing building (currently used as a mosque without planning permission), open space and vacant land. Residential development along with the provision of open space and community facilities are proposed. To the south, beyond a railway line, lies allocation N7.SA2 and to the west is the Three Mills Conservation Area and grade I and II listed buildings.
88. The policy needs to be modified to clarify that the community facilities to be provided on the site should include a mosque to replace the temporary use in the existing building as the Council's evidence indicates a shortage of facilities for Islamic worship in this part of the borough³⁰ [MM144]. Furthermore, the reference to the replacement having "equivalent floorspace" should be deleted. That is because the scale of the new mosque, and other community facilities, should be determined through masterplanning and the planning application process in the context of policies SI1, SI2 and SI3 (which are subject to modifications described later in this report) [MM144].
89. Similarly, the references to the mosque and other community facilities being located in the south east of the site close to West Ham station and as part of the new Twelvetreelocal centre to be provided on the adjoining allocation N7.SA2 should be deleted as that can be determined through the same process in the context of relevant part 1 policies [MM144 and MM145].
90. The inclusion of the south east part of the site within the local centre designation on the indicative diagram is justified as that, along with improvements to the pedestrian bridge to West Ham station and a new pedestrian route under or over the railway to the adjoining allocation, would help ensure the proposal forms part of a comprehensive, well-connected development. That said, if for practical or financial reasons the latter route could not be provided, the two allocation policies, along with part 1 policies, would provide an effective framework for securing an alternative form of development. To ensure effectiveness, the infrastructure requirement needs to refer to the applicant engaging with TfL and National Rail to see if land is required to enable the

³⁰ EB044 page 111.

station upgrades [MM145 and MM146]. I have amended those modifications published for consultation to remove repetitive wording about the route to and from West Ham station and to clarify the requirement for consultation.

91. The requirement for the provision of a local park with a minimum area of 2 hectares is justified given the existing shortage of green space and the need to provide a high quality, useable facility for future residents consistent with London Plan policy G4 size guidelines for public open space.
92. Subject to the above, and modifications to policies described elsewhere in this report, including in relation to tall buildings and clarification of sensitive context, there is a reasonable prospect that the site can be viably developed for at least 600 homes by 2042. The modified policies provide an effective framework to determine an appropriate form of development, including with regard to building heights and ensuring a managed transition across the site from the tallest buildings near the station to lower buildings close to the sensitive edge with designated heritage assets.

N7.SA2 Twelvetreets Park and former Bromley by Bow Gasworks

93. The extent of the SINC on allocation N7.SA2 as defined on the policies map is justified by up-to-date, adequate and proportionate evidence³¹. How biodiversity net gain is achieved, and how the SINC and listed gasholders are incorporated into a viable form of development, can be satisfactorily addressed through the masterplanning and planning application processes in the context of relevant part 1 policies including BFN2, BFN4, GWS3 and D7 as well as policy N7.SA2. It is not, therefore, necessary for soundness to modify the allocation policy to include an additional requirement referring to an assessment of, and viable strategy for, the gasholders similar to that in the adopted plan.

N7.SA3 Sugar House Island

94. The extent of the proposed local centre shown on the indicative site diagram and policies map needs to be modified to reflect the Council's latest evidence³² [MM151].

N8 Stratford and Maryland

³¹ EB070 Newham SINC Review April 2025 Update, London Wildlife Trust.

³² ED025 Town Centre Network Review Methodology Paper January 2026.

95. Neighbourhood policy N8 needs to be modified to refer to SIL in part 10, and to the provision of health care facilities on allocation N8.SA3 Greater Carpenters District [MM154]. This will ensure the policy is justified and effective.
96. Policy N8 part 4b supports the role of Stratford town centre as an area of 24 hour cultural, leisure and tourism activity of regional significance including through the provision of visitor accommodation. This is consistent with policy HS8 (which I consider under main issue 8) and London Plan policy E10. It is not, therefore, necessary to modify policy N8 to support hotel developments elsewhere in the neighbourhood despite it being within the Olympics Legacy Opportunity Area.

N8.SA2 Stratford Station

97. Policy N8.SA2 needs to be modified to clarify that the mixed use development within the allocation is separate from the redevelopment of the station entrance and ticket hall [MM159], and to delete reference to the decked street south of the station [MM160]. This will ensure that the policy is justified and effective.

N8.SA7 Rick Roberts Way

98. Policy N8.SA7 needs to be modified to clarify the requirements relating to existing sports and recreation uses on the site and the provision of green space including a Small Open Space of at least 1.2 hectares and a multi-use games area [MM170 and MM172]. This will ensure that the policy is justified, effective and consistent with London Plan policy G4 size guidelines for public open space.

N8.SA8 Bridgewater Road

99. The extent of the SINC on allocation N8.SA8 as defined on the policies map is justified by up-to-date, adequate and proportionate evidence³³. How biodiversity net gain is achieved, and how the SINC is incorporated into the development, can be satisfactorily addressed through the masterplanning and planning application processes in the context of policies BFN2 and GWS3.

N10.SA2 Newham Sixth Form College

100. The reference to Newham Sixth Form College playing fields in the list of natural environment designations in the site information table needs to be deleted to be consistent with policy GWS1 [MM182].

³³ EB070 Newham SINC Review April 2025 Update, London Wildlife Trust.

N11 Beckton

101. Neighbourhood policy N11 needs to be modified to clarify that odour impacts need to be mitigated ahead of the occupation of developments in the vicinity of the sewage treatment works [MM187]. This will ensure the policy is effective.

N11.SA3 Alpine Way

102. Policy N11.SA3 needs to be modified to clarify that odour impacts from the sewage treatment works need to be minimised and mitigated ahead of the occupation of the developments and that phasing of the site will need to take account of water supply upgrades [MM194 and MM195]. This will ensure the policy is effective.

N13.SA3 East Ham Gasworks

103. This allocation relates to a 10.3 hectare site comprising a former gasholder and open space including a disused sports pitch currently inaccessible to the public. Policy N13.SA3 proposes residential, open space and community facility uses, and states that development should take place on the part of the site outside the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) which is defined on the policies map and indicated on the site map / indicative diagram.
104. The Council's capacity study indicates that the allocation could accommodate around 250 homes. Based on that, the Council's viability evidence indicates that the development meeting all policy requirements would generate a substantial negative residual land value and would only become viable with the provision of 15% affordable housing. The site promoter's evidence identifies significant site constraints that suggest that development consistent with policy N13.SA3 and other relevant policies would deliver fewer than 200 homes. Furthermore, that evidence also indicates there would be significant abnormal costs (not factored into the Council's viability assessment) meaning that such development would not be viable.
105. The allocation is not within an area identified in the Plan as being suitable for tall buildings, and the existing MOL boundary limits the developable area. Policy N13.SA3 is not, therefore, justified or effective as it is unlikely to allow a form of development which has a reasonable prospect of being viable during the plan period due to the policy restrictions on developable area and building heights which effectively limit site capacity and therefore development value.
106. Modifying the Plan to allow tall buildings on the allocation, and thereby increase capacity and improve viability, would be inconsistent with the borough-wide

three-dimensional spatial strategy and policy D4 (as modified) that I considered under main issue 3.

107. Removing an area of around 1.8 hectares of land within the allocation from the MOL designation would increase the developable area and thereby facilitate a viable form of development consistent with policy N13.SA3, potentially including around 600 homes³⁴. The area de-designated as MOL would be contained between the gasholder to the north and roads lined with built development to the south and west. A significant area of MOL (6.7 hectares) would remain within the allocation to the north and east of the gasholder. The retained MOL would continue to form part of a linear pattern of adjoining parcels of MOL along the borough's eastern boundary.

108. I am satisfied that there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of 1.8 hectares of MOL as required by London Plan policy G3 because:

- There is not a reasonable prospect that policy N13.SA3 in the submitted Plan will be delivered with the MOL boundary unchanged.
- The delivery of a substantial number of new homes on the site would make a significant contribution to meeting housing needs, including affordable homes.
- In addition to new homes, policy N13.SA3 would deliver significant public benefits including remediation works, ecological improvements, and provision of publicly accessible green space, play space and sports facilities in a part of the borough with significant shortages.
- The remaining MOL on the site would be clearly distinguishable from the built-up area and form part of a strategic corridor in the network of green infrastructure on the eastern edge of the borough in accordance with London Plan policy G3 part B.

109. I therefore recommend that the indicative site diagram for allocation N13.SA3 be modified to remove 1.8 hectares of MOL and to ensure that the green space designation accurately reflects the extent of previously developed land [MM200]. The policies map needs to be changed accordingly. Policy N13.SA3 also needs to be modified to require development outside of the retained MOL to be limited to the minimum necessary to remediate the site, protect the openness of the retained MOL, and deliver significant improvements to the quality, accessibility, recreational value and ecological value of the retained MOL [MM202 and MM204]. A modification is also required to refer to a site

³⁴ St William Homes oral evidence at the hearing session on 4 February 2026.

specific flood risk assessment taking account of Environment Agency flood risk modelling of the River Roding [**MM198**].

