

Programme Officer
London Borough of Newham
Newham Dockside
1000 Dockside Road
E16 2QU

Submitted via email to bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

06 November 2025

Dear Sir / Madam

Examination of the Newham Local Plan (November 2025) – Matters 2-4
Hearing Statement submitted on behalf of The Ballymore Group

This Hearing Statement has been prepared by Rolfe Judd Planning on behalf of the Ballymore Group in reference to the hearing sessions for the examination of the Newham Local Plan (“NLP”) which are due to commence on the 2nd of December 2025.

The Statement principally responds to **Matters 2-4** as set out within the Inspector’s Matters, Issues and Questions (“MIQs”) for Examination.

We understand that LB Newham will be providing a response to all of the questions raised. Our response is intended to provide additional clarity/information to the particular questions raised within Matters 2 – 4.

Background

As you will be aware, our client has a number of major land interests within the Borough having recently completed the delivery of the Royal Wharf development on the North Woolwich Road, and the Deanston Wharf development (now known as Riverscape). We are working with London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) with regards to the recently resolved to grant Stratford Waterfront development as well as the Bridgewater Triangle Site also part of the Joint Venture.

Furthermore, we are working on the hybrid planning application at Thames Road Industrial Estate (also known as UNEX) which is has been re-submitted (ref: 24/02339/OUT) following the original application ref. 21/02450/OUT was submitted in 2021, and the hybrid planning application at Knights Road, which has been submitted to LB Newham in November 2024 (ref: 24/02083/OUT). As a result, the Ballymore Group are keen to work with the Council to assist in the formulation of new policy that supports the continued regeneration of the Borough, with a particular focus on the Royal Docks area.

The Ballymore Group previously submitted representations in February 2024 during the Regulation 18 Consultation period and in September 2024 during the Regulation 19 consultation, with comment responses provided by LB Newham. These responses have been noted below where relevant.

Overall, we support the Council’s ambitions to deliver a fairer Newham and the ethos behind many of the draft policies, however, we also have concerns regarding some of the new requirements being sought through the draft Local Plan, including the cumulative impact of these requirements on the viability and deliverability of

developments. The development industry is seeing a significant increase in build costs, a stagnation of residential values, and the introduction of new standards and legislation, all of which are resulting in increasingly challenging development viability across London, and we do not feel that this has been given sufficient consideration across the draft Local Plan.

Housing Need

Based on the outcome of the Housing Delivery Test (2023) Newham met just 61% of their housing target is currently under a presumption in favour of sustainable development (for the purposes of NPPF paragraph 11).

This position is expected to worsen, with housing starts in London at their lowest point since 2008/09 (note: Molior's report on Residential Development in London (Oct 2025) identified that construction started on only 3,248 residential homes during Q1-Q3 of 2025. This represents only 5% of the new Government Housing Target for London during the same period i.e. 66,000 new homes). This emphasises the importance of ensuring that site allocations are sufficiently flexible and support the viable delivery of housing at the site.

NPPF paragraph 125(c) is clear that planning policies and decision should "*give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, proposals for which should be approved unless substantial harm would be caused, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land*".

With this in mind, we offer the following comments on **Matters 2-4**, with a particular focus on the deliverability of the Council's Strategic Sites.

Matter 2: Amount of development required in the plan period

Q2.2 (a) Does policy H1 and/or the reasoned justification need to be modified to clarify what the Plan's minimum housing requirement is (irrespective of the specific figure)?

The Local Plan should clearly state a single minimum housing requirement figure in Policy H1, not just within the supporting text. The current wording lacks clarity and could lead to ambiguity in terms of housing delivery and monitoring. This lack of precision risks the Plan being **ineffective** under NPPF. The London Plan sets a minimum borough-level target, not a range; therefore, to be **consistent with the London Plan**, the Local Plan must define how it aligns with or exceeds that target.

(b) Is the approach of basing the housing requirement (irrespective of the specific figure) on capacity, rather than need, justified and consistent with the London Plan?

Ballymore does not consider the approach of basing housing requirement on capacity, rather than need to be justified or consistent with the London Plan. The approach conflicts with Paragraphs 61-69 of the NPPF, which require plans to meet objectively assessed housing need as far as possible.

Further, the London Plan sets minimum benchmarks (not ceilings) for housing delivery across London and per Borough. **London Plan policy D3** (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) requires housing delivery to be optimised on every site, to ensure the maximum appropriate number of homes are delivered across the city. Local capacity testing should demonstrate how this identified need can be met, not replace it.

London is facing an acute housing shortage with demand significantly outstripping supply. The London Plan identifies a **minimum** need of 66,000 new homes per year, with delivery consistently falling short of this. Setting a housing requirement based solely on capacity, rather than an objectively assessed need would fail to respond to this crisis. This approach would dampen housing delivery across the Borough and worsen existing affordability issues.

The Council's current approach to capacity-based housing requirements (as set out in draft Policy H1) is therefore **not justified**, as it fails to respond to the scale of housing need, and is **not consistent with national policy** or the London Plan, as it does not plan to meet or exceed the London-wide housing requirement.

(c) Is the reference to a target range justified and does it provide an effective and unambiguous approach (irrespective of the specific figures)?

While Newham's ambition to deliver a higher number of homes than the minimum requirement, Ballymore consider the use of a "target range" to be ambiguous and **not effective** for implementation or monitoring. This introduces uncertainty for developers and decision-makers as it is not clear what the actual housing target is for the Borough. This would also lead to difficulty with monitoring and measuring housing delivery against the housing target.

The NPPF and London Plan both use minimum requirements for housing delivery. The provision of a range therefore risks being **inconsistent with national policy**. If a range is retained to encourage greater housing delivery, then the policy should be explicit that the lower figure represents the minimum to be achieved, and the upper figure is aspirational.

(d) Is the inclusion of a stepped requirement (irrespective of the specific figures) consistent with national policy and guidance?

Ballymore objects to the inclusion of a stepped trajectory as this undermines the housing delivery objectives set out in both the NPPF and the London Plan, and therefore fails the tests of soundness.

