Strategic planning application stage 1 referral


The proposal

Redevelopment of the site for mixed use purposes, including the partial demolition, rebuilding, alteration and conversion of the Millennium Mills and the construction of buildings across the site to include Brand Buildings (Sui Generis), residential (C3), office (B1), retail (A1-A5), leisure (D2), education (D1), hotels (C1), other non-residential floorspace such as community use (D1); provision of public open space; works of repair and restoration of the dock walls; infilling and excavation of parts of the dock area; the placing of structures in, on or over the dock area; utilities; construction of estate roads and the creation of new accesses to the public highway; works of landscaping and making good; creation of surface and sub-surface car parking areas.

The applicant

The applicant is The Silvertown Partnership and the lead masterplan architect is Fletcher Priest.

Strategic issues

The principle of a mixed use development with commercial, leisure and housing uses in the Royal Docks and Beckton Waterfront Opportunity Area and Enterprise Zone is in accordance with strategic and local objectives and is supported. The proposed sui generis brand pavilions is innovative and supported. However, robust control mechanisms will be required to ensure the brand related retail and the associated A1 to A5 retail elements do not negatively impact on town centres in the wider sub-region and more local centres. Employment uses are supported.

Negotiations are ongoing in relation to viability and affordable housing. A review mechanism likely to be required. The indicative housing mix has been agreed in line with the Council’s local housing needs.

The indicative master plan is well conceived but the design code will need to be secured through the legal agreement to ensure a high standard of residential quality.

Planning conditions are required to secure inclusive design, play space, air quality and noise impacts and aviation safeguarding. Further discussion is required in relation to the energy strategy, parking and transport.

A legal mechanism will be required to secure the transport mitigation. Should Newham Council be minded to grant planning permission, this and the section 106 agreement will need to be completed prior to the stage 2 referral.
**Recommendation**

That Newham Council be advised that the application does not currently comply with the London Plan, with the reasons and remedies set out in paragraph 177 and 178 of the report.

**Context**

1. On 23 September 2014 the Mayor of London received documents from Newham Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. Under the provisions of The Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor had until 4 November 2014 to provide the Council with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. The Mayor may also provide other comments. In this instance, given the scale and strategic importance of the application and the need to take into account independent reviews of the viability appraisal and the retail impact assessment before reporting to the Mayor stage 1, Newham Council has agreed to take into account comments provided after this deadline. This report sets out information for the Mayor’s use in deciding what decision to make.

2. The application is referable under Categories 1A, 1B and 3F of the Schedule to the Order 2008:

   1A - Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats;

   1B - Development which comprises or includes the erection of a building outside Central London and with a total floorspace of more than 15,000 square metres.

   3F - Development for a use, other than residential use, which includes the provision of more than 200 car parking spaces in connection with that use.

3. Once Newham Council has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision as to whether to direct refusal; take it over for his own determination; or allow the Council to determine it itself. The Mayor of London’s statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website [www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk).

4. The environmental information for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 has been taken into account in the consideration of this case.

**Site description**

5. The site comprises 27.4 hectares within the Royal Docks, a major east London regeneration area which is designated as both an Enterprise Zone and an Opportunity Area (Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside). Located to the south of Royal Victoria Dock, the site has extensive dockside to its northern edge, and contains Pontoon Dock within the centre of the site. The site is bound to the east by the Silvertown Way, to the south by the North Woolwich Road and to the west by the existing residential development of Britannia Village. The River Thames is located to the south of the site on the opposite side of North Woolwich Road.

6. There is a level change across the site from +5 metres in the western and northern sections of the site to +1.75 at the southern and eastern section. There is also a significant level change from the North Woolwich Road into the site.

7. The locally listed Millennium Mills and the former Rank Hovis Building are located on the northern edge of the site and the Grade II listed Silo D building is located in the south western
corner of the site. Aside from these existing heritage assets, the remainder of the site is vacant and cleared with some temporary ‘meanwhile use’ structures remaining.

**Figure 1**: the proposed Silvertown Quays development site (source: submitted Planning Statement Quod)

---

8 In terms of the immediate surrounding area, the residential neighbourhood of Britannia Village lies directly to the west of the site, with London City Airport located to the east on the opposite side of Connaught Bridge/A112. A single runway exists on the stretch of land between the Royal Albert Dock and the King George V Dock. The Airport is currently applying for planning permission for additional passenger facilities and infrastructure works. To the south lies the Barrier Park East residential development and Thames Barrier Park and to the southwest is the new residential led mixed use development of Royal Wharf (previously Minoco Wharf) which has commenced construction. Lyle Park is in close proximity.

9 The ExCeL Centre is located to the north of the site on the other side of Royal Victoria Dock and is reached via the existing high level pedestrian footbridge. The rest of the neighbouring area is made up of limited residential development and industrial uses such as the Tate & Lyle factory. Other areas of vacant land exist in the area, most of which are protected as Strategic Industrial Locations (‘SILs’) and as Safeguarded Wharves.

10 Further to the northwest of the site lies Canning Town, with Custom House to the north. A new Crossrail Station is due to open at Custom House in 2018. Both these areas along with Beckton and Cyprus to the north east are established residential settlements together with a mixture of supporting uses ranging from retail to education. There are a number of ongoing and emerging regeneration proposals for these areas in addition to the proposed development to the
north of London City Airport, where Advanced Business Parks are proposing to create a new business centre aimed initially at Chinese and Asian business; also the subject of a live planning application.

11 Pontoon Dock Docklands Light Railway (DLR) station on the London City Airport/Woolwich Arsenal line is located on the opposite side of North Woolwich Road. A new bridge is proposed across the Royal Victoria Dock to provide a better route than the existing footbridge between the site and Custom House DLR (Beckton branch) and future Crossrail station (opening 2018). Custom House would be just over 500 metres via a new bridge from the nearest part of the site (which is also the area furthest from Pontoon Dock station). Two bus routes stop within 400 metres walk of the nearest parts of the site.

12 The site currently records a poor public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 1b or 2 although this may increase with the proposals for direct links between the site and Pontoon Dock station, the RVD footbridge to Custom House and enhanced bus services.

Details of the proposal

13 An outline planning application is proposed for the comprehensive regeneration of the site through a mixed use scheme including Brand Buildings, offices, new homes and high quality public realm. The description of the development is as follows:

Redevelopment of the site for mixed use purposes, including the partial demolition, rebuilding, alteration and conversion of the Millennium Mills and the construction of buildings across the site to include Brand Buildings (Sui Generis), residential, office (B1), retail (A1-A5), leisure (D2), education (D1), hotels (C1) other non-residential floorspace such as community use (D1); provision of public open space; works of repair and restoration of the dock walls; infilling and excavation of parts of the dock area; the placing of structures in, on or over the dock area; utilities, construction of estate roads and the creation of new accesses to the public highway works of landscaping and making good; creation of surface and sub-surface car parking areas.