110. Subject to those modifications, policy N13.SA1 along with other policies in the Plan including BFN2, BFN4, GWS1 and GWS3 provide an appropriate framework for facilitating a viable form of development including new homes, community facilities, the provision of high quality, publicly assessable greenspace, and the re-provision and enhancement of SINC, the existing defined extent of which is justified by up-to-date, adequate and proportionate evidence³⁵.

N14 Green Street

111. Green Street district centre is at the heart of neighbourhood N14 and is identified in policy HS1 as meeting local needs for retail, leisure, services and community uses and serving as a specialist retail visitor destination. The neighbourhood vision and policy N14 need to be modified to better reflect the valuable contribution that Queen's Market and the adjoining small shops play within the district centre in both those respects by providing affordable, diverse and culturally significant food, goods and services [**MM206**, **MM207** and **MM208**]. Those modifications, along with modifications to policy HS4 which I consider under main issue 8, should ensure that the Plan is effective in safeguarding the social and economic value of the market. This is particularly important as the market forms part of a tall building zone and could be affected by development proposals brought forward during the plan period.
112. A modification is required to N14.SA1 Shrewsbury Road Health Complex to refer to Green Street rather than East Ham, to correct a factual error [**MM209**].

N15.SA2 Woodgrange Road West

113. Policy N15.SA2 needs to be modified to delete the requirement relating to phasing and wastewater infrastructure upgrades as that is not necessary or justified [**MM213**]

N17 Gallions Reach

114. The Gallions Reach neighbourhood is mainly industrial and commercial in character and contains the out of centre Gallions Reach Shopping Park, extensive areas of SIL and the large Beckton sewage treatment works. Housing and a new local centre are being developed around the DLR station in the south

³⁵ EB070 Newham SINC Review April 2025 Update, London Wildlife Trust.

of the neighbourhood. Much of the neighbourhood away from the DLR station has poor public transport accessibility.

115. Policy N17 aims to transform Gallions Reach into a new neighbourhood - with a large number of new homes, new and intensified employment uses, and the creation of a new town centre and neighbourhood parade - through the delivery of an extended DLR line and a new DLR station.
116. The neighbourhood vision and policy N17 need to be modified to clarify that the transformative development of the area will be phased and supported by the delivery of the DLR extension and new station along with other complementary transport measures (including a Lower Roding crossing). The references to a similarly transformative public transport improvement as an alternative to the DLR extension and to the Thames Gateway Bridge Safeguarding need to be deleted. These changes [MM214 and MM215] reflect up to date evidence from Transport for London and ensure that the policy is justified and effective.
117. A modification is required to policy N17 to clarify that odour impacts need to be mitigated ahead of the occupation of developments in the vicinity of the sewage treatment works [MM215]. This will ensure the policy is effective.
118. Policy N17 also needs to be modified with regard to the phased reconfiguration of Gallions Reach Shopping Park into a new town centre to be consistent with the modifications to allocation policy N17.SA1 as set out below and policy HS1 (dealt with under main issue 8) [MM215].

N17.SA1 Beckton Riverside

119. The Beckton Riverside allocation is an 85 hectare site comprising the existing Gallions Reach Shopping Park, the Beckton DLR depot, a disused gas works, industrial uses designated as SIL, and areas of greenspace including designated SINC (the extent of which is justified by up-to-date, adequate and proportionate evidence³⁶).
120. Policy N17.SA1 proposes large scale mixed use development, with estimated capacity for between around 3,200 and 7,400 homes, served by the DLR extension and new station within the site. The allocation would also accommodate a new district level town centre through reconfiguring the existing Gallions Reach Shopping Park in accordance with policy HS1.
121. However, it is not clear in the submitted Plan how the transformative mixed use development would be coordinated with the delivery of the major public transport improvements required, nor how a new town centre would be created

³⁶ EB070 Newham SINC Review April 2025 Update, London Wildlife Trust.

or how this would relate to the existing Shopping Park in the short, medium and long term. Modifications are therefore required to policy N17.SA1, the indicative site diagram and to policy HS1 part 2 and implementation text HS1.2 (as described later in this report under main issue 8).

122. The modified indicative site diagram for N17.SA1 illustrates the location of the proposed district centre comprising the eastern part of the existing Shopping Park along with adjoining land to the south. The new DLR station is indicated within the centre, and an indicative route for the extended line shown from the existing Gallions Reach DLR station to the south and continuing to the site's eastern boundary with the river [**MM219**].

123. The modifications to policy N17.SA1 [**MM220** to **MM223**]:

- Refer to a new DLR station and track crossing the river in accordance with policy T1 part 1c which requires development to support the delivery of and safeguard land for strategic transport schemes (and delete references to the land safeguarded for a river crossing by the Secretary of State).
- Clarify that development should be phased to maximise transport connectivity and capacity.
- Require development of main town centre uses at the Shopping Park (other than that required for asset management) to deliver significant phased reductions in car parking and support complementary transport measures ahead of the DLR station.
- Clarify that transformative development of the site (other than the southern part within easy walking distance of the existing DLR station) is dependent on a funding commitment to the DLR extension and masterplanning.
- Refer to the new town centre being based on the area shown on the indicative site diagram and being phased to take account of information about how early phases will be located and managed alongside the existing Shopping Park and DLR extension.
- Clarify that the buffer between residential uses and SIL, including the sewage treatment works, should comprise well-designed and suitably-scaled employment or main town centre uses. I have amended the reference in MM221 published for consultation to the existing retail warehouses potentially acting as a buffer as that is unnecessarily specific and would pre-empt the masterplanning process.
- Clarify the requirements relating to the proposed health centre, secondary school, primary school and early years provision in terms of their phasing in relation to the DLR extension.

124. Those modifications, along with modifications to the site information [**MM216** to **MM218**], are based on up-to-date, adequate and proportionate evidence from the Council, GLA, TfL and the site promoters, including that provided during the examination. That evidence indicates that the DLR extension is expected to be delivered in the early 2030s which means that the trajectory for the site is realistic. The modifications ensure that the allocation policy is justified and effective.

Site allocation capacities

125. The allocation policies specify the types of development proposed on each site (residential, employment, community facilities, etc) but not the number of homes or amount of floorspace. Whilst there is evidence about potential capacity for every allocation - based on detailed, systematic site specific assessments carried out by the Council and, in many cases, planning permissions or applications - this shows that the amount of development on many sites could vary significantly depending on the design, layout and mix of uses³⁷. Setting a capacity figure in the Plan would not, therefore, be justified or effective as it could be misleading and prevent good quality design and making most efficient use of land on any particular site as required by policies BFN1 part 2, BFN2 and D3 and London Plan policies D1 and D3.
126. The individual site assessments and information from planning applications and permissions do, however, provide evidence to make informed judgements about the overall amount of housing, employment and other development that the allocations are collectively likely to accommodate which I return to under subsequent main issues.

Conclusion

127. Subject to the main modifications described above, the neighbourhood policies and site allocation policies in part 2 of the Plan are justified and they will provide an effective framework for preparing and determining planning applications in the context of the Plan's borough-wide three-dimensional spatial strategy.

Issue 5 – Does the Plan identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites to ensure that the housing targets in policy H1 can be met?

Introduction

128. Under main issue 1 earlier in this report, I referred to the Council's housing land supply evidence in relation to the Plan's housing targets as they are capacity-

³⁷ Site Capacity Study Summary parts 1 and 2 [ED003a and ED003b] and housing land supply pro formas [ED008].

based, and under main issue 4 above I considered each of the site allocations. Under this main issue I bring together each of the individual components that make up the identified housing land supply.

129. The submitted Plan identifies a land supply with capacity for between 51,425 and 53,784 homes between 2023 and 2038. However, for the reasons set out under main issue 1, it is necessary to modify the Plan so that its housing targets and supply cover the period 2027 to 2042 (the 15 years following adoption as required by national policy) and reflect the latest evidence.

130. The Council’s up-to-date housing trajectory and evidence based on comprehensive information relating to 1 April 2025³⁸ identifies total capacity for up to 53,954 homes between 2027 and 2042. That supply is made up of the following components:

• Allocations	42,136
• Small sites	5,700
• Windfalls	3,328
• Permissions and resolutions to grant on sites not allocated	2,790
• Total	53,954

131. I look firstly at these components of supply for the period 2027 to 2042, and then for 2027 to 2032 as that is the period that national policy expects a sufficient supply of “deliverable” sites to be identified for.

Housing land supply 2027 to 2042

Site allocations

132. I concluded under main issue 4 that, subject to the main modifications that I described, all of the allocation policies are justified and provide an effective framework for facilitating development in a way that optimises capacity on each site.