Paragraph 78 of the NPPF states that “Local Planning Authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies”. Newham’s stepped trajectory approach would not achieve this and would fail to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply for the early years of the Plan period. The proposed approach is therefore **not consistent with national policy**.

A stepped trajectory would defer housing delivery, meaning the borough is not able to meet its identified housing need ‘as soon as possible’, in conflict with this Paragraph of the NPPF. The NPPF only supports a stepped trajectory where there is clear, evidence-based justification (such as major infrastructure constraints). Ballymore do not consider the case put forward by Newham to justify the stepped trajectory to be sufficient to delay housing delivery in this way. Ballymore have an interest in a number of significant development sites in the Borough (including the Connaught Riverside, Lyle Park West and Limmo site allocations) and are keen to progress at pace on all of these. As such, the stepped trajectory is **not justified or effective**.

Furthermore, a stepped trajectory would artificially lower housing delivery expectations in the initial years of the Plan period, allowing continued under-performance to appear policy compliant. Given the Council’s current poor housing delivery performance (only 61% in the 2023 Housing Delivery Test), any further delay to housing delivery risks worsening the shortfall and putting greater pressure on housing delivery in the future.

Rather than delaying housing delivery, a more positively prepared approach would be to ‘front-load’ housing targets, with incentives to secure early delivery and optimise housing delivery on strategic sites.

(e) If a stepped trajectory is justified (irrespective of the specific figures), does the Plan need to be modified to include it in policy H1 rather than in the reasoned justification to be consistent with national policy and guidance?

Ballymore strongly objects to the inclusion of a stepped trajectory and does not consider this to be appropriate for the reasons set out above (in response to question d).

Notwithstanding this, if the Inspector determines that a stepped trajectory is appropriate, any stepped trajectory should be embedded within Policy H1 itself, not only in the reasoned justification. This will ensure the policy is clear, enforceable, and consistent with national policy. Providing key delivery mechanisms within the supporting text of the policy undermines the effectiveness of the plan.

Q2.3 To be consistent with the London Plan, does policy H1 and/or the reasoned justification need to be modified to include reference to the London Plan target of 47,600 homes for 2019 to 2029 and/or to a residual target of 35,954 homes for 2023 to 2029 (irrespective of whether the evidence demonstrates that actual delivery will be lower in those periods)?

The London Plan sets Newham’s 10-year target at 32,800 new homes (2019-2029). The GLA’s updated residual target (2023-2029) is 35,954 homes, taking account of completions to date. To be **consistent with the London Plan**, the Local Plan should therefore explicitly reference these figures as the strategic

benchmark for delivery, even if local capacity assessments indicate a lower figure.

The current draft bases its requirement solely on capacity, not London Plan need, which creates an **inconsistency** with strategic policy. To be **positively prepared**, the plan must seek to meet Newham's objectively assessed housing need and its contribution to the London-wide target. To be **effective**, the policy should clearly identify what target the plan will be monitored against, without this, performance against the Housing Delivery Test cannot be appropriately measured.

M3: Spatial Strategy (Tall Buildings)

Q3.2 Are the Tall Building Zones listed in policy D4 Table 1 and designated on the policies map, and the “height range maximum” for each, justified and will they be effective in helping to meet the identified needs for housing and other development in an appropriate way that is consistent with national policy and the London Plan?

Ballymore recognises that the Council’s definition of a tall building within Policy D4 is at or over 21m (roughly seven storeys) which is in excess of the minimum height set out within the London Plan, however, we strongly object to Part 2 of the draft policy (as previously raised during Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation) which states that tall buildings will only be acceptable in areas marked on the Policies Map as ‘Tall Building Zones’.

This is not **consistent with strategic policy** as it conflicts with London Plan and fails to recognise the London Borough of Hillingdon, R (On the application Of) v Mayor of London EWHC3387 (15th December 2021) case on the application of London Plan Policy D9 where the court determined that tall building proposals do not necessarily have to be located within defined tall building zones in Local Plans, and can be acceptable where they result in public benefits and are in accordance with the rest of **Policy D9 of the London Plan** and the development plan as a whole. As such, the draft policy is **not Justified**, or **Consistent with National Policy**.

It is therefore recommended that the wording of Part 2 should be amended to be less restrictive on the location of tall buildings, noting the Council’s support for tall buildings within the identified tall building zones, but not seeking to wholly prevent tall buildings outside of these zones where it can be demonstrated that they comply with Policy D9 and the development plan as a whole.

On this basis we suggest that the second paragraph of Policy D4 is amended to the below.

*“Tall buildings will ~~only~~ be acceptable, subject to detailed design and masterplanning considerations, in areas designated as ‘Tall Building Zones’. **Tall buildings outside of Tall Building Zones may be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that they comply with London Plan Policy D9 and the development plan as a whole.** The height of tall buildings ~~in any ‘Tall Building Zone’~~ should be proportionate to their role within the local and wider context **and where they are located within Tall Building Zones** should not exceed the respective limits set in Table 1 below.”*

In response to the question posed above, it is considered that the “height range maximum” for each tall building zone is **not justified** and **will not be effective** in helping to meet the identified needs for housing and other development in an appropriate way that is consistent with national policy and the London Plan.

In regard to **tall building zone TBZ10: North Woolwich Road** (which includes site allocation N3.SA3 Connaught Riverside), the draft policy sets out a ‘suitable’ height range maximum of 50m. The proposed 50m height limit set out within draft Policy D4 does not align with the 16 storey height limit set out within the draft site allocation (N3.SA3 Connaught Riverside) and would be more likely to result in a building of 14 storeys when accounting for taller floor to ceiling heights at ground floor and roof top plant etc. It is therefore considered that the upper appropriate height limit should be increased to circa 55m as outlined below to align with the draft site allocation.