14 The application proposes a maximum total of 670,000 sq.m. of floorspace which is broken down into the following maximum floorspaces by use:

- 179,000 sq.m. B1 office
- 222,000 sq.m ‘Sui generis’ brand accommodation (please see paragraphs 28 to 35 below)
- 300,000 sq.m C3 residential use (up to 3,003 units)
- 44,500 sq.m. A1 brand-related retail
- 20,400 sq.m. A3-A5
- Up to 10,000 sq.m. local retail (A1 to A5)
- 6,900 sq.m. D1 community and education floorspace (two form of entry primary school to be delivered in development zone 6 and community floorspace in development zone 1 and 2).

15 The maximum permitted floorspaces by use are further broken down into Development Zones to give an indication of how these uses may be distributed across the site. For the purposes of the outline planning application, the site has been organised into seven ‘development zones’ which are formally defined in Parameter Plan 08 and reproduced in Figure 2, below. The masterplan does not commit the amount of floor space in specific building plots, but the maximum amount of development (in total and by specific land use) is fixed in each zone. The proposed schedule of accommodation is as below in Figure 3 and is set out in the submitted Development Specification and Framework.
To provide flexibility, the total floor areas for each zone add up to more than the total indicated. This approach allows the development to respond to demand and the market as the development is built out. For example the floorspace applied for may vary over the three proposed phases so that the B1 and brand uses on the site can vary according to market needs. The masterplan has been designed to accommodate a range of building sizes and uses for varying tenant types, such as large corporate headquarters to smaller incubator and start-up occupiers.

A flexible housing offer is also intended to cater for changing community needs over the lifetime of the development and should a higher level of residential development be brought forward, then the proposed interchanging of uses will mean that the office floorspace will be reduced. The submitted Development Specification and Framework sets out that the total approved floor space shall not exceed the permissible amount stated by zone. Phasing of the development will begin with Development Zone 1 but will be flexible thereafter dependent upon market conditions.
Figure 3: Maximum floorspace by use class and Development Zone.

Maximum Floorspace for each Use Class within the respective Development Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Use Class</th>
<th>Brair (excluding retail)</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Retail Local A1 A5</th>
<th>Culinary Food &amp; Drink A1 A2</th>
<th>Hotel C2</th>
<th>Leisure &amp; Cultural D1</th>
<th>Community &amp; Education D1</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Maximum Floorspace Permitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>333,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Floorspace Permitted 221,000 170,000 300,000 44,500 10,000 20,400 16,000 19,800 6,900 3,600 670,000

Form of the planning application

18 The planning application has been submitted in outline with matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved within the parameters set out in the Parameters Plans. The principal means of access to the site is sought for approval at this stage and the positioning and treatment of vehicular circulation routes within the site will be determined as part of detailed design. To this end, the outline application is accompanied by the following documents which will inform and control all reserved matters applications:

- **Development Specification Framework (‘DSF’)**: defines and describes the principal components of the proposed development, including the form and content of the planning application as well as the parameters for future detailed applications;

- **Application Drawings (comprising Parameter Plans)**: show details of the proposed development for which outline planning permission is sought:
  - Parameter Plan 1: Demolition and Existing Site Levels
  - Parameter Plan 2: Proposed Site Levels
  - Parameter Plan 3: Works to Existing Structures
  - Parameter Plan 4: Roads and Routes
  - Parameter Plan 5: Open Space
  - Parameter Plan 6: Maximum Building Heights
  - Parameter Plan 7: Development Zones

- **Design Codes**: these add a further level of detail to the Parameter Plans to inform future reserved matters applications. They contain design guidelines and principles in respect of matters such as the relationship to surrounding buildings, street frontages, public routes through the proposed development and landscaping/public realm.

19 The application is to be accompanied by several separate but related planning applications which will be submitted in future (NB: some of these applications will also be referable to the Mayor):
• The outline application seeks permission for works to partially demolish and rebuild/refurbish the Millennium Mills building and establish its use for retail (A1-A5) uses on the ground floor and offices (B1) and/or residential above. Appendix 3 of the DSF comprises a specification for these works. However, a full detailed planning application is due to be submitted for these works to allow its consideration alongside the masterplan.

• Alterations to the grade II listed Silo D building: The structure will be retained and incorporated into the scheme at the same time as development around it is brought forward. There are a number of options for the potential use of the building and a separate Planning and Listed Building application will, in due course, seek permission for the permanent use of this building and consequential changes to the listed structure.

• Detailed planning permission for the pedestrian and cycle footbridge over the Royal Victoria Dock will be sought separately to the outline application. (Parameters for the alignment, width and other parameters for the bridge are secured as part of this application).

• Parameter Plan 4 safeguards land for a bridge from the Pontoon Dock Docklands Light Railway (DLR) Station to the site across North Woolwich Road and onward routes throughout the site. Enhanced surface level crossing facilities are proposed across North Woolwich Road to ensure the site is integrated with its surroundings including the DLR Station. The former would be subject to a separate planning application in due course whilst the latter would be delivered through the section 278 highway works.

20 The site is currently owned by the Greater London Authority Land and Property (GLAP) and the outline application is submitted by The Silvertown Partnership LLP, the selected development partner to bring forward the redevelopment of the site. A portion of the embankment on the southern edge of the site is owned by the London Borough of Newham. The Pontoon Dock and Royal Victoria Dock water bodies are owned and managed by RoDMA (The Royal Docks Management Authority Limited) in which GLAP has a controlling interest. The Greater London Authority, Newham Council, Transport for London and the applicant have entered into a Project Performance Planning Agreement to establish milestones for the progress of the planning application outside of the statutory timescales.

**Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance**

21 The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- **World City status**  
  London Plan;
- **Regeneration**  
  London Plan;
- **Employment**  
  London Plan;
- **Retail**  
  London Plan;
- **Housing**  
  London Plan; Housing SPG; Housing Strategy; draft Revised Housing Strategy; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation SPG
- **Affordable housing**  
  London Plan; Housing SPG; Housing Strategy; draft Revised Housing Strategy
- **Urban design**  
  London Plan
- **Access**  
  London Plan; Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG
- **The Blue Ribbon Network**  
  London Plan
Proposed uses and principle of development

23 The site lies within the Royal Docks and Beckton Waterfront Opportunity Area which is identified in the London Plan as being capable of delivering a minimum of 11,000 new homes with an indicative employment capacity of 6,000 jobs. The draft Further Alterations to the London Plan - ‘intend to publish’ version as submitted to the Secretary of State December 2014, update the London Plan to take account of the designation of the Royal Docks as London’s first of the newly reintroduced Enterprise Zones in 2011, noting:

The Royal Docks will return to its former glory at the forefront of international trade and exchange. The regeneration of Silvertown Quays, Royal Albert Dock and Royal Albert Basin should build upon innovative and iconic developments such as the Siemens Crystal and the Emirates Air Line cable car. The Enterprise Zone will support its role as a world class business destination with capacity for at least 6,000 jobs. Joint public and private investment will create London’s first Asian business park. The potential for a new ‘floating village’ should be explored as part of the Royals’ potential to accommodate at least 11,000 new homes. Key issues to be addressed include maximising the benefits of the Crossrail station at Custom House, future growth of London City Airport, capitalising on the success of ExCel and its potential as a focus for further visitor/business related growth and improving connections to London Riverside.