133. In total, the allocations are expected to deliver up to 42,136 homes between 2027 and 2042 based on the robust evidence of capacity and delivery that I referred to above³⁹. The assumptions about start dates, phasing and build rates (around 500 homes per year on some sites) are not unduly optimistic being

³⁸ EWS026a (November 2025), ED7 to ED9 (November 2025) and ED18 (December 2025).

³⁹ Site Capacity Study Summary parts 1 and 2 [ED003a and ED003b] and housing land supply pro formas [ED008].

based on developer intentions, past experience in the borough and elsewhere in London, and current initiatives to boost delivery, including by the GLA. Development on some of the allocations is underway, and others have planning permission or were subject to an application awaiting a decision on 1 April 2025.

134. There is, therefore, a reasonable prospect that up to 42,136 homes will be built on the site allocations between 2027 and 2042.

Sites with permission not allocated in the Plan

135. The Council's up-to-date trajectory indicates that a total of 2,790 homes will be built between 2027 and 2042 on sites that had planning permission or a Council resolution to grant permission on 1 April 2025 that are not allocations in the Plan. It is not necessary to apply a lapse rate to that figure as the Council's evidence indicates that if permissions do lapse in the borough it is invariably the case that a revised scheme is subsequently approved⁴⁰.

136. There is, therefore, a reasonable prospect of 2,790 homes being built between 2027 and 2042 on the identified sites that had planning permission but are not allocations.

Windfalls

137. The Council's up-to-date trajectory includes a total windfall allowance of 9,028 homes between 2027 and 2042. This is made up of a small site annual allowance of 380 homes from 2027, and a total of 3,328 other windfalls between 2037 and 2042. The former is consistent with London Plan policy H2 and Table 4.2, whereas the latter is based on potential sites identified through lapsed permissions and others in the London Plan strategic housing land availability assessment 2017 that may come forward late in the plan period.

138. The overall annual average windfall allowance is around 600 homes. This compares to an average of 580 homes per year having been built on small site and other windfalls between 2014 and 2024⁴¹. It is reasonable to assume that small site windfalls could increase in the future following the publication of Council guidance in 2024⁴².

139. I am, therefore, satisfied that the assumption that a total of around 9,000 homes will be built on windfall sites between 2027 and 2042 is based on compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply having regard to the

⁴⁰ EWS026.

⁴¹ ED004.

⁴² Newham Characterisation Study Small Site Intensification Guidance 2024 [EB022].

strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends.

Conclusion on housing supply 2027 to 2042

140. Adequate, proportionate and up-to-date evidence indicates that there is a reasonable prospect that up to 53,954 homes will be built in the borough between 2027 and 2042. The allocations and other identified sites are located throughout the borough and vary in size and character. That, and the small site allowance, mean that the Plan identifies an appropriate mix of sites as expected by national policy.

Five year housing land requirement and supply 2027 to 2032

141. I consider now whether the Plan identifies a supply of specific, deliverable sites for five years following the intended date of adoption with an appropriate buffer as expected by national policy. It is reasonable to assume that the Plan will be adopted before 31 March 2027 meaning that the relevant five year period is 1 April 2027 to 31 March 2032.

Housing requirement 2027 to 2032

142. For the reasons set out under main issue 1, policy H1 needs to be modified to include the London Plan target between 2027 and 2029 and a capacity-based figure for the remaining three years of the five year period to 2032.
143. Based on the minimum housing requirement⁴³ and stepped trajectory⁴⁴ set out in the proposed modification to policy H1, the five year requirement for the period 1 April 2027 to 31 March 2032 (including a 20% buffer) is 20,575 homes.
144. Whilst this five year requirement does not make an allowance for the predicted shortfall in delivery against the London Plan target between 2019 and 2027 (16,570 homes), it is justified for the purposes of examining the Plan as it includes the annual average London Plan target (4,760) up to 2029 and is based on up-to-date evidence of capacity for 2029 to 2032 (as described above) plus a 20% buffer in accordance with national policy.

Housing land supply 2027 to 2032

145. National planning policy and guidance sets out the type of evidence that should be used to assess whether there is a realistic prospect of sites being built within

⁴³ PPG ID: 68-027-20190722.

⁴⁴ PPG ID: 68-026-20190722.

five years⁴⁵. As referred to above, the most up-to-date housing land supply information relates to 1 April 2025, whereas the five year period does not start until two years after that. This presents some difficulties in conducting that exercise, but it is possible to make an informed judgement based on the Council's trajectory and summary of evidence relating to each individual site assumed to contribute⁴⁶.

146. The Council's latest trajectory referred to above, indicates a total of 22,113 homes being completed between 1 April 2027 to 31 March 2032⁴⁷. This is made up of:

• Sites with detailed planning permission	4,255
• Sites with outline planning permission for 10 or more homes	7,794
• Sites with resolution to grant planning permission	4,062
• Site allocations and small sites without permission	6,002
• Total	22,113

147. As there is not clear evidence to the contrary, the assumption that 4,255 homes will be built on the sites with detailed planning permission is justified.

148. Of the 7,794 homes on sites with outline planning permission, 4,370 have detailed planning permission under hybrid permission or reserved matters. It is, therefore, also reasonable to assume those homes will be built by 2032 as there is not clear evidence to indicate otherwise.

149. The Council's evidence referred to above for the other sites with outline permission or a resolution to grant, and allocations without permission, is robust and up-to-date. I am satisfied that evidence demonstrates there is a realistic prospect that the number of homes assumed for those sites will be delivered between 2027 and 2032. The main exception to that is N2.SA4 Thameside West where the developer considers it more likely that 1,200 rather than 2,500 homes will be built by 2032⁴⁸. On the other hand, subject to the modifications referred to elsewhere in this report, there is a realistic prospect that up to 200 homes could be built on N13.SA3 East Ham Gasworks by 2032⁴⁹.

150. Other than the 380 small site annual allowance, no other homes are assumed on windfall sites between 2027 and 2032. That represents a cautious approach

⁴⁵ NPPF Annex 2 "deliverable" and PPG ID: 68-007-20190722.

⁴⁶ ED8 and ED9 (November 2025).

⁴⁷ ED9.

⁴⁸ Oral evidence on behalf of Silvertown Homes at the hearing session on 4 December 2025.

⁴⁹ Oral evidence on behalf of St William Homes at the hearing session on 20 January 2026.

as it is likely that some larger windfalls will materialise by 2032 that did not have planning permission in 2025.

Conclusion on housing land supply 2027 to 2032

151. Based on the above, I am satisfied that there is a realistic prospect that at least 21,000 homes will be built in the borough between 2027 and 2032. That compares to a minimum requirement of 20,575 homes for that period based on the stepped trajectory in policy H1. As modified, therefore, the Plan identifies a supply of specific, deliverable sites for five years following adoption which is the relevant national policy soundness test⁵⁰. For decision making purposes, the five year requirement and supply will need to be calculated in the context of relevant national policy and evidence at the time.

Modifications

152. To reflect my conclusions above, policy H1, associated reasoned justification and implementation text need to be modified based on the latest evidence relating to housing land supply for the period 2027 to 2042 [MM49 to MM51]. Those modifications will ensure that the Plan is effective, justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan.

Conclusion

153. Subject to the main modifications referred to above, the Plan identifies a sufficient supply and mix of sites to ensure that the housing targets in policy H1 can be met.

Issue 6 – Are policies H2 to H11 justified, consistent with national policy and the London Plan, and will they be effective in helping to ensure that the housing needs of different groups in the community are met?

H2 Protecting and improving existing housing

154. Policy H2 aims to protect, and encourage the improvement of the existing housing stock, including by preventing the loss of residential floorspace and family homes. This is justified given the high level of need in the borough and the limited amount of land for the provision of new homes.

H3 Affordable housing

⁵⁰ NPPF 69(a).

155. Policy H3 states that all developments of ten or more homes must provide at least 50% for social rent and 10% for affordable home ownership unless detailed viability assessment demonstrates that the maximum viable mix will be delivered. Whilst this reflects evidence of need for those types of affordable homes, the overall 60% requirement and the tenure mix are inconsistent with London Plan policies H4, H5 and H6. Furthermore, the Council's viability evidence indicates that those requirements would make most types of development unviable.

156. Policy H3 therefore needs to be modified to refer to a strategic target of 50% of all new homes being affordable and to developments of ten or more homes providing affordable housing in accordance with the London Plan and a tenure mix of 65% social rent and 35% intermediate homes **[MM52]**. This will ensure consistency with the London Plan and, along with other modifications described elsewhere in this report, ensure that there is a realistic prospect that the development proposed in the Plan can be viably delivered. By so doing, the Plan will be effective in maximizing the number of affordable homes that are delivered on market-led development schemes.

H4 Housing mix

157. Policy H4 aims to ensure that all new residential developments deliver a mix and balance of residential types and sizes; this is consistent with national policy and the London Plan. However, the limit on one-bedroom homes needs to be deleted, and the requirements relating to the provision of three- and four-bedroom family homes need to be modified to apply to social rent rather than all homes to reflect the evidence relating to need and viability. Furthermore, for the reasons set out below in relation to policy H10, the evidence referred to in part 1(b) to determine the appropriate mix of residential types and tenures needs to be modified to refer to the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Those modifications **[MM53]** will ensure that the policy is justified and effective.