The proposed change to TBZ10 is as follows:

*Height Range Maximum: ~~50m~~ **55m** (ca. 16 storeys)*

In regard to **tall building zone TBZ11: Lyle Park West**, the prevailing heights are identified to be 21m and 32m, with an opportunity to include tall building elements up to 40m. Detailed comments are provided below in relation to the draft Lyle Park West site allocation, and it is considered that the indicative heights identified within draft Policy D4 should be updated in line with the adopted site allocation (i.e. indicative height range of 10-12 storeys with capacity for up to 18 storeys in key locations). It is noted that Ballymore has successfully delivered tall buildings at Royal Wharf and Deanston Wharf, as outlined above, which neighbour Lyle park West.

The proposed change to TBZ11 is as follows:

Height Range Maximum: ~~40m (ca. 13 storeys)~~ 60m (ca. 18 storeys)

In regard to **tall building zone TBZ13: Canning Town** (which includes N4.SA4 Limmo), the draft policy sets out a 'maximum height of 100m within defined areas and up to 50-60m maximum in all other areas (stepping down to 60m at the Limmo Site). Whilst the maximum height of 100m is supported, it is recommended that this maximum height covers the whole tall building zone, which includes the Limmo Site. Detailed comments are provided below in relation to the N4.SA4 Limmo Site Allocation however as drafted, the site allocation is **not Justified** as it does not evidence why a step-down approach is appropriate or reasonable. Ballymore has successfully delivered tall buildings at London City Island (27 storeys) and Goodluck Hope (30 storeys), which immediately neighbour the Limmo Site.

The proposed change to TBZ13 is as follows:

Height Range Maximum: ~~50m (ca. 16 storeys) and 40m (ca. 13 storeys), 60m (ca. 20 storeys) and 100m (ca. 33 storeys) in the defined areas~~

Finally, as recommended within the above changes, the draft policy should be worded more flexibly, noting that the identified heights are considered to be appropriate for each site, but without directly preventing taller buildings where it can be demonstrated if they are high quality, deliver appropriate public benefits and comply with the development plan as a whole.

It is not appropriate at Local Plan preparation stage to be designing by proxy, restricting heights on sites without any evidenced contextual analysis, or allowing for the proper application of the planning balance which would be considered at development control stage. As mentioned above setting an inflexible maximum height range is also in **direct conflict with the London Plan** which requires a design led approach to determining site capacity.

Ballymore continue to deliver tall buildings to an exceptionally high design standard, exemplified more recently within the completed Royal Wharf and Deanston Wharf developments where building heights up to 18 storeys have been developed, accounting for the principles set out above, emphasising the positive benefit of expertly delivered taller buildings within the area.

Given both the importance of optimising vacant brownfield development sites to meet the acute need for housing (both in London and Newham), the approach to building heights is unnecessarily restrictive and does not align with the London Plan's requirement to optimise housing delivery.

M4. Neighbourhoods and allocations

*Q4.4 Are policies N2, N2.SA1, **N2.SA2**, **N2.SA3**, N2.SA4 and N2.SA5 justified, consistent with the London Plan, and will they be effective in helping to encourage significant levels of growth and achieve sustainable development in the Royal Victoria neighbourhood? In particular*

- a) The requirements relating to exiting and improved transport infrastructure on site N2.SA1.*
- b) The requirements relating to the location and design of employment uses on sites N2.SA2, N2.SA3 and N2.SA4 and the relationship with the adjoining existing industrial uses including SIL.*
- c) The requirements relating to tall buildings.*
- d) The assumption that around 2,900 homes will be built on N2.SA1 between 2028 and 2038.*
- e) The assumption that around 800 homes will be built on N2.SA2 between 2028 and 2033.***
- f) The assumption that around 1,380 homes will be built on N2.SA3 between 2028 and 2034.***
- g) The assumption that around 2,400 homes will be built on N2.SA4 between 2026 and 2038.*
- h) The assumption that around 140 homes will be built on N2.SA5 between 2028 and 2033.*

N2.SA2 Lyle Park West

Ballymore submitted a hybrid planning application (currently live) in November 2024 which covers much of the Lyle Park West site allocation, seeking to deliver 1,667 new homes (Class C3), c. 11,500sqm replacement industrial floorspace, flexible commercial and community floorspace, a new public riverside walk and associated public open space (application reference 24/02083/OUT). This application has been received positively by the Council and is due to be presented to Planning Committee within the coming months.

Development Principles

Ballymore supports the redevelopment principles set out within the site allocation for of “Residential, employment uses, open space, main town centre uses and social infrastructure, including community facilities”. This mirrors its ambitions for a residential-led mixed-use development on the site.

Design Principles

Ballymore notes the aspiration to locate the main town centre uses around West Silvertown Station. This has formed the basis of the redevelopment proposals within Ballymore's ownership. However, given the size of the site, the number of residents who will be living on the site and the needs of the residents, it is considered that town centre uses may also be well located throughout the masterplan. This should be updated to “*the main town centre uses should be **primarily** located around West Silvertown Station*”.

The current wording is **overly restrictive** and **not justified**. The amended wording will ensure the site allocation is effective in supporting redevelopment of the site.

In terms of the employment floorspace, Ballymore supports this being located on the west of the site to create a buffer. However, it is considered that there should be an opportunity to support co-location here, subject to it meeting the agents of change test and ensuring residential amenity.

We therefore request that the allocation is updated to state “*non-residential stacked industrial buildings are considered to be the most appropriate typology to provide a buffer, however, other forms of stacking including co-location may be considered appropriate subject to a detailed design review*”.

Again, it is considered that the current wording is **overly restrictive** and **not justified**. The amended wording

will ensure the site allocation is effective in supporting redevelopment of the site.

As set out in respect of Policy D4: Tall Buildings, Ballymore strongly objects to the heights set out within the allocation. The height has decreased since the Regulation 18 consultation, and again in comparison to the adopted Local Plan. It is not clear why the Council have sought to reduce the height requirements from the adopted Local Plan, particularly when facing a presumption in favour of sustainable development given their current underperformance in housing delivery.

A significant body of work has been undertaken to masterplan and design the site as well as testing heights as part of the submitted planning application. These have shown that taller buildings are acceptable in townscape and heritage terms on the site. The heights reflect the datums of Deanston Wharf and Royal Wharf which have been delivered by Ballymore and show their commitment and long-term stewardship to the Royal Docks.