24 The site is also locally designated in Newham Council’s Core Strategy as Strategic Site 21: Silvertown Quays which is described as being suitable for the following uses: “residential-led mixed use with potential for leisure and hospitality and green industries including research and development, building on the visitor attraction cluster at the western end of the docks (ExCel, Siemens exhibition centre). New residential development on this site will form part of the wider neighbourhood at Silvertown, supported by local shopping and community uses (and a new local) centre focused around North Woolwich Road, including use of space under the DLR viaduct. Leisure uses should relate to the water space, with clear pedestrian and cycle connections through to the new local centre and across North Woolwich Road. Public access to the dock edge should be provided. Indicative residential typology – medium density, medium family.”

25 The Silvertown Quays development site is the largest undeveloped site remaining from the legacy of the Royal Docks’ closure over the latter half of the 20th century and represents an important regeneration opportunity for east London. There is a previous consent on the site for a residential-led mixed use development and as such the principle of regeneration of this long-term vacant site to deliver growth in jobs and homes within the Royal Docks is well established.

26 This proposed development of a large, previously developed employment site located within a designated Opportunity Area to deliver a mixed use development is supported for the employment growth and homes benefits it will generate.

Residential uses
The application proposes up to 300,000 sq.m. residential uses which could equate to some 3,033 homes on the site over the lifetime of the development. London Plan Policy 3.3 provides explicit strategic support for the provision of housing within London and the inclusion of residential accommodation on this site is in line with the Core Strategy Strategic Site Allocation. Affordable housing is proposed (final level to be determined through viability discussions) and this is supported by London Plan policy 3.12 which sets out that strategic planning applications should deliver the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, taking into account viability and site specific circumstances.

**Brand accommodation and associated ‘Brand related retail’**

A key component of the proposed Silvertown Quays development is the use of ‘Brand accommodation’ which comprises a maximum of 222,000 sq.m of the overall floorspace to be developed within Zones 1, 3 and 4 (equating to some 33% of total proposed development) and may also include up to 44,500 sq.m. of A1 brand-related retail uses (total of 266,500 sq.m. GEA). This floorspace is to be located in the north west and central parts of the masterplan, forming a central zone with high levels of pedestrian activity. It is envisaged that the Silvertown Quays development will play a key role in transforming the Royal Docks into a global meeting place and a centre for the exchange of ideas and that the provision of Silvertown Brand Buildings will be integral to this. Paragraph 4.9 of the submitted Brand and Retail Impact Assessment (BRA) states that retailers and brand owners are reassessing the role and function of advertising and how they interact with consumers, for example in physical stores. The BRA adds that “brand buildings are considered to be the ideal means of responding to this step change in interaction, and in effect are a physical form of experiential marketing which is becoming an increasingly popular and important marketing tool.”

Brand Accommodation is principally concerned with promoting brands and will provide the means to showcase individual brands through means such as demonstration, exhibition, research & development, workshops and display. The brand accommodation is not intended to function as retail floorspace and the applicant notes that is not provided with the servicing or car parking that would be associated with this use. In addition, planning controls are intended to prevent the sale of goods within this floorspace, and any ancillary brand-related retail floorspace that is required alongside the brand floorspace must be applied for separately. The ‘brand accommodation’ will be mainly provided as permanent structures of varying typologies (including different amounts of office space for example) which would enable showcasing. The submitted Design and Access statement sets out that there are three main types of brand building:

- **Trading House typology:** these buildings are seen as formal, vertical, urban buildings that serve to define streets and spaces. Within the masterplan they are generally 6-8 floors in height. The ground and first floors are normally of generous height (c. 6 metres) to create large volumes that can be fitted out in multiple ways, with installations that might include testing new forms of consumer experience. Upper floors will be closer to contemporary offices in their floor-floor height. These buildings are located in the north-west and central part of the masterplan, forming a central zone in which high levels of ground level pedestrian activity are sought, to be supported with food and beverage, hotels and cultural facilities and curated experiences for members of the public.

- **Pavilion typology:** a series of pavilion structures will strongly characterise the site. These will be in two types – permanent and temporary – and will contain a mixture of functions. The permanent structures will be those that are long-term freestanding object buildings, designed to be seen from all sides and generally disengaged from the surrounding street line, either sitting as objects within streets and open spaces, or ‘floating’ on water within the in-filled dock areas. The temporary buildings will be mobile
structures or ‘pop-up’ constructed objects that are designed to move from place to place within the site, across the city or internationally. In terms of functions, some of these will serve as brand showcases and exhibition spaces (such as the existing Siemens Crystal building to the west of the site, or multiple Expo precedents around the world) and others will contain food and beverage or cultural uses. In scale, these will range from kiosks to single storey buildings to three or four floors where they are designed to be seen from a distance. In these cases, they will operate in a similar fashion to the ‘trading houses’ discussed above, but will serve a different role as ‘foreground’ urban buildings.

- **Headquarter typology (offices):** The office buildings identified in the masterplan are generally located in the southern part of the site immediately adjacent to Pontoon Dock DLR station. These buildings are intended to serve large organisations for whom proximity to international brands, and their consumers, would be highly beneficial. The relationship to public transport connectivity, London City Airport, and Excel, is also part of the rationale for their inclusion within the project. These buildings would be large floorplate efficient structures capable of subdivision into multiple tenancies, and could be up to ten floors in height towards the southern edge of the site.

30 The proposed mix of uses and the various typologies of brand buildings do not easily fall within a single use class and following detailed discussions at the pre-application stage it has been agreed between the applicant, Newham Council and GLA planning officers that a ‘Sui Generis’ classification is appropriate for these uses. This has been supported by the independent review of the Brand and Retail Impact Assessment and is discussed in greater detail below. Given this classification and to provide greater certainty that the proposed brand uses will remain as such, a detailed description of the Brand Accommodation has been produced and this will be secured as part of the legal agreement as follows:

“Buildings to showcase and promote corporate, educational and other brands including the following uses or mix of uses: demonstration, exhibition, museum, research & development, education, office, workshops, display, catering and ancillary uses”

31 In recognition that some brands may wish to provide some associated retail accommodation, planning permission is also being sought for up to 44,500 sq.m. of Brand-related retail floorspace as part of the outline planning application. As noted above, this is intended to function as a set budget of floorspace which has associated controls (see section on assessing brand use and retail impacts below) that must be applied for separately at the reserved matters stage. To control this, planning conditions and/or obligations will be entered into such that it can only come forward in conjunction with, and be limited in quantum and/or percentage terms to, the Brand accommodation. Given the quantum being applied for, there are also proposed conditions to ensure that the form of the brand related A1 retail does not create a retail frontage which may be similar to a traditional town centre frontage. These various conditions and/or obligations are considered in paragraphs 52 to 64 below which consider the brand and brand related retail impacts. These matters are under discussion and will need to be agreed by Newham Council and GLA officers before the application is referred back for a stage two decision.

32 The proposals for Silvertown Quays could be considered in keeping with the vision of the Royal Docks to provide a world-class business destination within the knowledge economy, and a focus for investment on a world stage. Subject to certain caveats and controls being agreed, this first proposed clustering of brand accommodation to create a type of ‘brand park’ is in accordance with the objectives of the London Plan and Core Strategy policies to create a successful destination, capable of attracting innovative and high value added companies to reflect London’s strongest and most dynamic economic growth sectors. This approach reflects...
the aspirations in London Plan policy 4.10 ‘New and emerging sectors’ to support innovation and research and to ensure the availability of workspaces and support clusters of research and innovation.