H5 Build to Rent housing

158. Recent years have seen a significant increase in the private rented sector in the borough. Policy H5 is in most respects consistent with national guidance⁵¹ and London Plan policy H11. However, the requirements relating to the provision of affordable housing, and associated implementation text H5.2 and H5.3, need to be modified to be consistent with the modifications to policy H3 and with the London Plan **[MM54, MM55 and MM56]**.

H6 and H7 Supported and specialist housing

⁵¹ PPG ID:60 (2018).

159. Policies H6 and H7 relate to existing and proposed specialist housing, and support the provision of accommodation for older people including sheltered housing, extra care/assisted living, and care homes. Those policies are justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan

H8 Purpose built student accommodation

160. In recent years, Newham has seen significant amounts of purpose built student accommodation development⁵², particularly within the Stratford and Maryland neighbourhood where over 1,000 bedspaces were built between 2019 and 2025 and a further 6,887 have planning permission or a resolution grant permission⁵³. This represents a relatively high proportion of the total need for purpose built student accommodation in London as identified in the London Plan (35,000 bedspaces between 2019 and 2029). Whilst such developments help meet London's housing needs and reduce pressure to convert existing family homes to student accommodation, they also compete for scarce land in the borough that could be used to provide new family and affordable homes.
161. Therefore, whilst there are around 33,000 students studying in the borough and around 13,000 purpose built student bedspaces, the approach in policy H8 of only allowing further purpose built student accommodation in certain defined circumstances and locations is justified in principle as it reflects the Plan's strategic objective of prioritising the delivery of family homes for social rent, which is the borough's most pressing need, in the context of a limited amount of land available for development.
162. The restriction in part 1 on further purpose built student accommodation in Stratford and Maryland other than in two defined circumstances is justified given the high number of completed and committed schemes and the important role that the neighbourhood has to play in contributing to meeting the housing targets in policy H1. That is the case notwithstanding the significant and growing number of higher education facilities in the neighbourhood.
163. However, a number of modifications are required to policy H8 and associated implementation text [**MM57** and **MM58**) to:
- Clarify that student accommodation in the Stratford and Maryland neighbourhood (and elsewhere) could be located within or adjacent to an approved campus as well as an existing campus.
 - Define what is meant by "campus" and "adjacent to" for the purposes of policy H8 (within 300 metres of a campus).

⁵² 9,384 purpose built student accommodation bedspaces were built or approved in Newham between 2019 and 2025 (Topic Paper 3 Table 1).

⁵³ TP003 Purpose Built Student Accommodation Topic Paper 2025 table 1.

- Delete the requirement for any replacement accommodation in that neighbourhood to have no net increase in bed spaces.
- Replace the phrase "over saturation" with "over concentration" and clarify how that will be assessed spatially using a proportionate, reasonable and consistent methodology.
- Ensure the requirement for the provision of affordable student accommodation is consistent with policy H3 as modified and the London Plan.
- Clarify that ancillary communal space should include exercise space (rather than "sporting facilities").

164. Those modifications will ensure that policy H8 is justified, effective and consistent with the Plan's strategic priorities and London Plan policy H15 and associated guidance⁵⁴ which expects the need for additional purpose built student accommodation to be addressed in the context of creating mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods. The modified policy provides an effective framework for ensuring that further accommodation is located in the most accessible locations well related to higher education facilities.

165. London Plan policy H15 part A(3) expects nomination agreements to be used for the majority of purpose built student accommodation bedrooms and all affordable bedrooms. Whilst parts 4(b) and 4(c) in policy H8 include additional requirements, these are justified as they help to ensure that further provision in Stratford and Maryland or areas of over concentration in Newham is directly linked to existing or planned campuses and their need for additional accommodation.

H9 Houses in multiple occupation and large-scale purpose built shared living

166. Policy H9 seeks to ensure that shared accommodation (for which there is growing demand) is delivered in suitable locations, is neighbourly, and contributes to the supply of affordable accommodation within the borough. In most respects the policy is justified and consistent with the London Plan, including part 4 which directs large scale developments to town and local centres or along major routes well connected by public transport as they are particularly suitable locations.

167. However, policy H9 part 2 needs to be modified to clarify that the rent level should be secured under policy H2 part 4 **[MM59]**. The requirements relating to affordable housing in part 3 need to be modified to be consistent with the modifications to policy H3 and to clarify that such provision should be delivered on site in the general needs housing element of the scheme where being

⁵⁴ London Plan Guidance on PBSA (October 2024).

delivered alongside build for sale housing [MM59 and MM60]. The implementation text H9.6 needs to clarify that the restriction on main town centre uses does not apply to ancillary facilities for residents such as gyms or shared workspace [MM61]. Those modifications will ensure that the policy is justified and effective.

H10 Gypsy and Traveller accommodation

168. Paragraph 3.195 in the Plan refers to a need for 23 additional pitches based on the Council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2022⁵⁵. Much of that identified need is associated with families living on the one, publicly-owned site at Parkway Crescent (concealed households, children who will require their own accommodation within 5 years, and projected household growth), along with some families living on the roadside and some in bricks and mortar housing. The assessment also identifies a need for additional transit or negotiated stopping sites in London, but not specifically in Newham.

169. Policy H10 in the Plan safeguards the existing Parkway Crescent site, which is designated on the policies map, and supports the provision of additional pitches, including on new sites, where they meet identified need (and certain criteria are met). However, the Plan does not identify any additional sites as expected by national policy – because no suitable and available sites had been identified.

170. During the examination, the London Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment November 2025 was published. Based on this, and the Council's 2022 assessment, there is a need for 39 pitches in the borough between 2027 and 2037, including backlog need from 2022.

171. The Council continued during the examination to consider whether land in its ownership may be suitable and available for additional pitches. This identified some land within and to the north of the existing Parkway Crescent site that could accommodate a total of 5 pitches. A number of other small Council-owned sites were also investigated, but none are currently identified as being available and suitable with various issues needing to be resolved including flood risk, accessibility, infrastructure, utilities and historic incidences of anti-social behaviour.

172. In light of the above, policy H10 needs to be modified [MM62] to refer to:

- A need for 39 additional pitches between 2027 and 2037.
- The intensification and / or expansion of the existing Parkway Crescent site (and amend the policies map accordingly).

⁵⁵ EB057.

- Support for the provision of transit and negotiated stopping sites.
173. The reasoned justification needs to be modified [MM63] to refer to the latest London-wide evidence and clarify that:
- 34 pitches are needed between 2027 and 2032.
 - 5 pitches are needed between 2032 and 2037.
 - Approximately 16 pitches are needed to meet the needs of the families living on the existing Parkway Crescent site.
 - Approximately 23 pitches are needed to meet the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community currently living in bricks and mortar housing.
 - The Council will seek to meet those needs through its Small Sites Appraisals and Modular construction programme.
174. In addition, policy H4 part 1(b) needs to be modified to refer to the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment in the evidence used to determine the appropriate mix of residential types and tenures on all residential development sites [MM53].
175. Whilst those modifications will not make the Plan fully consistent with national policy due to the lack of sufficient identified deliverable and developable sites to meet needs, it is not possible to do that based on the available evidence. The modifications ensure that the Plan sets out clear pitch targets for ten years following adoption as required by London Plan policy H14 and a positive approach to meeting those targets through the intensification and expansion of the existing site, the provision of new sites, and the requirement in policy H4 for all residential schemes to consider pitch needs when determining the appropriate mix of residential types and tenures. Furthermore, following modification, the Plan references that the Council is committed to helping to meet needs on land that it owns through an established and ongoing property programme.
176. Overall, therefore, I am satisfied that, subject to the above modifications, there is a reasonable prospect that the identified need for additional pitches will be met over the plan period and that the inconsistency between policy H10 and national policy does not render the Plan unsound.

H11 Housing design quality

177. Policy H11 aims to ensure that housing developments are designed for long term comfort and flexibility, and ease of maintenance. In most respects the

policy is justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan. However, modifications are required to the policy and implementation text [MM64 and MM65] to:

- Clarify the requirements relating to ground floor amenity space facing streets and close to main roads.
- Delete the detailed requirements for accessible purpose built student accommodation and refer to relevant London Plan Guidance.
- Clarify the internal communal space standards relating to houses in multiple occupation and large scale purpose built accommodation.
- Clarify that the requirement for the provision of on-site play space relates only to developments likely to be used by children and young people.
- Clarify the requirements relating to building regulation M4(2) and M4(3) compliant dwellings.

178. Those modifications will ensure that policy H11 is justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the London Plan.

Conclusion

179. Subject to the modifications described above, policies H2 to H11 are justified, consistent with national policy and the London Plan, and will be effective in helping to ensure that the housing needs of different groups in the community are met.