We therefore object to the proposed reduction in the identified building heights. The introduction of more restrictive height parameters would have a **significant impact on the deliverability and viability** of development and would conflict with **London Plan Policy D9 (Tall Buildings)** which recognises that tall building proposals do not necessarily have to be located within defined tall building zones in Local Plans, and can be acceptable where they result in public benefits and comply with the wider requirements of Policy D9.

The current restriction is **not justified** as it is inconsistent with a positive strategy for meeting identified housing needs and would directly constrain the delivery of an efficient, high-density mixed-use development on a site that has already demonstrated capacity to accommodate taller buildings appropriately. Further, the current wording is **not justified** as there is insufficient technical evidence to counter the significant townscape analysis prepared as part of the live planning application which demonstrates building heights of up to 21 storeys would respond positively to local character, townscape, and environmental considerations. Finally, the restriction would render the site allocation **not effective** as it would jeopardise the viability and deliverability of the site, rendering the allocation less likely to be implemented within the plan period.

On this basis, we suggest that the allocation provides an opportunity to deliver additional height where it can be demonstrated that this is appropriate (in terms of high-quality design, environmental impacts and residential quality etc), particularly along the riverfront and at other key locations across the site. This would also be in character with existing tall buildings along the river in the neighbouring Royal Wharf and Deanston Wharf developments.

As such, we contend that the indicative heights identified within draft policy D4 and site allocation N2.SA2 should be updated in line with the adopted site allocation (i.e. indicative height range of 10-12 storeys with capacity for up to 18 storeys in key locations), which will allow any forthcoming development at the site to optimise the delivery of homes, in a form which reflects the established pattern of development across the strategic riverfront sites in this part of Newham.

We suggest the following wording to encapsulate this:

*"Building heights should range between 21—32m (~~ca. 7—10 storeys~~) **10-12 storeys** with taller buildings up to 40m (~~ca. 13 storeys~~) **18 storeys in key locations, including** towards the south of the site fronting the river and around the station as part of the Lyle Park Neighbourhood Parade. **Greater height may be considered appropriate where justified with robust townscape and environmental analysis.** Massing should step down towards the west of the site in proximity to the Strategic Industrial Location and adjacent to the extension of Lyle Park. Buildings should be set back from the watercourse to avoid overshadowing impact."*

Infrastructure Requirements

Ballymore objects to the requirement for an extension to Lyle Park. The proposed extension is **not justified**, as substantial open space provision is provided as part of the forthcoming development which will provide open space for future residents. The proposed requirement is also **not effective**, as it risks introducing unnecessary complexity, cost, and land implications, potentially undermining the deliverability and viability of the development. The extension of Lyle Park should not be a pre-requisite and should be an option depending on the masterplan that comes forward, which policy should recognise.

Notwithstanding this, Ballymore has prepared indicative plans for improvements to the park which would be funded through a financial contribution secured through a S106 Agreement.

For these reasons, the requirement for a park extension should either be deleted to reflect the comprehensive open-space and enhancement measures already proposed through the current planning proposals or amended to the following: *“providing an extension to the northern section of Lyle Park **where necessary and feasible subject to other open space provision set out within the masterplan**”*.

Furthermore, the opportunities for green space as shown on the site allocation plan should be treated as illustrative (and labelled as such on the site allocation map), to ensure consistency with **London Plan Policy D3**, allowing a design-led approach to determine the optimal layout and balance of uses. The current plan's depiction of open space also conflicts with the proposed industrial buffer on the western boundary, further demonstrating that the allocation is not justified.

The draft site allocation requires: “Development should provide a sports-lit Multi-Use Games Area in Lyle Park.” Ballymore objects to this requirement, as it is **not justified or effective**. Provision of new play and sports space should be calculated based on the estimated population yield of the proposed development, and appropriate facilities are already included within the proposed development. The requirement to deliver a MUGA on land outside the site allocation and applicant boundary cannot reasonably be secured or implemented by the developer alone.

Implementation of improvements on adjoining Council-owned land will require active partnership and delivery support from the Borough, and therefore the allocation should be amended to clarify that such works are subject to agreement with the Council (and a contribution toward delivery may be included in a future S106 Agreement) rather than being a direct development requirement. This will ensure the site allocation is both **effective** and **justified**.

Phasing and Implementation

It is important to note that there is a mix of ownership within the site allocation boundary. While Ballymore is the majority landowner, sections of the site are owned by London Borough of Newham and third-party ownership (in proximity to West Silvertown Station). This makes bringing forward a comprehensive masterplan extremely challenging compared to if all the land was in one ownership. This is integral to understanding and realising what can come forward on the site and when. Ballymore therefore proposes that the site allocation should acknowledge that redevelopment of the site should come forward in phases in accordance with a comprehensive masterplan for the site.

We suggest inclusion of the following wording to reflect this: *“**Development should be phased in line with a comprehensive masterplan, with individual sites able to come forward independently where consistent with the overall framework.**”*

This amendment will ensure the site allocation is deliverable and effective.

In response to question (e) “*The assumption that around 800 homes will be built on N2.SA2 between 2028 and 2033*” – it should be noted that the current construction programme for this project is indicative and subject to approval from third parties, such as the Gateway process and Reserved Matters Applications.

Notwithstanding this, please see below for the current indicative construction programme:

Completions from April 2030 to September 2031: 643 homes

Completions from January 2031 to May 2034: 546 homes

Completions from 2035 onwards: 477 homes

N2.SA3 Connaught Riverside

Ballymore submitted a hybrid planning application (currently live) in November 2024 which covers the southern portion of the Connaught Riverside site allocation, seeking to deliver an employment buffer building along the eastern boundary of the site (providing over 13,000sqm industrial floorspace), alongside 1,685 new homes (Class C3), 359 co-living units (Sui Generis), a new Primary School and public open space (application reference 24/02339/OUT). This application has been received positively by the Council and is due to be presented to Planning Committee within the coming months.

We therefore support the continued allocation of the site, and the overarching development principles requiring a residential development, with industrial and employment uses, alongside open space, community and education facilities and main town centre uses.