33 This approach will also ensure that the proposal contributes to London’s world city status and as such is in accordance with the objectives of London Plan Policy 2.1 which seeks to ensure that London retains and extends its global role as a sustainable centre for business, innovation, creativity, health, education and research, culture and art and as a place to live, visit and enjoy.

34 The proposed development at Silvertown Quays has the potential to create up to 20,680 jobs across all skills levels, which is well beyond the FALP target for the whole Opportunity Area of 6,000 jobs and is welcomed. The creation of employment opportunities for local people is also key priority for Newham Council and should be subject to provisions within the legal agreement. Figure 4 below sets out the skills demand anticipated at the proposed development which is welcome and in line with strategic priorities.

Figure 3: Indicative employment creation at Silvertown Quays (Source: submitted planning statement Quod).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Entry Level</th>
<th>Intermediate/Semi-Skilled</th>
<th>Skilled Professionals and Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offices; Brand Pavilions (offices and Research and Development)</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>8,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail; Brand Pavilions (public facing and leisure)</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Leisure</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,440 (26%)</td>
<td>4,375 (21%)</td>
<td>10,885 (53%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 London Plan policy 2.1 also recognises that the development of London supports wider spatial, economic, environmental and social development of Europe and the United Kingdom. London has a distinctive role to play in the spatial development of the country and continent as part of a polycentric network of cities and urban areas and the Silvertown Quays proposals to provide innovative commercial and employment spaces that will contribute to London’s aspirations of continuing to be a world city and world class business destination while complying with strategic and local objectives for regeneration are supported. However, the quantum of brand use and associated A1 brand-related retail being applied for in this planning permission is significant and the impacts of these proposed uses are explored further in the paragraphs below. The applicant should note that this quantum of floorspace will be only be acceptable if robust controls and mechanisms are in place to ensure that any impact on neighbouring centres is appropriately mitigated.

Office uses

36 The proposed development seeks approval for the delivery of up to 179,000 sq.m. (GEA) of business floorspace (B1 use class) as part of the overall master plan, equating to up to 26% of the overall quantum of floorspace for the application site which is to be delivered across Development Zones 1, 3 and 4. London Plan policy 4.2 relating to offices sets out that the Mayor will support consolidation and extension of the diverse office markets elsewhere in the capital by promoting their competitive advantages, focusing new development on viable
locations with good public transport and enhancing the business environment including through mixed use redevelopment.

37 London Plan policy 4.1 ‘Developing London’s economy’ seeks to promote London as a suitable location for European and other international agencies and businesses. The site is located in the Royal Docks, which is a growing employment location and the designation of the Enterprise Zone recognises that the scale of development within the Royal Docks has the potential to bring significant benefits to local people and businesses. Specifically, the objectives of the Enterprise Zone are to increase job and business opportunities, improve skills and reduce local unemployment.

38 Although it is recognised that the quantum of B1 office used proposed is significant it should be recognised that this is a maximum amount of floorspace to be delivered within a flexible planning permission that is intended to meet the changing needs of the market over the build of the development. The London Plan sets out in paragraph 4.11 that office based employment may grow by some 303,000 jobs up to 2031 and that this may result in the need for an additional 3.9 million sq m (net) or 4.6 - 5.2 million sq.m (gross) office floorspace by 2031 (see London Plan Table 4.1). The clustering of brand and other uses is required to ensure viability and attractiveness of the proposals to potential investors. The applicant has also noted that the Millennium Mills development (for which planning permission is sought for the alteration and conversion as part of this outline application) is intended to provide a range of office types to include start-ups alongside brand accommodation and encourage employment growth.

39 However, given the scale of potential office development proposed, it will also be important to ensure that the B1 offer at Silvertown Quays (and potentially the cumulative impact of the ABP development in Royal Albert Dock) is not undermining the office markets at CAZ/City of London/north of the Isle of Dogs or the emerging office location at Stratford (as set out in London Plan Policy 2.16 ‘Strategic Outer London Development Centres’). Providing this reassurance can be provided, there is no strategic concern with the principle of the proposed B1 development on this site in a designated Enterprise Zone location. However, further discussions on the range of rent levels may be required as part of the legal agreement to ensure that some affordable office space is provided as part of the overall offer.

40 It is noted that the Royal Docks Enterprise Zone is currently exempt from the liberalised permitted development rights for B1 office use established by the Government in 2013. In the event that the Government removes the exemption, as it currently proposes to, these permitted development rights should be removed.

Retail uses

41 As noted above, the ‘sui generis’ Brand Accommodation is principally concerned with showcasing individual brands through demonstration, exhibition, research and development, workshops, display, etc. The proposed Brand Buildings are not shops but it is acknowledged in the submitted Brand and Retail Impact Assessment, that retailing is likely to be one of the associated functions of their operation, which could represent up to 17% of the total Brand Accommodation and as such 44,500 sq.m. GEA of brand-related A1 retail floorspace is included within the planning application.

42 In addition to the brand-related A1 retail floor space, the planning application seeks approval for up to 10,000 sq.m. GEA of A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 floorspace across the scheme, approximately 50% of which is expected to be A1 retail and 2,500 sq.m. of which would be net sales of local convenience floorspace. The applicant has noted that this floorspace will have a crucial role in in activating ground floor frontages across the site and providing ancillary retail
and catering uses for new residents, visitors and workers. A further 20,400 sq.m. of A3 to A5 uses (food and beverage) is also proposed to serve the future development and planning conditions/obligations are under discussion to ensure that these uses cannot through permitted development rights be converted to A1 uses. This local convenience provision is in line with the Newham Core Strategy which identifies the Silvertown Site as a location for a new local centre.

43 London Plan Policy 4.8 supports a successful, diverse and competitive retail sector which promotes sustainable access to the goods and services that Londoners need. A proactive approach to planning decisions for retailing should bring forward capacity for additional comparison goods retailing and support convenience retail, particularly in District, Neighbourhood and more local centres. As such, the range of retail uses proposed are supported.

44 However, while there is no strategic concern with the proposed brand uses or the introduction of retail uses as part of a mixed use redevelopment of the site, the total quantum of these uses is significant and requires thorough assessment of potential impacts. These matters are addressed in greater detail in paragraphs 52 to 64 below.

Leisure and cultural uses

45 Permission is sought for a maximum of 19,800 sq.m. of leisure/cultural floorspace. This flexible floorspace will primarily be situated in Development Zone 3, with smaller elements in Zones 1 and 6. The principle of leisure and cultural uses on the site are in accordance with the policy objectives of the London Plan (policies 4.7 and 4.8) and the Newham Local Plan (policies SP1 and SP6). The nature, scale and hours of operation of any D1 and D2 uses will need to be determined through further discussions with Newham Council.

46 Development Zone 1 seeks permission for a maximum of 16,000 sq.m. of hotel floorspace to complement the Brand Buildings. This will contribute to the hotel and entertainment sector in the Royal Docks which results from the established exhibition centre and associated uses. The delivery of hotel accommodation is supported by London Plan policy 4.5 which seeks to deliver an additional 40,000 hotel bedrooms by 2036. Planning conditions should be applied to ensure that the 10% of the hotel bedrooms delivered are accessible.