Issue 7 – Are policies J1 to J4 justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan, and will they be effective in helping to build a strong, competitive and inclusive local economy?

180. Newham is a strategically important economic location in London and has a significant existing employment land resource including SIL close to the capital's Central Activity Zone and elsewhere in Opportunity Areas⁵⁶.

181. Policies J1 to J4 relate to industrial and other employment uses, aiming to direct growth across the borough to areas which have the greatest economic potential and create an inclusive economy.

182. The Plan's Glossary defines "employment use" as:

- Offices E(g)(i).

⁵⁶ Plan 3.149.

- Research and development E(g)(ii).
- Light industrial E(g)(iii).
- General industrial B2.
- Storage or distribution B8 (including micro fulfilment and dark kitchen/shop).
- Industrial-related sui generis uses (including waste, utilities including digital/data and transport depots).

183. "Industrial uses" are defined as those referred to in bullet points 3 to 6 above. Those definitions are consistent with the London Plan and ensure that policies J1 to J4 can be effectively applied.

Policies J1 to J3 Employment development

184. Policies J1 and J2 direct different types of employment development to different defined areas (designated on the policies map) including SIL, Local Industrial Locations (LIL), Local Mixed Use Areas (LMUAs), Micro Business Opportunity Areas (MBOAs), town centres and relevant site allocations set out in part 2 of the Plan.

185. This is a justified approach, consistent with the London Plan and effective in directing employment uses to appropriate areas having regard to their existing character and economic potential. However, to be effective, policy J2 part 2 needs to be modified to clarify that the requirements relating to the co-location of residential and employment uses in specific LMUAs and MBOAs and site allocations applies to the existing employment sites listed in policy J1 and to site allocations as referenced in policy J1 part 2f [MM46].

186. Policy J2 part 1 requires development within SIL and LIL to lead to a net increase in floorspace, and policy J3 seeks to prevent the net loss of employment floorspace (and yard space) in those areas. That approach is consistent with the London Plan and reflects the limited amount of other land suitable for industrial development. However, some detailed wording changes are needed to policy J3 to clarify the approach to safeguarding employment floorspace capacity unless it can be demonstrated that there is no current or future demand. The implementation text for J3 needs to provide additional clarity about how the policy will be applied in different circumstances including where there is an existing employment use, a site with existing vacant buildings, or a cleared site formerly in employment use. It also needs to clarify the circumstances when planning conditions will be used to control changes within the E use class.

187. Those modifications [MM47 and MM48] will ensure policies J2 and J3 can be effectively applied, including to relevant allocations containing land currently or previously in employment use.

Policy J4 Inclusive economic growth

188. Policy J4 expects all development to create high quality economic opportunities including through a tariff-based financial contribution to fund various employment and training initiatives aimed at helping Newham residents access employment both during construction and in the businesses occupying the completed buildings. A similar policy is included in the adopted plan which has been implemented with the financial contributions having been used effectively to complement mainstream education by providing specific training to suit the particular needs of Newham's residents and relevant economic sectors.
189. Given the borough's high levels of deprivation, low skill levels, and the multitude of languages spoken there is clearly a particular need for such initiatives. Whilst planning obligations made through the application process would need to meet the relevant legal tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), I am satisfied that the policy is consistent with London Plan policy E11 and justified as it sets out a strategic and consistent approach for relevant developments to make a proportionate contribution to helping local residents access construction and end user jobs, which is critical in creating an inclusive local economy.
190. Whilst the financial contributions for some schemes could be substantial, they were factored into the viability assessment which shows that they typically represent less than 3% of total construction costs. For the reasons set out elsewhere in this report, policy BFN4 (as modified) sets out an effective and justified approach to negotiating financial contributions and policy requirements at the planning application stage for viability reasons if necessary.

Office and industrial floorspace supply

191. Table 11 in the Plan, modified as described under main issue 2 above [MM45], identifies an oversupply in the pipeline of office floorspace (around 520,000 sqm) compared to the modified requirement for around 118,000 sqm in policy J1. However, there is significant uncertainty around the office market and the delivery of the identified schemes. The approach of protecting existing floorspace and focussing on Stratford Town Centre as the main office location is therefore justified and consistent with the London Plan.
192. Table 12 in the Plan, also modified as described under main issue 2 above [MM45], identifies a total supply of industrial floorspace of around 484,000 sqm – an oversupply of 66,000 sqm against the modified need referred to in policy

J1 (around 418,000 sqm). However, a significant element of the identified supply (around 352,000 sqm) is assumed to come from existing employment sites with potential for intensification. This reinforces the need for the approach set out in policies J1 to J3 aimed at ensuring net gains in floorspace when sites are developed.

193. Policies J1 to J4 are, therefore, justified and should be effective in helping to ensure that the identified need for additional office and industrial floorspace can be met in appropriate locations.

Conclusion

194. Subject to the modifications referred to above, policies J1 to J4 are justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan, and will be effective in helping to build a strong, competitive and inclusive local economy.

Issue 8 – Are policies HS1 to HS8 justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan, and will they be effective in supporting the vitality and viability of town centres and ensuring that the need for additional main town centre use floorspace can be met?

Introduction

195. Newham has six existing town centres: Stratford (metropolitan), East Ham (major), Green Street, Forest Gate, Canning Town and East Beckton (all district) along with numerous smaller local centres and neighbourhood parades all of which are listed in Table 3 in the Plan and designated on the policies map. There are also three large scale retail parks in the Beckton and Gallions Reach neighbourhoods.

196. In most respects, the town centre network and policies HS1 to HS8 are consistent with national policy and the London Plan and justified by up-to-date, proportionate evidence including the Retail and Leisure Study 2022 and Town Centre Network Topic Papers 2024 and 2026⁵⁷. However, a number of modifications are required which I describe below.

Local centres, neighbourhood parades and small scale frontages

197. The requirements in policy HS1 parts 1 and 4 relating to the creation of small-scale frontages need to be modified to clarify that they are intended to ensure localised needs are met in locations that are not currently within 400 metres of

⁵⁷ EB029 to EB034 and ED025.

an existing or planned town centre. Part 4 also needs to clarify that the 300 sqm threshold for impact assessments applies to neighbourhood parades, and Pier Park needs to be added to the list of designated parades. These modifications [MM25 and MM27] will ensure policy HS1 is effective in helping to achieve the aim of residents in all parts of the borough having close access to local convenience retail and services.

198. I considered under main issue 4 the proposals for new or extended local centres within some of the site allocations - including N2.SA1 Silvertown Quays, N7.SA1 Abbey Mills, and N7.SA3 Sugar House Island - and no further modifications or changes to the policies are required other than those already identified.

Beckton Riverside new town centre

199. Policy HS1 part 2 and implementation text HS1.2 need to be modified to clarify the approach to creating a new town centre within allocation N17.SA1 Beckton Riverside through a masterplanned and phased approach to transforming the existing Gallions Reach Shopping Park coordinated with the delivery of new homes and an extension to the DLR and new station. HS1 part 2 and implementation text HS3.1 also need to be modified to allow asset management related development at the Shopping Park during the transition to the new town centre.

200. These modifications [MM26, MM28 and MM29] - along with those described under main issue 4 relating to neighbourhood policy N17, allocation policy N17.SA1 and changes to the policies map - will ensure that the approach to the creation of a new town centre is effective and consistent with national policy and London Plan policy SD7.

Markets

201. Policy HS4 part 1, relating to development impacting on existing markets, needs to be modified [MM30] to:

- Clarify that it applies to indoor and outdoor markets.
- Clarify that the number of pitches should be maintained or increased.
- Refer to the overall layout, visibility, quality, management and public realm being improved through co-design taking into account the existing character of the market.
- Refer to proposals identifying and positively contributing to the health and social value of the market in line with policy BFN3.

202. Part 3 and implementation text HS4.3 also need to be modified to clarify that proposals for a new market should also demonstrate how positive social value potential is optimised in line with policy BFN3 [MM31 and MM33].
203. Modifications are required to implementation text HS4.1 to include a definition of market pitch, and to provide further details of how policy HS4 part 1 will be implemented [MM32].
204. Those modifications are necessary to ensure that policy HS4 provides an effective framework for the protection of existing markets and the provision of new markets and permanent, flexible spaces for temporary events. I set out under main issue 4 modifications to policy N14 relating to Queen's Market in the Green Street neighbourhood.