It is recognised that the Council have addressed our concerns on previous iterations of the Draft Plan in relation to open space provision, noting that the location of the open space within the Site Allocation has been amended, reflecting the recommendations of the Green Infrastructure study, with a consolidated area of open space in the south-eastern corner of the site, aligning with the submitted planning application. We support the amended requirements for the provision of open space in this area.

Development Principles

Ballymore considers that alternative accommodation types, such as large-scale purpose-built shared living (LSPBSL), should also be explicitly supported within Site Allocation N3.SA3 (Connaught Riverside). Under Draft Policy H9 (Houses in multiple occupation and large-scale purpose-built shared living), such developments are directed to town and local centres or along major roads with good public transport accessibility. The Connaught Riverside site allocation meets these criteria, being partly designated as a Local Centre and benefitting from good connections via North Woolwich Road, nearby DLR stations (Pontoon Dock, London City Airport, West Silvertown), and multiple bus services along Albert Road.

To reflect this suitability, the following amended allocation wording is proposed:

“Residential development (including non-self-contained housing alongside traditional Class C3 housing), employment uses, open space, main town centre uses, and social infrastructure, including community and education facilities.”

This amendment would ensure the allocation is **positively prepared, justified, and effective**. Recognising a broader range of residential typologies will help optimise site capacity, provide a diversity of housing choice, and improve overall viability and deliverability of this strategic site.

We support the designation of the site as a local centre, and the allowance for the provision of a medium sized food store which is missing from the surrounding area (and was one of the most raised issues by residents through our public consultation).

Design Principles

In regard to building heights, Ballymore supports the recognition that the site can accommodate tall buildings. However, the current wording regarding maximum heights should be amended to allow greater flexibility, allowing developers to demonstrate that additional height is appropriate above the indicative maximum, through appropriate design, townscape and environmental analysis in accordance with **Policy D9 of the London Plan**.

It should be noted that the currently live 2024 application includes buildings of up to 18 storeys which the Council had not objected to, and the neighbouring 'Tradewinds' development, located at Wards Wharf Approach, has been previously approved for flatted development in the form of 4 connected buildings, including one at 19 storeys in height.

On this basis, we suggest that the allocation provides an opportunity to deliver additional height where it can be demonstrated that this is appropriate:

*"Building heights should range between 21-32m (ca. 7-10 storeys) with taller buildings up to 50m (ca. 16 storeys) to the western part of the site and along the River Thames edge. **Greater height may be considered appropriate where justified with robust townscape and environmental analysis.** Buildings should set back from the watercourse to avoid overshadowing impact."*

This amendment will ensure the site allocation is **effective** and **positively prepared**.

Existing Employment Uses

The draft site allocation currently requires: "The existing employment uses on Thames Road Industrial Estate should be relocated within the site boundary to form a buffer building adjacent to Thameside East Strategic Industrial Location."

While Ballymore support the Council's aspiration to retain existing businesses on site, it should be recognised that not all tenants will want or be able to move into the industrial buffer building. The site comprises low lying industrial sheds at present, many with large areas of open storage and yard space. These are not compatible with an industrial buffer and adjoining residential development. The requirement to relocate all tenants is therefore **not justified or effective**.

In determining the appropriate industrial uses to be re-provided on-site, as part of their live planning application, Ballymore sought advice from an Industrial Agent (Stretton's) who prepared an Employment Statement to support the planning application. While the existing Application Site does include some Class B2 industrial uses, these are not considered to be appropriate to be retained on-site given the difficulty of accommodating their needs within the buffer building and the potential noise and air quality impacts that such uses could have on new neighbouring residential uses.

It should therefore be recognised that not all existing industrial tenants could be relocated into the industrial buffer building. Where tenants either cannot (or choose not to) be relocated into the new development, the site allocation should allow for these tenants to be relocated into other suitable facilities (ideally within the Borough, or within London if required).

To enable this flexibility for tenants, we suggest the site allocation is amended as follows:

*"The existing employment uses on Thames Road Industrial Estate should be relocated within the site boundary to form a buffer building adjacent to Thameside East Strategic Industrial Location. **Where existing tenants cannot be reasonably relocated into the buffer building, relocation assistance should be provided to help businesses find suitable alternative accommodation.**"*

Infrastructure Requirements

The draft site allocation currently requires development to provide an upgrade of Pontoon Dock Station, including escalators to improve access to the station. It is understood that TfL have secured planning permission for improvements to Pontoon Dock Station, including the provision of additional escalators

(application reference 24/00671/FUL). Any contribution towards this scheme must be proportionate to the scale of development, based on estimated trip generation figures, and the site allocation must be clear that it is not just the Connaught Riverside site allocation which is responsible for contributing towards its delivery. As such, we propose the following amended wording to ensure the site allocation is **justified, effective** and **positively prepared**:

“Development should provide ~~an~~ a proportionate contribution towards upgrades of Pontoon Dock Station, including escalators to improve access to the station. The contribution should be based on estimated trip generation figures for the proposed development.”

Ballymore therefore suggests the above changes should be made to the draft site allocation to ensure the successful delivery of this site allocation.

In response to question (f) *“The assumption that around 1,380 homes will be built on N2.SA3 between 2028 and 2034”* – it should be noted that the current construction programme for this project is indicative and subject to approval from third parties, such as the Gateway process and Reserved Matters Applications.