Community and Education Accommodation

47 Planning permission is sought for up to 6,900 sq.m. of D1 floorspace, to include a 2 form of entry primary school in Development Zone 6 and community floorspace in Development Zone 1/2. This provision will ensure that the future communities within the scheme are adequately served by conveniently located local services and facilities and these uses are supported by London Plan policy 3.16 which seeks to ensure that new developments adequately provide necessary social infrastructure and London Plan Policy 3.18 which supports new developments which maximise the extended or multiple use of educational facilities for community or recreational use.

48 The submitted planning statement sets out a number of ways in which the proposed community and educational spaces may be used to ensure integration and flexibility to meet the needs of community groups to access facilities. It is recommended that these provisions are captured in a community use plan which should be secured as part of the draft section 106 agreement along with the agreed trigger point for delivery.
Public open space and dockside uses

49 The Silvertown Quays indicative masterplan proposes 6 hectares of public realm and open space (which is a mixture of green and blue: i.e open water space) within the site which will be fully accessible and is welcome. However, some of the open space does lie within the airport Public Safety Zone and cannot be used for congregating which limits its community benefit.

50 However, the intention to enable and enhance access to the dockside throughout the site is also strongly supported in line with Blue Ribbon Network policies and the draft Further Alterations to the London Plan which note in paragraph 7.103: “The size and scale of the water spaces of the Royal Docks are unique in London and form an important part of the character and distinctiveness of east London. Improving access to and activity on these water spaces can support the regeneration of the surrounding area and contribute to the creation of new jobs and homes.” London Plan policy 7.27 supports development proposals which protect and improve existing access points to or alongside the Blue Ribbon Network and the proposals to create a dockside development are clearly in line with strategic policy objectives. While improving access to the dockside, the development does also propose some infilling of Pontoon Dock, which is contrary to London Plan 7.28 and the acceptability of this is explored further in paragraphs 65 to 69 below.

51 In summary, there is in principle potential strategic support for the proposed mix of uses on the Silvertown Quays site which include business uses, brand uses, retail and commercial, leisure and cultural, education and community uses alongside public open space and improved dockside access. This mix of uses is in line with strategic and local regeneration objectives for the area and aligns with the intentions of the Enterprise Zone to deliver growth in employment. However, given the scale of the proposed development and the quantum of uses proposed (particularly of the ‘brand use’ and the associated ‘brand related A1 retail’), the impact of these uses is examined in further detail in the sections below.

Brand-related A1 retail and other retail impacts

Brand-related A1 retail

52 London Plan policy 4.7 and the NPPF require an impact assessment for retail development proposals in edge/out of centre locations not in accordance with an up to date development plan. There is no planning requirement to assess the impacts of the ‘sui generis’ brand accommodation. However, the applicant has submitted a Brand and Retail Impact Assessment (BRA) which assesses the consequences of the proposed 44,500 sq.m. of A1 brand-related retail component, which could represent up to 17% of the total Brand Accommodation. To control this budget of A1 brand-related retail floorspace it is envisaged that planning obligations will be entered into such that it can only come forward in parallel with connected Brand Accommodation to ensure that the retail floorspace would always be complementary to the Brand Buildings at Silvertown.

53 The BRA seeks to demonstrate that there are no significant adverse impacts arising from the brand-related A1 retail element of the scheme and that the positive benefits are significant for the future residential and working population of the Royal Docks. It is noted in the BRA that London’s household expenditure on comparison goods is projected to rise from £23 billion in 2011 to over £48 billion by 2036 (Para. 4.40) and that London’s household expenditure on convenience goods retail is expected to increase from £12 billion in 2011 to £22 billion by 2036 (Para. 4.42), highlighting the potential for growth in the retail sector in the sub-region. The BRA also sets out that the turnover of the brands retail component (up to £314 million) represents less than 3% of the available expenditure within Greater London (up to £10,508 million). There
is, therefore, significant additional expenditure available for all centres within the study area to grow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Available Catchment Expenditure</th>
<th>GLA Comparison Turnover</th>
<th>Turnover of Commitments</th>
<th>Turnover of Brands</th>
<th>Net Capacity</th>
<th>% Draw from Net Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£33,516m</td>
<td>£21,279m</td>
<td>£1,415m</td>
<td>£147.14m</td>
<td>£10,675m</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>£33,516m</td>
<td>£21,279m</td>
<td>£1,415m</td>
<td>£223.16m</td>
<td>£10,599m</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>£33,516m</td>
<td>£21,279m</td>
<td>£1,415m</td>
<td>£313.90m</td>
<td>£10,508m</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Capacity Analysis of Brands Retail (2024)

54 It is acknowledged that to meet identified needs and to support the vitality and viability of town centres, the Mayor supports a proactive approach to improving the quality of retail floorspace and managing growth. The submitted BRA concludes that there is sufficient capacity to support the comparison turnover of the brands floorspace even after commitments of nearby developments are taken into account. It notes that the brands element can be easily supported by forecast growth in expenditure across the study period, rather than as a direct impact on existing comparison floorspace/centres. Following the expected trade diversions, existing centres across both the borough of Newham and the Greater London area continue to display healthy levels of growth in their turnover in the low, medium and high scenarios which were tested. It concludes that there will therefore not be a significant adverse impact upon the vitality or viability of existing centres.

Local convenience (A1 to A5)

55 In relation to the impact on local convenience, the BRA sets out that the need for the proposed facilities is site specific, and the residential and commercial uses will generate sufficient expenditure to support the level of convenience retail proposed. It concludes that the application will not prejudice the delivery of identified, committed and planned investment in existing centres and that the application will align with an extant consent at Minoco Wharf to meet the convenience demand at a new Local Centre at Silvertown.

Food and beverage offer (A3 to A5)

56 London Plan policy 4.8 sets out that planning decisions should identify areas underserved in local convenience shopping and services provision and support additional facilities at an appropriate scale in locations accessible by walking, cycling and public transport to serve existing or new residential communities. The new Local Centre will serve a localised catchment primarily orientated towards fulfilling the local shopping needs of new residents and workers and as such, the proposals will largely be self-sufficient and will not negatively impact on existing established centres such as Canning Town, East Beckton, North Woolwich and Cundy Road.

Sequential test

London Plan policy 4.7 sets out that retail, commercial, culture and leisure development should be focused on sites within town centres, or if no in centre sites are available, on sites on the
edges of centres that are, or can be, well integrated with the existing centre and public transport, noting that the impacts of such development should be assessed. The submitted BRA also undertakes a sequential test in line with the requirements of the NPPF and this reveals that there are no suitable alternative sites for a development of this kind, which relies on the large scale clustering of brand accommodation as part of its key offer. The proposed leisure and cultural uses are designated in local policy and do not therefore require a sequential test approach.