Visitor accommodation

205. Policy HS8 supports hotels and other forms of visitor accommodation in town and local centres and within 15 minutes walking distance of the Excel conference centre which is in the Royal Docks and Beckton Opportunity Area. This is consistent with national policy, which defines hotels as a main town centre use, and London Plan policy E10 part G which states that in parts of inner London outside the Central Activity Zone serviced accommodation should be promoted in town centres and within Opportunity Areas (in accordance with the sequential test set out in policy SD7). The London Plan does not require local plans to include policies to allow hotels in all parts of all Opportunity Areas, and to do so could undermine other policies in the Plan including those aimed at meeting the housing targets.
206. Completed and committed developments mean that the supply of hotel rooms in the borough is likely to exceed the demand identified in the evidence supporting the London Plan, and Newham has amongst the highest level of people housed in temporary accommodation in the country. Policy HS8 part 2 therefore requires applicants to demonstrate that any visitor accommodation proposed responds to market demand testing. Paragraph 3.114 and implementation text HS8.2 need to be modified to include the justification for that requirement and clarify about how it will be implemented [MM34 and MM35].

Retail and leisure floorspace supply

207. Policy BFN1 part 4 summarises how the Plan proposes to meet retail and leisure needs by:
- Directing main town centre uses to existing metropolitan, major, district and local town centres.

- Creating a new district centre on allocation N17.SA1 Beckton Riverside.
- Creating new local centres on 5 specified allocations.
- Expanding three specified local centres.
- Protecting and expanding the network of neighbourhood parades.

208. Completions since 2022, existing commitments and planned further growth focused in the town centre network as discussed above and under main issue 4 is expected to cumulatively deliver around 35,000 sqm of retail and 75,000 sqm leisure floorspace (excluding the new Beckton Riverside Town Centre). That is sufficient to meet the identified need for around 26,000 sqm of additional retail floorspace referred to in paragraph 3.1 of the Plan. Past trends, along with relevant HS, neighbourhood and site allocation policies, indicate that leisure developments are likely to continue to come forward across the town centre network, particularly within Stratford, Canning Town and Royal Docks and Beckton areas where most new homes are proposed.

209. The Plan therefore sets out an effective strategy, policies and allocations to ensure that the scale and types of main town centre uses that are likely to be needed can be accommodated in appropriate locations in accordance with the spatial strategy.

Conclusion

210. Subject to the modifications described above, policies HS1 to HS8 are justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan, and will be effective in supporting the vitality and viability of town centres and ensuring that the need for additional main town centre use floorspace can be met.

Issue 9 – Are policies SI1 to SI5 justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan and will they be effective in ensuring the provision of the social infrastructure that the community needs in appropriate locations?

211. Social infrastructure is the umbrella term used in the Plan to describe a wide range of community, health, education, cultural, sport and recreation uses which are all listed and defined (including by reference to use class) in the Glossary.

212. Policies SI1 and SI2 relate to existing and proposed community and health facilities; SI3 to cultural, sport and recreation facilities; SI4 to education and childcare facilities; and SI5 to burial space and related facilities. Whilst in most respects the policies are sound and consistent with the London Plan, a number of modifications are required which I set out below.

SI1 Existing community facilities and health facilities

213. Policy SI1 needs to be modified as follows:

- The requirement in part 1 that existing community or health facilities must not be reconfigured needs to be deleted.
- Part b needs to clarify that all proposed losses must be justified by an assessment that demonstrates that the existing use is surplus to current and future needs.
- Part 1(b)(ii) needs to clarify that an existing facility must be actively marketed specifically for a community or health use in order to demonstrate that it is no longer required.
- The implementation text needs to clarify that the assessment of whether a facility is needed must include spatial mapping that identifies all relevant social infrastructure within 15 minutes' walk of the site.
- Part 2, and the implementation text, need to clarify that if the loss of such a facility is justified the preferred type of alternative use would be one which delivers the maximum viable amount of affordable housing (and the reference to at least 60% needs to be deleted).
- The implementation text also needs to clarify that policy SI1 does not apply to education and childcare uses, and specify that parts 1(a), 1(c) and 2 do apply to cultural, sport and recreation uses.

214. Those modifications [**MM36** and **MM37**] will ensure that policy SI1 is justified and effective.

SI2 New and improved community facilities and health facilities

215. Policy SI2 needs to be modified as follows:

- To clarify which uses the policy does and does not apply to.
- Parts 1(a) and (b) need to refer to re-provided facilities as well as new facilities.
- Part 1(c) needs to be modified to delete the requirement to demonstrate "unmet demand", and part 4 relating to "speculative infrastructure development" needs to be deleted entirely. Instead, part 1(c) should support proposals for new or re-provided facilities outside site allocations provided that the design, layout and scale of the facility reflect the intended role of the

space, type of uses to be accommodated, and the needs of users, and that needs cannot be adequately met through planned provision.

- The implementation text needs to clarify the evidence required to support different types of community or health facilities outside site allocations in line with part 1(c) (as modified) to prevent the provision of unnecessary facilities that do not consider the needs of users and which may become unviable.
- Part 2(d) needs to clarify that all proposals for new community or health facilities outside a town or local centre with floorspace over 1,000 sqm or with a user appeal beyond the local neighbourhood should carry out a sequential test.
- The implementation text needs to clarify that such a sequential test should be proportionate to the size and nature of the facility.

216. The above modifications [**MM38** and **MM39**] are necessary to ensure that policy SI2 is justified and effective. The requirements aimed at steering community and health facilities over the specified size thresholds to town and local centres are justified as they ensure they are as accessible as possible and help to support the vitality and viability of those centres. Such an approach is consistent with London Plan policy S1. It is not necessary for soundness to further modify the policy or implementation text to include more detail about health facilities or NHS organisations.

SI3 Cultural facilities and sport and recreation facilities

217. Policy SI3 needs to be modified as follows:

- Parts 1(a) and (c) and the implementation text need to clarify which parts of policy SI1 and SI2 are intended to apply to cultural, sport and recreation uses.
- The requirement in part 1 that existing cultural, sport and recreation facilities must not be reconfigured needs to be deleted (and part 3 amended accordingly).
- Part 1(b) needs to refer to proposals that form part of a recognised public sector body's estates programme in the list of evidence that may demonstrate that a facility is no longer required.
- Part 1(d) relating to demonstrating "unmet demand" needs to be deleted and part 2 modified to support proposals for new or re-provided cultural, sport and recreation facilities outside site allocations provided that the design, layout and scale of the facility reflect the intended role of the space, type of

uses to be accommodated, and needs of users, and that needs cannot be adequately met through planned provision.

- The implementation text needs to clarify the evidence required to support different types of cultural, sport and recreation facilities outside site allocations in line with part 2 (as modified) to prevent the provision of unnecessary facilities that do not consider the needs of users and which may become unviable.
- Part 3 needs to refer to re-provided facilities as well as new facilities.

218. Those modifications [MM40 and MM41] will ensure that policy SI3 is justified, effective and consistent with national policy including with regard to the protection of sports facilities.

SI4 Education and childcare facilities

219. Policy SI4 part 3, and implementation text, need to be modified to clarify the requirements aimed at coordinating the delivery of new education facilities with residential and other development including through phasing, legal agreements, and future proofing design to facilitate expansion of the facility in the future if required. The implementation text needs to be modified to clarify that proposals for education and childcare uses are not expected to comply with policies SI1, SI2 or SI3; the site allocations that are expected to provide facilities; and the requirements relating to travel plans, active travel and mitigating transport impacts. Those modifications [MM42 and MM43] will ensure that policy SI4 is justified, effective and consistent with national policy including with regard to development affecting existing sports facilities which would also be subject to policies SI3 and GWS1.

Conclusion

220. Subject to the main modifications described above, policies SI1 to SI5 are justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan and will be effective in ensuring the provision of the social infrastructure that the community needs in appropriate locations.

Issue 10 – Are policies BFN2 and D1 to D9 justified and consistent with national policy and will they be effective in creating well designed places and conserving and enhancing the historic environment?

221. Policy BFN2 relates to the masterplanning of development sites, and policies D1 to D9 cover various aspects of design including for development affecting

heritage assets. I considered policy D4 (tall buildings) under main issue 3 as it forms a key part of the Plan's three-dimensional spatial strategy.

BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning

222. Policy BFN2 seeks to ensure that sites are designed and developed comprehensively and requires applicants to undertake co-designed masterplanning through engagement with stakeholders. A number of modifications are required to ensure that the policy is effective and justified:

- Parts 1 and 2, and associated implementation text, need to be modified to set out a positive approach to achieving comprehensive development that is effectively coordinated with infrastructure delivery, including through collaboration on large complex sites in multiple ownership that may be delivered in phases by a number of different developers [MM6, MM7, MM10 and MM11].
- The implementation text for part 3 needs to refer to whole life carbon considerations being factored into masterplanning [MM12].
- The requirement in part 4 and associated implementation text need to clarify that meanwhile uses on phased sites must be appropriate having regard to health and safety considerations [MM8 and MM13].
- Part 5 needs to clarify that post occupancy surveys relating to development on site allocations should demonstrate delivery against the aims of the approved masterplan [MM9] whereas the reference in the implementation text to achieving a response rate of 40% needs to be deleted [MM14].