Notwithstanding this, please see below for the current indicative construction programme:

Completions from August 2030 to September 2032: 774 homes + 359 co-living units

Completions from August 2033 to July 2034: 524 homes

Completions from 2035 onwards: 387 homes

N4.SA4 Limmo

*Q4.6 Are policies N4, N4.SA1, N4.SA2, N4.SA3, **N4.SA4** and N4.SA5 justified, consistent with the London Plan, and will they be effective in helping to encourage significant levels of growth and achieve sustainable development in Canning Town neighbourhood? In particular:*

- a) The requirements for the provision of employment uses, including B class, on site N4.SA3.*
- b) The safeguarding of land for a bridge landing point on site N4.SA5.*
- c) The requirements relating to waste management uses on site N4.SA5.*
- d) The assumption that around 1,390 homes will be built on N4.SA1 between 2028 and 2038.*
- e) The assumption that around 170 homes will be built on N4.SA2 between 2028 and 2033.*
- f) The assumption that around 220 homes will be built on N4.SA1 between 2028 and 2033.*
- g) The assumption that around 700 homes will be built on N4.SA4 between 2028 and 2038.***
- h) The assumption that around 870 homes will be built on N4.SA5 between 2027 and 2033.*

This Statement focusses on Site Allocation N4.SA4 (Limmo Peninsula). Ballymore are joint partners with Places for London (PfL) (TfL's Property company) to bring forward the Limmo Site to provide a landscape-led housing development. Whilst no formal representation was made by Ballymore during the Regulation-19 stage, Ballymore request to speak as joint partners, supporting PfL who have previously submitted representations on the Site Allocation N4.SA4.

The key question in relation to N4.SA4 is whether the Site Allocation, as drafted, is **effective** in encouraging significant levels of growth and in particular whether it will allow 700 homes to be built between 2028 and 2038 (part g).

Ballymore, in partnership with PfL are preparing to submit a hybrid planning application to LB Newham which covers the land within their ownership at Limmo Peninsula. The proposals seek to deliver a large area of open space along the western boundary of the site, alongside high-density residential development (circa 2,000 multi-tenure homes), and supporting infrastructure. It is anticipated that a planning application will be submitted in 2026.

Ballymore support the continued allocation of the site, and the overarching development principles requiring residential development and open space. However, we do have significant concerns regarding a number of aspects of the Site Allocation which could restrict growth and limit residential development in this location.

Firstly, there is a mix of ownership within the Site Allocation boundary. While PfL is the majority landowner, sections to the north of the Site (including the bus station) are owned by third-party owners and would be subject to delivery by separate developers. The Site Allocation restricts piecemeal delivery noting the Site should be designed and developed comprehensively in accordance with Local Plan Policy BFN2 (Co-designed Master planning) however given the mixed ownership of the Site this makes bringing forward a comprehensive masterplan extremely challenging compared to if all the land was in one ownership. This is integral to understanding and realising what can come forward on the site and when.

Ballymore therefore proposes that the Site Allocation acknowledges that redevelopment of the site should come forward in phases in accordance with a comprehensive masterplan for the site. Whilst Ballymore and PfL's proposals will not prejudice the realisation of the Site Allocation principles, early deliver should be supported, and it is essential that the land can be delivered independently and in advance of the third-party land that is also included in the Allocation area.

On this basis we suggest that the first paragraph of the Site Allocation Design Principles is amended to the

below.

~~The site should be designed and developed comprehensively in accordance with Local Plan Policy BFN2. Development should be phased in line with a comprehensive masterplan, with individual sites able to come forward independently where consistent with the overall framework.~~

This amendment will ensure the site allocation is **positively prepared** and **effective**.

The second key restriction to development within the Site Allocation is the proposed building heights. Please note our comments above on the general Tall Buildings Policy D4 and required flexibility, in accordance with the **London Plan Policy D9**.

The Limmo Site Allocation states that 'building heights should range between 21-32m (ca. 7-10 storeys) with taller buildings up to 60m (ca. 20 storeys) adjacent to the railway line and open space.' This fails to reflect the existing and emerging townscapes context within which tall buildings, exceeding 20 storeys are prevalent. This includes:

- / Brunel Street Works (LB Newham) – up to 26 storeys
- / Manor Road Quarter (LB Newham) – up to 30 storeys
- / London City Island (LB Tower Hamlets, delivered by Ballymore) – up to 27 storeys
- / Goodluck Hope (LB Tower Hamlets, delivered by Ballymore) – up to 30 storeys
- / Orchard Wharf (LB Tower Hamlets – subject to a resolution to approve) – up to 24 storeys

Noting the above townscape context, it is clear that a more appropriate height range for the Limmo Site is up to 100m (circa 30 storeys) within the boundary of the Site Allocation, with taller buildings to be considered where they can demonstrate compliance with the development plan as a whole. The tall building zone, of which Limmo sits within (TBZ13) has a maximum height of 100m in defined areas. It is recommended that this maximum height is extended across the tall building zone, to include the Limmo Site Allocation.

Notwithstanding this, the optimum building heights must be determined by undertaking a detailed design and townscape-led assessment; and extensive environmental analysis, which has not yet been completed to a satisfactory level. The assessments must take into consideration the adjoining LB Tower Hamlets developments as part of the townscape context which sit immediately adjacent to the Site. At present, it is **not justified** from the Evidence Base why a significant step down in heights on the Limmo Site is necessary, when taking into account the surrounding townscape context. Ballymore has successfully delivered tall buildings at London City Island and Goodluck Hope, as outlined above, which immediately neighbour the Limmo Site. The height proposal for Site Allocation N4.SA4 is therefore **not based on proportionate evidence or Justified**.

In addition to ensuring the height range reflects the townscape context surrounding the site, it is also important to note that restricting taller buildings in this location could impact the viability and in turn the deliverability of development coming forward in this location due to the high infrastructure costs and requirements associated with the Site (as acknowledged within the Site Allocation). The site is constrained with physical infrastructure including Elizabeth Line tunnels which run under the southern portion of the site, and their associated shafts on site, underground high-voltage cables, overhead power lines to the eastern edge and gas and water easements which result in exclusion/no-build zones. These infrastructure requirements are in addition to the

requirement on site of 2ha of open space and the delivery of a bridge – which collectively limits buildable area. Limiting building heights therefore harmfully impacts the density of development realistic to the Site which could in turn impact other key requirements such as affordable housing. The height restriction proposed is therefore **not Effective or Deliverable**.

Limiting building heights as proposed would fail to optimise the use of land as required by paragraph 130 of the NPPF through limiting high density development in this location, on a 5ha constrained, brownfield site. As a result, the height restriction noted within the Policy discourages growth and the wider ambition to achieve sustainable development in Canning Town neighbourhood. It is therefore noted that the height strategy is **not Justified, Effective or consistent with National policy**.