Impact on the town centre network and proposed controls

58 While the results of the sequential test are accepted, several matters of clarification within the submitted BRA have formed the basis of discussion between the applicant, Newham Council and GLA officers. These queries relate to whether at 44,500 sq.m. the quantum of brand related retail proposed, which is calculated as 17% brand related retail offer, can be considered genuinely ancillary. The projected annual turnover from the Greater London catchment of these elements is estimated at between £147 million and £343 million in 2024. This level of turnover is significant and is equivalent to the annual turnover of centres such as Richmond, Wimbledon and Ilford (as in the Experian/GLA comparison goods retail need study).

59 There are also implications for the town centre network (London Plan policy 2.15) given that 44,500 sq.m. GEA retail (Para 1.5 and 4.6 of the submitted BRA) is equivalent to a Major centre in the London Plan town centre network in floorspace terms. The London Plan sets out that there are five town centre classifications in Annex 2 which are as follows:

- **International centres** – London’s globally renowned retail destinations with a wide range of high-order comparison and specialist shopping with excellent levels of public transport accessibility.
- **Metropolitan centres** – serve wide catchments which can extend over several boroughs and into parts of the wider South East region. Typically they contain at least 100,000 sq.m of retail, leisure and service floorspace with a significant proportion of high-order comparison goods relative to convenience goods. These centres generally have very good accessibility and significant employment, service and leisure functions.
- **Major centres** – typically found in inner and some parts of outer London with a borough-wide catchment. They generally contain over 50,000 sq.m of retail, leisure and service floorspace with a relatively high proportion of comparison goods relative to convenience goods. They may also have significant employment, leisure, service and civic functions.
- **District centres** – distributed more widely than the Metropolitan and Major centres, providing convenience goods and services for more local communities and accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. Typically they contain 10,000–50,000 sq.m of retail, leisure and service floorspace. Some District centres have developed specialist shopping functions.
- **Neighbourhood and more local centres** – typically serve a localised catchment often most accessible by walking and cycling and include local parades and small clusters of shops, mostly for convenience goods and other services. They may include a small supermarket (typically up to around 500 sq.m), sub-post office, pharmacy, laundrette and other useful local services. Together with District centres they can play a key role in addressing areas deficient in local retail and other services.

---

1 Modelled turnover at 2026
As the only proposed new retail centre in Newham Council’s Core Strategy is the local centre at North Woolwich Road, this extent of retail provision is clearly not proposed through an up-to-date policy. When the 20,400 sq.m. A3-A5 uses and the 19,800 sq.m. leisure is added to the local centre figure of 10,000 sq.m. GEA, the total amount of A1-A5 retail provision would be equivalent in floorspace terms to a Major or even a Metropolitan centre (total of 74,900 sq.m. A1 to A5 retail uses). In light of this potential quantum, to ensure consistency with the London Plan town centre network and ensure that brand related A1 retail impacts are suitably managed, any retail provision as part of the brands accommodation must be robustly controlled if it is to be accepted.

The submitted planning statement sets out outline Principles for Brand Accommodation and notes that planning conditions or obligations are expected to be imposed in order to limit the main Brand Accommodation to demonstration, exhibition, museum, research and development, education, office, workshops, display, catering and ancillary uses. And that it is anticipated that planning conditions will also be imposed to limit the maximum permissible amount of floorspace for each use, including the brand related retail floorspace which represents around 17% of the total overall brand floorspace. To reinforce the position, the applicant has noted that it has no intention for the development to become a retail destination and, to this end, the applicant proposed that the following principles are incorporated into any section106 Legal Agreement:

- No Brand Accommodation shall be occupied at any time, for any use that is not defined as a Brand Use and that no Dedicated Brand Retail floorspace shall be occupied at any time for any use that is not a retail use which is provided in conjunction with associated Brand Accommodation occupied at the same time by the same tenant.
- Dedicated Brand Retail floorspace must not be greater than the size of the associated Brand Accommodation floorspace occupied by a tenant at any time.
- For each phase of development which includes Brand Accommodation, any associated Dedicated Brand Retail floorspace must not be greater than 30% of the size of the Brand Accommodation floorspace in that phase at any time.
- Leases for the Brand Accommodation will restrict the use of the relevant premises to Brand Use. [n.b. this is not a material planning consideration but could be incorporated into the legal agreement]
- The submission of a draft Marketing Strategy to the Council no later than the date of submission of the first reserved matters application.
- All applications for the approval of reserved matters for Brand Accommodation will be accompanied by a statement which will explain how the proposed design contributes towards the overall objective for the Development and provide an explanation of the proposed brand experience.
- The Applicant will commit to providing a monitoring report to the Council no less frequently than once every six months for a defined period starting on the date of approval of the first reserved matters in respect of any Brand Accommodation.

The BRA has been independently reviewed on behalf of Newham Council by GVA and this has been shared with GLA officers. This independent review has concluded that the ‘sui generis’ classification of brand uses is suitable in this instance and has confirmed that the
process for assessing the impact of the brand-related retail element of the proposed development has been correctly undertaken. However, the independent review considers that a development of unrestricted A1 retail uses of the scale proposed (44,500 sq.m. net) at Silvertown Quays, would have an unacceptable and detrimental impact on the network of town centres and the borough-wide town centre strategy over the plan period. It suggests the following additional controls should the Council be minded to grant planning permission:

- Planning condition to set a maximum net sales floorspace within each brand building, rather than a maximum percentage to avoid the creation of large sales floorplates.
- Planning conditions to avoid the location of A1 shop floorspace at the front of each brand building as this would create shop frontages and a ‘traditional shopping high street’ with an inevitable greater impact on town centres.
- Planning condition to ensure the complementary nature of A1 retail floorspace alongside the principal use brand concept, in order to avoid a sole retail development.
- Planning conditions to restrict the Sui Generis floorspace from displaying retail products for sale.
- Request an impact assessment for the full 10,000 sq.m. GEA of local retail to ensure the applicant complies with the requirements set out in the NPPF and place restrictions on the size of the convenience floorspace/foodstore and non-convenience floorspace, and maximum unit sizes for the remaining space.
- Place restrictions on Use Class and unit sizes for the A3 to A5 retail uses.

The conclusions made in the report as summarised above are supported by GLA officers and are considered necessary to provide the robust mechanisms to control the brand and brand-related retail elements of the proposals and manage any potential impact on London’s town centre network. In addition, it may be necessary to consider conditions for the restriction on creating mezzanine floors in those brand building typologies with increased floor to ceiling heights. Without these controls (to be secured by planning condition and/or in the legal agreement), the proposal will not comply with London Plan policies 2.15 and 4.7. These matters are still in discussion and will need to be resolved and agreed between all parties prior to a stage II referral of the application.

Given that the proposals for the Silvertown Quays site are to create a new urban quarter on a large scale site of 24 hectares (relying on a clustering of brand accommodation and other uses as a key component of its business model) and the fact that the site has the potential to generate some 20,680 jobs across all skill levels, on balance, the quantum of uses proposed may be acceptable in strategic planning terms, provided that adequate planning controls are imposed and monitoring mechanisms are secured to ensure these controls function effectively into the future.

**Blue Ribbon Network and Heritage**

The use of Pontoon Dock and the increased access to the Royal Victoria dockside are key to creating the character of the proposed development and this is supported by the Further Alterations to the London Plan (Intend to Publish version December 2014): “The size and scale of the water spaces of the Royal Docks are unique in London and form an important part of the character and distinctiveness of east London. Improving public access to and activity on these
water spaces can support the regeneration of the surrounding area and contribute to the creation of new jobs and homes."