D1 Design standards

223. Policy D1 part 4 requires temporary buildings that are likely to be used for three years or more to be designed to a high standard. This is justified due to the number of such proposals in the borough and the impact they can have on the character and appearance of an area. However, the implementation text needs to be modified to clarify that, whilst design, landscaping and accessibility should take account of local context, this must take account of the expected timeframe of the development [MM16]. This will ensure the policy is justified and effective. I have deleted the reference to it rarely being justifiable to grant a second temporary permission (that had been included in the modification published for consultation) as it is not essential for soundness and would pre-empt the outcome of the process set out in the preceding sentences.

D6 Neighbourliness

224. Policy D6 aims to ensure that all development achieves good neighbourliness having regard to the agent of change principle. The implementation text needs to be modified to clarify the requirements relating to mitigating emissions and to ensure that the long term viability of industrial uses on employment sites is not

compromised by nearby development comprising residential or other vulnerable uses [MM22 and MM23]. Subject to that, the policy is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

D7, D8 and D9 Designated and non-designated heritage assets

225. Policies D7, D8 and D9 relate to conservation areas, areas of townscape value, archaeological priority areas, and other designated and non-designated heritage assets. In most respects they are consistent with relevant legislation and national policy. However, to ensure that is so, policy D7 part 3 needs to be modified to clarify the requirement relating to conservation areas and areas of townscape value [MM24].

Conclusion

226. Subject to the modifications described above (and under main issue 3), policies BFN2 and D1 to D9 are justified and consistent with national policy and will be effective in creating well designed places and conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Issue 11 – Are policies CE1 to CE8 justified and consistent with national policy and will they be effective in ensuring that development in the borough contributes positively to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change?

227. Policy CE1 sets out an overall approach for development to address and respond to the climate emergency, whereas policies CE2 to CE8 set out specific requirements relating to energy, embodied carbon, overheating, air quality, flood risk and drainage.

228. The policies are ambitious, aimed at ensuring that development in the borough over the next 15 years contributes to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimises vulnerability and improves resilience. They are supported by detailed, proportionate and up to date evidence⁵⁸. Assumptions about the additional costs associated with the requirements, including in policies CE2 and CE3, were included in the viability assessment. This found that those policies could add around 2% to 4% to the total cost of tall buildings and slightly more for other forms of development⁵⁹. For the reasons set out elsewhere in this report, and subject to my recommended modifications, it is likely that those costs can be absorbed by most types of development without undermining viability.

⁵⁸ EB72 to EB92 and ED028a.

⁵⁹ EB72.

CE2 Zero carbon development

229. The Planning and Energy Act 2008 allows local planning authorities to set energy efficiency standards in their development plan policies that exceed the requirements of the building regulations. However, such policies must not be inconsistent with relevant national policies and should use standards that are nationally endorsed.
230. National planning policy expects development to be planned in ways that help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, including through design. Any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards.
231. Policy CE2 parts 1 and 3 set space heating demand and energy use intensity standards for all new homes (and other types of buildings) expressed in terms of KWh/m²GIA/year. As such, they are not consistent with the written ministerial statement published on 13 December 2023 which states that any local energy efficiency standards in local plans that go beyond current or planned building regulations should be expressed as a percentage uplift of a dwelling's Target Emission Rate calculated using a specified version of the Standard Assessment Procedure.
232. However, the standards are justified by the robust evidence referred to above that demonstrates that they are measurable, achievable and will be effective in helping to achieve zero carbon developments. To better reflect that evidence, and best practice, modifications are required to the energy use intensity standard for purpose built student accommodation **[MM74]**.
233. Policy CE2 part 4 sets minimum standards for on-site renewable energy generation for all developments expressed in terms of KWh/m² per building footprint per year. Again, these standards are justified by robust evidence. However, to better reflect that evidence, the standard for all non-industrial buildings needs to be modified to set a lower requirement for tall buildings to reflect the fact that significant proportions of their rooftops are likely to be required for mechanical plant and services **[MM75]**.
234. Policy CE2 part 2 states that new development should not use fossil fuels for heat or energy. However, part of the borough is served by an existing large district heat network powered by gas. To be justified and effective, the implementation text needs to be modified to refer to development connecting to a heat network powered by gas only where an effective decarbonisation strategy has been agreed by the Council (rather than a decarbonisation plan being fully funded) **[MM77]**.

235. To set an effective policy for the existing energy intensive industry in the borough, an additional part 6 needs to be added to policy CE2 [MM76]. This will exempt relevant industrial development from the requirements of other parts of policy CE2 provided that the proposal would result in substantially lower carbon intensity per m²GIA/year over the site and would be consistent with a long term decarbonisation strategy for the business to be agreed with the Council.

CE3 Embodied carbon

236. The embodied carbon limit for major developments in policy CE3 part 6 needs to be modified from 500 kgCO₂/m² to 700 kgCO₂/m² [MM78]. This will ensure that the policy expectation is justified and effective, based on what has been achievable for a significant proportion of development in London in recent years.

CE7 Managing flood risk

237. A number of changes to policy CE7 and implementation text are required to ensure consistency with national policy and to reflect the flood risk evidence⁶⁰ [MM79 to MM85].

Conclusion

238. Subject to the modifications described above, policies CE1 to CE8 are justified, consistent with national policy and will be effective in ensuring that development in the borough contributes positively to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change.

Issue 12 – Are policies GWS1 to GWS5 justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan, and will they be effective in ensuring easy access to high quality green and water spaces and enhancing biodiversity?

239. The borough has a network of well used and valued green spaces along with significant water spaces including the Royal Docks and stretches of London's three largest rivers – the Thames, Lea and Roding.

240. However, the amount of green space is low compared to elsewhere in London and nationally, averaging around 0.7 hectares per 1,000 residents. With the population growth expected in the Plan, this would fall to under 0.6 hectares per 1,000 residents unless additional greenspaces are created. Maintaining an

⁶⁰ EB78 to EB92.

equivalent level of provision per person would require the creation of around 70 hectares of new green space during the plan period.

Green Belt

241. There is one area of Green Belt in the north east corner of the borough on the border with Redbridge; the Plan makes no changes to the boundaries of that designation.

Metropolitan Open Land

242. There are around 40 parcels of MOL in the borough. A comprehensive review of MOL was carried out during the preparation of the Plan⁶¹ and a total of ten changes made on the submitted policies map including the addition of three areas (much of West Ham Park; Thames Barrier Park; and land at Water Works River). The modification to site allocation N13.SA3 described under main issue 4 requires the removal of 1.8 hectares of land from MOL in the East Ham neighbourhood. A further minor change to the MOL boundary on the submitted policies map is required to accurately reflect the built form at the Langdon Academy. I am satisfied that there are exceptional circumstances to justify each of those changes, having regard to the purposes of including land in MOL set out in London Plan policy G3 part B.

GWS1 Green spaces

243. The definition of green space in the Plan's glossary needs to be modified to clarify that it includes all predominantly-vegetated natural or semi-natural open spaces including parks, woodlands, nature reserves, gardens, allotments, community gardens, school playing fields, playing pitches, river corridors and other natural or semi-natural areas **[MM224]**. The glossary also needs to be modified to include a definition of "maximum feasible quantity greenspace **MM225]**. Those modifications will ensure that policy GWS1 is effective.

244. Policy GWS1 sets out requirements relating to existing green space, and for the creation of new green spaces. Modifications are required to part 1 to state that it relates to all existing green spaces, and to part 3, along with the associated implementation text, to clarify the requirements relating to development resulting in the loss of existing green space including for replacement provision **[MM66, MM67 and MM69]**.

245. The implementation text to part 1 needs to be modified to clarify the requirements relating to the creation of new green spaces on development sites, including publicly accessible play spaces, along with reference to the

⁶¹ EB78 MOL Review 2025.

Council's Green and Water Infrastructure Strategy and relevant London Plan standards. The text also needs to explain that the green spaces shown on the site allocation maps are indicative, and that an alternative layout may be acceptable based on masterplanning in accordance with policy BFN2 [MM68].

246. Those modifications will ensure that policy GWS1 can be effectively implemented, including through the creation of new high quality green spaces as part of the development of site allocations which is essential given the shortage of existing provision.
247. Whilst most if not all existing green spaces are designated on the policies map, it is justified to apply the policy to all areas that meet the definition as the characteristics of undeveloped land can change over time and new green spaces will be created which will need to be protected.
248. A number of changes to the green spaces designated on the policies map are required to ensure that policy GWS1 is justified and effective:
- Areas of privately owned land within school grounds that are used for educational purposes and are not publicly accessible need to be removed from the designation as they serve no significant green space function.
 - Small areas within the grounds of Newham Hospital, including narrow verges, minor planted islands and operational courtyards, need to be removed from the designation as they serve no significant green space function.
 - The green space within allocation N2.SA5 needs to be amended to accurately reflect the existing Royal Victoria Square outside the Excel conference centre.
 - The green space designation within allocation N13.SA3 needs to be amended to exclude the previously developed land to the west of East Ham gasholder.
 - Various other changes are required to some of the green space designations to accurately reflect the land use or correct mapping errors.
249. The designation of the whole of West Ham Park as green space on the submitted policies map is consistent with the Plan's definition of such areas which includes parks (whether publicly or privately owned). Furthermore, it reflects the site's importance as a Grade II listed Park and Garden. The green space designation includes around 1.2 hectares of land in the north east corner that is not currently accessible to the public and contains derelict glasshouses and vacant land. Whilst this area is not currently vegetated, its inclusion in the green space designation is justified (despite it not being included within the

MOL designation) as it forms an integral part of the historic park as defined on the map in Historic England's official list entry⁶² and its landscape character could change in the future.