The Site Allocation should be worded more flexibly, noting the identified heights are considered to be appropriate, but without directly preventing taller buildings where it can be demonstrated they are of high quality, deliver appropriate public benefits and comply with the development plan as a whole.

It is not appropriate at Local Plan preparation stage to be restricting heights on sites without any evidenced contextual analysis or allowing for the proper application of the planning balance which would be considered at development control stage. As mentioned above setting an inflexible maximum height range is also in direct conflict with the London Plan which requires a design led approach to determining site capacity and is therefore not Consistent with National Policy.

Ballymore believe that this location is extremely capable of accommodating taller buildings which could aid in delivering the much-needed homes as set out within the earlier strategic policies (discussed under Matter 2). There is a clear urban design rationale that the Limmo Site could and should achieve building heights greater than these surrounding developments. This is based on the following:

- / It sits centrally within an existing established cluster of taller buildings.
- / It presents an island site – which will be reached by a series of connecting routes. Tall buildings will play an important role in demarcating these entrance points and the proposed open space (designed to support the wider community).
- / It is separated from neighbouring developments by the existing railway tracks and the River Lea – which assists in managing the impact of taller buildings.
- / The inclusion of taller buildings assists in freeing up ground space to provide public routes, social infrastructure and opportunity for open space.
- / It is central location and in close proximity to public transport and local services

On this basis we suggest that the second paragraph of the Site Allocation Design Principles is amended to the below.

Building heights should range between 21-32m (ca. 7-10 storeys) with taller buildings up to ~~100m 60m~~ (ca. ~~20 33~~ storeys) ~~adjacent to the railway line and open space~~. Above the bus station, development should range between 19-42m (ca. 6-13 storeys)

The third concern with the Site Allocation as drafted is the infrastructure requirement to deliver a new

pedestrian bridge connection from the Limmo site through to Brunel Street Works, providing 24 hour non-fare paying access to the town centre. Whilst the ambition and principle of a bridge connection is supported, as drafted, the wording restricts the viability and deliverability of development as a whole when viewed in the context of all infrastructure requirements of the Site. As a result, it is **not Effective or Deliverable**.

Ballymore believe that more appropriate wording should include safeguarding of a bridge landing position to support the delivery of a bridge which is a common requirement under Site Allocations, as shown in N4.SA5 - Canning Town Riverside.

Further, it should be recognised that a pedestrian bridge over the railway is not the only way of securing accessibility improvements to the site. The site allocation should therefore recognise that alternative transport and accessibility improvements may be made in lieu of a new bridge. It is considered that the requirement including type and location of the transport infrastructure should be further reviewed as part of a forthcoming application to review the most appropriate form of improving accessibility to the site.

This proposed change to paragraph 3 of the Infrastructure requirements section of the Site Allocation is reflected below:

*Development should **safeguard land for** ~~provide~~ a new pedestrian bridge connection from the Limmo site through to Brunel Street Works, providing 24 hour non-fare paying access to the town centre, **or alternative transport infrastructure improvement from the Limmo site.***

The final area of concern relating to Site Allocation N4.SA4 and whether, as drafted, it encourages growth and can support the delivery of homes is the requirement of 2ha of open space on site.

The Allocation states that ‘*development should address open space deficiencies by providing a local park... of a minimum of 2 hectares of consolidated space to service nearby residential neighbourhoods.*’ It is noted that there are other Allocations that rely on a new open space at Limmo Peninsula, including Silvertown Way East (N4.SA2) and Canning Town Holiday Inn (N4.SA3).

Ballymore supports the Council’s ambition to deliver easy access to a network of high-quality green spaces for all residents however, as noted above, the Site is owned by multiple landowners, with Pfl as the majority landowner. As such, the site allocation should acknowledge that the responsibility of delivering up to 2ha of open space is across the entire site allocation and should be proportionate to each relevant developer, as opposed to being one 2ha area of consolidated space. As drafted, the 2ha of consolidated open space is required to be provided in full within the Pfl land which will further impact the buildable area and in turn the viability and deliverability of development, as discussed above.

To enable **effective** and viable delivery, the allocation should allow for proportionate delivery of the open space within each parcel of land and relevant developer. As such, the below changes are proposed to the first paragraph of the Infrastructure requirements section of the Site Allocation:

*The development should provide ~~a local park of~~ a minimum of 2 hectares of ~~consolidated~~ **open** space **across the Site Allocation** to service nearby residential neighbourhoods*

The allocation also states that ‘the open space provision should prioritise community growing opportunities.’ Ballymore consider this to be overly prescriptive, and the park design should be determined following at detailed application stage through a collaborative, landscape-led approach; and extensive environmental analysis. It is recommended that this requirement is removed from the draft wording.

To answer the question posed above, whilst Ballymore support the continued allocation of the site, and the

overarching development principles requiring residential development and open space, due to the several areas of concern noted above, it is considered that the Allocation as drafted is **not Effective** in encouraging growth. It is instead considered that the allocation as drafted could restrict growth and limit residential development in this location. Should the Allocation be revised to reflect the above proposed changes, it is only then that the assumed number of homes can be delivered at the Limmo Site.

In response to question (g) *“The assumption that around 700 homes will be built on N4.SA4 between 2028 and 2038”* – it should be noted that the current construction programme for this project is indicative and subject to approval from third parties, such as the Gateway process and Reserved Matters Applications. Notwithstanding this, it is anticipated that all homes on the Limmo site will be delivered by 2035. Ballymore contends that the site has a greater capacity than 700 homes, with the emerging masterplan for the site including c.1,100 homes alongside co-living or student apartments.