66 Although the proposals promote much improved access to the dockside areas and by creating some areas of shallow water and enhance the biodiversity value; partial infilling of Pontoon Dock is proposed to achieve these benefits, which is contrary to London Plan policy 7.30 which sets out that Development within or alongside London’s docks should protect and promote the vitality, attractiveness and historical interest of London’s remaining dock areas by: a preventing their partial or complete infilling. However, it should be noted that the dockside is at present not accessible to the public due to the long-term derelict condition of the site and furthermore, the Further Alterations to the London Plan (Intend to Publish version) includes the following new reference to the Royal Docks in paragraph 7.103: “To help achieve this, development into parts of these water spaces may facilitate this transformation, provided that any such development maintains the visual integrity, openness and historic character of the relevant dock and provided that navigation, hydrology, flood risk management and biodiversity are not compromised."

67 As such, the applicant should provide an assessment of the biodiversity, navigation and hydrology and flood risk implications of the proposed infilling of Pontoon Dock. The applicant should also confirm that the Dockside will become accessible at all times to the public and provisions should be included in the legal agreement to secure this.

68 The application has clearly quantified the proportion of dock which would be lost due to the development and has established how the heritage of the ‘lost’ sections of dock will be reflected in the proposals for the urban realm for the site. The indicative master plan indicates that there will be four floating pavilions located in the main section of the Pontoon Dock. Appendix 5 of the submitted DSF sets out the detailed proposals for the works to the dock walls and it is noted that significant works are required to bring these back into use as part of the public realm.

Figure 5: Parameter Plan 6: Open space (source: Submitted DSF by Quod)
69 There is a complex interrelationship between the infilling of the docks, the preservation of historic dock walls, the enhanced biodiversity and the creation of a new waterside space. In this particular instance, given the wider benefits of the proposal to enhance access to the waterside, the preservation of the heritage value of the docks along with the wider regeneration benefits of the proposals as a whole, some partial infilling of the dock in these site specific circumstances could be justified, however, the applicant is encouraged to consider retaining a broader channel of the finger dock as part of a more credible memory of the original form and function of Pontoon Dock.

Housing and affordable housing

70 The proposals will deliver a maximum of 300,000 sq.m. of residential floorspace. The application is not applying for a set number of residential units although indicatively this floorspace could deliver between circa 2,300 and 3,000 residential units. Once the residential component has been fully implemented it may represent a significant contribution towards delivering the housing needs of Newham Council which has an average annual target of 1,994 homes. The indicative unit numbers by development zone are detailed in Figure 6 below.

71 Residential development will be delivered within Development Zone 2 located along the south western edge of the site, adjacent to existing residential communities at Britannia Village, and Development Zones 5 and 6 which are located to the east and south of the site (with some frontages onto North Woolwich Road).

Housing choice

72 The submitted material provides an indicative unit mix from one bedroom units to four-bedroom units of 27% 1 bedroom, 34% 2 bedroom, 28% 3 bedroom and 11% 4 bedroom units. This is in line with London Plan Policy 3.8, together with the Mayor’s Housing SPG, and the Housing Strategy, which seek to promote housing choice and a balanced mix of unit sizes in new developments, with particular focus on affordable family homes. Newham Council’s policy is to deliver 39% three-bedroom plus units to meet demand for family housing within the borough and the current proposals would comply with this, which is welcome.

Figure 6: Indicative minimum and maximum unit numbers by development zone (Source: Submitted Planning Statement: Quod)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Zone</th>
<th>Indicative unit numbers (Minimum Residential Floorspace)</th>
<th>Indicative unit numbers (Maximum Residential Floorspace)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,369</td>
<td>3,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:1 Indicative Housing numbers (Maximum & Minimum floorspace)
Affordable housing

73 Discussions to date relating to affordable housing are ongoing. An indicative site wide 15-20% affordable housing target is proposed (subject to viability) within the planning application material and the submitted Financial Appraisal suggests that a level of 17% affordable housing is deliverable, when factoring growth into the appraisal process. Newham Council’s policy requirement is for 35% to 50% affordable housing and as the proposed level falls below this, the financial appraisal has been independently assessed by BNPP to determine the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing that the proposal can provide.

74 This independent assessment has raised a number of queries in relation to the proposed residential and commercial values and there have been discussions relating to an acceptable profit rate for the applicant (IRR) and the principle of a review mechanism. Sensitivity testing is also being undertaken on the financial model to determine the impact of the several large scale infrastructure improvements that are required to support the development and to mitigate its transport impact (notably the pedestrian and cycle bridge over Royal Victoria Dock, bus service enhancements, Pontoon Dock DLR station upgrade and North Woolwich Road footbridge). Provision may need to be made as part of the legal mechanisms to account for alternative funding streams for some of this infrastructure, should it become available in the future.

75 These matters will need to be resolved as a matter of urgency before the proposal is reported back at stage II. A review mechanism is supported given the size and likely timescales for the build-out of the proposals and the clauses for the review mechanism should be agreed as part of the draft section 106 agreement.

Housing quality

76 The application is submitted in outline but the submitted material confirms that all the proposed residential dwellings will meet or exceed the requirements of the Housing SPG which is welcome. It is noted that the masterplan intended to maximise the number of dwellings with direct views to the water while minimising the number of single aspect dwellings and ensuring that there are no north facing single aspect units. The residential units will be designed to Lifetime Homes standards and 10% will be easily adaptable to meet the needs of wheelchair users. These requirements should be secured in any planning permission.

77 While these provisions are welcome and in line with policy, provision must also be made to ensure that any noise or air quality issues arising from surrounding uses, including the airport...
and North Woolwich Road/DLR, are appropriately addressed through the design, layout and orientation of the residential accommodation and this will also need to be secured through the design guidelines.

Density

78 London Plan policy 3.4 requires the development to optimise residential densities and policy 3.12 emphasises the need for optimised densities in Opportunity Areas and development that contributes significantly towards borough housing and employment targets.

79 The residential density of the proposal based on the maximum number of units comprises some 453 hr/ha. Table 3.2 of the London Plan suggests an appropriate density range for residential development with public transport accessibility rating of 2 to 3 (which is expected to be reached provided the transport mitigation package is implemented), of 200 to 450 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha). This calculation includes internal roads and ancillary open spaces such as the Pontoon Dock and when these elements are removed from the calculation a density figure of 536 hr/ha is reached, which falls above the guidelines for an appropriate density in this setting.

80 The applicant has also calculated the residential density of the individual development zones based on an adjusted site area of 9.86 hectares, which reflects 44.8% of residential uses. When calculated in this way, site-wide density is 1189 hr/ha. The density for Development Zone 2 is 944 hr/ha and the density for Development Zones 5&6 (combined) is 785 hr/ha. While these figures exceed the suggested range, the policy requires consideration also be given to local context, character and design principles with an overall requirement for developments to optimise housing output. The delivery of an optimised proposal is unlikely to be problematic provided that sufficient safeguards are put in place to secure high quality design, good residential amenity levels, access to public open spaces and sustainable transport improvements as part of the outline planning consent.