250. The designation of Mill Meads allotments close to Abbey Mills Pumping Station as green space on the submitted policies map is justified given its existing use. The continued inclusion of operational land at the Northern Lagoon area at Beckton sewage treatment works as MOL is justified as there are not exceptional circumstances for its removal. In both cases, proposals for essential operational development could be properly assessed in the context of policy GWS1 and other relevant policies.

GWS2 Water spaces

251. Policy GWS2 relates to development affecting the borough's rivers, docks and other water spaces, including for water-related and water-dependent facilities. In most respects, the policy is justified, consistent with the London Plan and will be effective in facilitating appropriate forms of development whilst protecting and enhancing the quality of those water spaces.

252. However, modifications [**MM70** and **MM71**] are required to policy GWS2 and associated implementation text to ensure that is so:

- To clarify that GWS2 part 2 applies to undeveloped riparian buffer zones (as well as the water space itself).
- To refer to maximising opportunities for water space restoration.
- To clarify the approach to preventing encroachment or covering of water spaces, including in relation to permanently moored vessels and water-dependent and water-related uses.
- To ensure that residential and visitor moorings are in accessible locations and do not impact negatively on flood risk or ecology.
- To clarify that development may take a form that differs in detail from site allocation policies if masterplanning demonstrates that this will improve the functionality, connectivity, quality, and accessibility of the relevant water space.

GWS3 Biodiversity, urban greening and access to nature

253. To reflect the findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment and ensure that the Plan is effective in helping to prevent adverse impacts on the integrity of the

⁶² ED16.

Epping Forest SAC, policy GWS3 part 7 needs to be modified to clarify that residential development must contribute to the delivery of Newham's Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation Recreation Mitigation Strategy [MM72].

254. The areas of SINC defined on the policies map, including within site allocations, are justified by up-to-date, adequate and proportionate evidence⁶³. Policies BFN2 and GWS3, along with allocation policies, provide an effective framework for determining how those areas are taken into account in masterplanning development and achieving biodiversity enhancement (including, if necessary, replacement of lost features on site) informed by an ecological assessment.

GWS5 Play and informal recreation for all ages

255. Newham has the highest proportion of young people in the UK with 37% of the borough's population being under the age of 25. However, the total amount of publicly accessible play space is only around 10% of the Fields in Trust recommended standard of 0.25 hectares per 1,000 people – a total shortfall of over 80 hectares. The requirement in policy GWS5, and in site allocation policies, for development to provide play and informal recreation facilities is therefore justified. However, the implementation text needs to clarify that masterplanning may demonstrate that this could be provided in a different layout than indicated on the site allocation maps [MM73].

Conclusion

256. Subject to the above modifications, policies GWS1 to GWS5 are justified and consistent with national policy and the London Plan, and will be effective in ensuring easy access to high quality green and water spaces and enhancing biodiversity.

Other soundness matters

257. I deal here with a number of other soundness matters that are not covered above under the main issues.

Cycle storage in purpose built student accommodation

258. Policy T3 part 4 requires cycle storage in line with or higher than London Plan standards. Surveys of completed purpose built student accommodation across London indicate that take up has been far lower than those standards and that there are substantial numbers of unused cycle storage spaces. However, this is a matter that should properly be addressed in the review of the London Plan and I am not persuaded that it is appropriate for the Plan to set reduced

⁶³ EB070 Newham SINC Review April 2025 Update, London Wildlife Trust.

standards in advance of that. The requirements relating to particular types of cycle, including cargo bikes and E-bikes, are justified as they respond to recent trends in use and are expected to be met "where relevant" which provides appropriate flexibility.

London City Airport

259. Policy T5 sets out a justified and effective framework for development proposals at London City Airport that is consistent with national policy and London Plan policy T8. However, implementation text T5.2 needs to be modified because stating that certain specified changes in the use and function of the airport are "un-mitigable and unacceptable" is unjustified, inconsistent with policy T5, national policy and the London Plan, and would not provide an effective framework for properly assessing development proposals based on evidence [MM86].

Waste management

260. To avoid inconsistency and unnecessary duplication with the adopted Joint East London Waste Plan and/or its replacement (which was submitted for examination in January 2026), policy W1 and parts 1 and 2 of policy W2 (and associated reasoned justification and implementation text) need to be deleted [MM87 and MM88]. This will ensure that the two waste policies in the Plan are justified and provide effective local detail to supplement the joint plan.

Utilities and digital connectivity infrastructure

261. A number of modifications are required to policy W4 to ensure that it is effective, justified and consistent with national policy [MM89 to MM91].

Meanwhile uses and BREEAM standards

262. The implementation text BFN1.8 needs to be modified to clarify the requirements for meanwhile uses to comply with BREEAM standards to ensure a justified approach for temporary structures having regard to the importance of addressing the climate emergency [MM5].

Policies and other parts of the Plan

263. A local plan must set out the authority's policies (however expressed) relating to the development and use of land in their area. If to any extent a policy set out in

a local plan conflicts with any other statement or information in the document, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy⁶⁴.

264. To be effective, therefore, users of the Plan must know which parts of it are "policies". To provide the necessary clarity, the Plan's introduction, and the way in which the different sections of parts 1 and 2 are presented, need to be modified to ensure that policies are clearly defined and distinct from the reasoned justification, implementation text, factual information, site diagrams and other information [MM3].

Information requirements for applicants

265. Numerous policies and other parts of the Plan require planning applications to provide particular types of information (assessments, strategies, evidence to demonstrate compliance with specified guidance or standards, etc). A modification is required to the introduction to the Plan to clarify that in most instances these requirements can be met by providing the information as part of standard application documents such as a Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement, Environmental Impact Statement or Transport Assessment [MM3]. Subject to this, I am satisfied that the information requirements referred to in policies are proportionate, avoid duplication and imposing unnecessary burdens on applicants, and consistent with national policy⁶⁵.

Maintaining effective cooperation

266. The duty to cooperate under section 33A of the 2004 Act applied during the preparation of the Plan up until it was submitted for examination on 18 July 2025. Although that duty was abolished in March 2026, NPPF policies on maintaining effective cooperation on strategic matters remain relevant. I am satisfied that the Council acted consistently with national policy in that regard.

Viability revisited and policy BFN4 developer contributions

267. I concluded under main issue 1 that the submitted Plan is not sound because the viability evidence indicates that the cumulative costs of all of the policy requirements would undermine the deliverability of the allocations and other development in the borough.
268. My findings in relation to various subsequent main issues and recommended modifications address the viability issues in a number of ways. These include, in particular but not exclusively, the modifications to:

⁶⁴ Section 17(5) of the 2004 Act.

⁶⁵ NPPF 44.

- The requirements for the provision of affordable and family-sized homes in policies H3, H4, H5 and H8.
- The approaches to tall buildings inside and outside tall building zones in policy D4.
- Increase flexibility in the way part 1 and part 2 policies are to be applied to specific development proposals on site allocations including how the site maps (indicative diagrams) are to be interpreted.
- Clarify the information required to support planning applications.

269. In addition to those modifications, it is necessary for effectiveness to modify policy BFN4 part 3 to clarify that where substantial viability constraints are demonstrated, applicants should deliver the maximum viable level of obligations taking account of site specific considerations and the need to provide any new or improved infrastructure or other mitigation necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms [MM15]. This will ensure that essential infrastructure, including public transport, is prioritised as required by London Plan policy DF1. To ensure clarity, I have amended the modification to part (c) as published for consultation to refer to "other" infrastructure (to distinguish it from essential infrastructure).

270. I am satisfied that, collectively, the main modifications mean that there is a realistic prospect of the allocations, other identified sites and windfalls being viably developed over the plan period.

Conclusion

271. Subject to the above, no further main modifications are required to make the Plan sound or legally compliant.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

272. The Plan has a number of deficiencies in respect of soundness and/or legal compliance for the reasons set out above, which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with section 20(7A) of the 2004 Act. These deficiencies have been explained throughout this report.

273. The Council has requested that I recommend main modifications to make the Plan sound and/or legally compliant and capable of adoption. I conclude that, with the recommended main modifications set out in the Appendix, the "Our Newham Local Plan" satisfies the requirements referred to in section 20(5)(a) of the 2004 Act and is sound.

William Fieldhouse

Inspector

This report is accompanied by an Appendix containing the main modifications.