N8. SA6 (Stratford Waterfront South) & N8.SA8 (Bridgewater Road)

Q4.10 Are policies N8, and N8.SA1 to N8.SA10 justified, consistent with the London Plan, and will they be effective in helping to encourage significant levels of growth and achieve sustainable development in the Stratford and Maryland neighbourhood? In particular:

- a) The support in policy N7 part 1 for a moderate uplift in density in “enhance” areas.*
- b) The requirements relating to tall buildings, including in terms of viability and the effect on heritage assets.*
- c) The layout of development illustrated on the site maps.*
- d) Whether the detailed policy requirements are consistent with extant planning permissions.*
- e) The assumption that around 1,200 homes will be built on N8.SA1 between 2025 and 2038.*
- f) The assumption that around 1,310 homes will be built on N8.SA2 between 2025 and 2038.*
- g) The assumption that around 1,310 homes will be built on N8.SA3 between 2028 and 2038.*
- h) The assumption that around 150 homes will be built on N8.SA4 between 2028 and 2033.*
- i) The assumption that around 2,780 homes will be built on N8.SA5 between 2023 and 2038.*
- j) The assumption that around 500 homes will be built on N8.SA6 between 2031 and 2032.*
- k) The assumption that around 390 homes will be built on N8.SA7 between 2028 and 2033.*
- l) The assumption that around 680 homes will be built on N8.SA8 between 2028 and 2033.*
- m) The assumption that around 2,110 homes will be built on N8.SA9 between 2023 and 2033.*
- n) The assumption that around 210 homes will be built on N8.SA10 between 2028 and 2033.*

N8. SA6 Stratford Waterfront South

In line with our previous representations, we support the identification that the Stratford Waterfront Site Allocation (N8.SA6) is located within the Stratford Metropolitan Centre. This recognition of the key aspect the wider allocation can bring to the area will be paramount to the ongoing success of the space.

We also support the ongoing height designations for the areas within the N8 Neighbourhood notably for N8.SA6 Stratford Waterfront Site. The ongoing recognition that height and density can be secured within this allocation is important to its overall delivery of new homes. It will be **Effective** in helping to encourage significant levels of growth and achieve sustainable development in the Stratford and Maryland neighbourhood.

Since our previous representations, a Reserved Matters planning application (ref: 24/00067/REM_LLDC) associated with the Outline scheme (ref: 18/00470/OUT as varied by 20/00274/VAR) has been consented relating to the Stratford Waterfront Site. It is therefore considered **Justified** that the Council has assumed 500 homes to be delivered between 2031 and 2032.

N8.SA8 Bridgewater Road

We are pleased to see the inclusion of Warton Road within the site allocation following our previous comments. The synchronisation with the extant outline consent for the site will help bring clarity to development proposals coming forward.

We are however concerned that the Council continues to reference open space within the site allocation without identifying within the relevant site allocation diagram or associated Proposals Map where the existing open space (which must be replaced) is located. It is appreciated that there is a need to retain the MOL and Allotment land however further clarity is needed on the open space commentary for the scheme to be able to identify and review the constraints of the allocation. The layout of development illustrated on the site maps is therefore not **Effective** or **Justified**.

On this basis we suggest that the first paragraph of the Site Allocation Development Principles is amended to the below.

Development should protect and maintain the openness of the Metropolitan Open Land. The design and layout of the site should protect and retain the allotments ~~and the existing open space~~, including access and functionality.

Site Allocation N8.SA8 has been updated to include the Greenway Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) within part of the Allocation boundary. There is no clear justification within the Evidence base explaining why this has been included and therefore it is **not Justified**. The Evidence Base notes that the encroachment is necessary because the land is ‘*ecologically contiguous with the existing SINC*’, however, no substantive evidence to justify this is provided. Previous correspondence noted this as a “mapping error” and therefore we request that the designation is reviewed and removed from the Allocation, unless clear justification is provided to support its inclusion. In answer to the question above, the Site benefits from recent extant permissions (ref: 21/00403/OUT, 21/00407/FUL & 24/00035/VAR_LLDC) and an earlier Legacy Communities Scheme (LCS) Outline permission for delivery of housing on this site granted in 2012 (ref. 11/90621/OUTODA as varied by 24/00115/VAR). The new designation of a SINC onsite is **not consistent** with these extant planning permissions, where it shows an overlap with three development parcels. Further, it conflicts with the equivalent site allocation within the current LLDC Local Plan.

Site Allocation N8.SA8 specifies heights between 21-32m (7-10 storeys) with taller buildings up to 50 metres (16 storeys). It also requires the massing to step down towards the allotments in the north of the site. Whilst the variation in building heights across the site is supported, it is not appropriate at Local Plan preparation stage to be restricting heights on sites without any evidenced contextual analysis or allowing for the proper application of the planning balance which would be considered at development control stage. As mentioned above setting an inflexible maximum height range is also in direct conflict with the London Plan which requires a design led approach to determining site capacity and is therefore not **Consistent with National Policy**.

Ballymore believe that this location can accommodate a varied massing, including taller buildings which could, in turn, aid in delivering the much-needed homes as set out within the earlier strategic policies (discussed under Matter 2).

The Site Allocation should be worded more flexibly, noting the identified heights are considered to be appropriate, but without directly preventing taller buildings where it can be demonstrated they are of high quality, deliver appropriate public benefits and comply with the development plan as a whole. On this basis we suggest that the second paragraph of the Site Allocation Design Principles is amended to the below.

*Building heights should range between 21-32m (ca. 7-10 storeys) with taller buildings up to 50m (ca. 16 storeys) in the east and south east of the site. **Greater height may be considered appropriate where justified with robust townscape and environmental analysis.** Massing should be sensitively designed to ~~step down towards the allotments in the north of the site to sensitively integrate with the low rise context~~ and prevent **unreasonable** overshadowing.*

As drafted, there are significant concerns with Allocation N8.SA8 which include key barriers to future development on site. As a result, they are not considered to be effective in helping to encourage significant levels of growth and achieve sustainable development in the Stratford and Maryland neighbourhood. LLDC and Ballymore, as joint venture partners, have been in pre-application discussions with LBN since late 2024 in preparing Reserved Matters Applications for the site. Ballymore therefore suggests the above changes should be made to the draft site allocation to ensure the successful delivery of this site allocation.

Summary

We look forward to the opportunity to discuss these matters further at the forthcoming hearing session on Main Matters 2-4 in December 2025 and collectively working towards the formulation of a positive planning policy framework.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours faithfully

A rectangular area containing a black and white diamond pattern, used to redact a signature.

For and on behalf of
Rolfe Judd Planning Limited