Children’s play space

81 London Plan Policy 3.6, which seeks to ensure that development proposals include suitable provision for play and recreation. The submitted Planning Statement recognises that play is a fundamental component of childhood that promotes social interaction, learning and a healthy lifestyle and accordingly the importance of high quality, well-located child play spaces particularly in densely populated urban areas such as inner east London. In order to provide adequate play space, including doorstep open space for children without access to a private garden, the development proposes a hierarchy and quantum of playspace types in accordance with the Development Specification Framework which will include:

- Doorstep play space for children under 5 within 100m of dwellings (residences with private/semi-private gardens are excluded from the requirement);
- Local play space for children aged 5-11 within 400m of dwellings;
- Neighbourhood and youth play space for children aged 12+ within 800m of dwellings; and
- Open space that would be playable for children of all ages and their families.
The quantum of provision will be in accordance with the Mayor’s Supplementary Planning Guidance on Playspace, amounting to a total of 10sq.m per child (the number of children being a factor of the number, size and type of residential dwellings that will come forward). The applicant has provided an estimated child occupancy for the minimum and maximum employment scenario on the site, and demonstrated on Parameter Plan 5 that the proposal is able to deliver the required quantum of playspace. However, provision should also be made to ensure that should a higher level of affordable housing be provided, the increase in family sized units and child occupancy can still be easily accommodated on site.

To ensure full compliance with London Plan policy 3.6 relating to the provision of children’s playspace, detailed play strategies in line with the detail provided in the Mayor’s Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation Supplementary Planning Guidance will need to be secured by Newham Council for future approval as the reserved matters applications come forward.

**Urban design and heritage**

The layout of the masterplan is based on a number of distinct neighbourhoods, creating a legible and permeable development that connects with the surrounding area and creates a number of focal points which accommodate the built form and open space. The masterplan gives priority to landscape and public realm in determining the size and location of development plots whilst looking to deliver identifiable districts within the site.

Given the outline nature of the majority of the scheme, its design quality is intended to be secured through the Design Code. Officers have worked with the scheme architects to ensure that this document will function effectively to secure the design quality of the site and this should be secured by Newham Council as part of the legal agreement.
The layout of the masterplan is based on a number of key axial connections which provide the structure for the subdivision of the site into a number of urban blocks and a network of secondary routes. This primary structure creates a legible and permeable masterplan that connects well to the surrounding area and creates a number of well-located focal points which are suited to accommodate important public buildings and open spaces.

The route between Pontoon Dock DLR station and the proposed bridge to the west of the Excel centre is likely to become a strategic pedestrian and cycle connection through the site significantly improving the permeability of the wider area and is strongly supported. Its alignment through to the Thames Barrier Park to the south will also ensure that this strategic open space will play a key role in the areas wider urban structure.

A second primary north-south route is located parallel to Connaught Bridge subdividing the site into three separate areas and creating another important and legible link between the Dockside and North Woolwich Road. This is also well-aligned to connect through to future developments to the south, which is welcomed.

A diagonal route following the alignment of the Dock Wall links these two north-south routes and the Millennium Mills building at the end of the Dock. Whilst this route is also strongly supported it is disappointing it does not provide a legible connection all the way through to Connaught Bridge to the east or North Woolwich Road to the south. The applicant is encouraged to consider this further making it a more legible and connected route through the site.
The aspiration to overcome the severance created by North Woolwich Road is welcomed. The approach of lining it with buildings that address the street at ground level, accommodating the change in levels within the building itself, is strongly supported and has been reinforced by provisions in the design codes to secure a good width of footway along this edge of the development and that all buildings have a good distribution of front entrances and active frontage facing North Woolwich Road.

The concept of ‘brand buildings’ has been discussed above. However, the form that these pavilions will take and how they are embedded into a high quality, adaptable, high density mixed use neighbourhood has been a key consideration in the development of the scheme. The applicant has sought to minimise the standalone pavilions, providing just four within the Pontoon Dock with the remainder as more traditional future-proof sized urban blocks. The identity and individuality of these pavilions can still be individually celebrated through their architecture without requiring them to be stand-alone buildings.

There is also concern with how the residential areas have been subdivided and the layout of buildings within these blocks. Given the height of the buildings, the applicant is strongly encouraged to consider laying out the residential elements in courtyard blocks. This successfully provides private external space ideally suited for door-stop-play and ensures that the public realm is clearly defined, active and well used. When considering the residential typologies, the applicant is advised to avoid double loaded corridor typologies for deck access blocks. These can provide significantly higher number of dual aspect units regardless of the orientation of the blocks.

A clearer strategy for the retention of the dock as a heritage and water feature into the scheme has been provided since the pre-application stage.

Figure 9: Sile D and Millennium Mills (Source submitted Design and Access Statement by Quod)

The retention of the locally listed Millennium Mills on the site is strongly supported and the reuse of this substantial building at the gateway of the site from Custom House will ensure a prominent role in the character and identity of the area, which is welcomed. The proposals for the refurbishment and alteration of Millennium Mills are now to be subject to a separate full planning application, which will be considered as a linked and referable application. The principle of these works is however, considered to be in line with London Plan policy 7.9 which sets out that “schemes designed so that the heritage significance is recognised both in their own right and as catalysts for regeneration. Wherever possible heritage assets (including buildings at risk) should be repaired, restored and put to a suitable and viable use that is consistent with their conservation and the establishment and maintenance of sustainable communities and economic vitality.” It is not considered that the current proposals will impact negatively on the character and setting of the locally listed Millennium Mills building or on the grade II listed Silo D building.
although planning conditions or provisions in the legal agreement may be necessary to secure this.

95 The proposals were presented to Newham Design Review Panel and CABE in December 2013 and again on 26 February 2014. The review panel expressed support for the aspiration for the site as an international hub for trade and innovation and as a new “piece of city”. After the second presentation the panel was generally supportive but also raised a number of issues that needed further work, including the integration to the wider area (particularly the link across North Woolwich Road to the Thames Barrier Park) and the relationship between the scheme and Pontoon Dock to further strengthen the presence and value of water across the scheme. These matters have been satisfactorily addressed in the submitted application.

96 The proposals are generally well thought out and the proposed design codes and parameter plans are consider robust and sufficient to ensure that a high quality urban design is delivered. In order to ensure compliance with London Plan policies 3.5 and 7.3 it is requested that these documents are secured as part of the legal agreement. Appropriate maintenance and management arrangements will also be required for the development and in particular the public realm and retained water areas. These would ensure that the quality of the setting and public access and activity continue for the life of the development. In the event permission is resolved to be granted these arrangements should be secured by condition and in the legal agreement.

**Inclusive design**

97 In accordance with London Policy 7.2, the applicant has sought to demonstrate that the principles of inclusive design have been incorporated throughout the proposals. The design of the landscaping and the public realm is particularly crucial to how inclusive the development will be for many people. The levels across the site rise substantially from AOD +1.7m at North Woolwich Road street level to the south up to AOD +5.2m across the site generally. The highest point in the site sits to at +7.1 ion the far east of the site near the A1020 Connaught Road roundabout leading to City Airport which presents challenges relating to the accessibility of the site. In terms of the principal pedestrian access to the site, the The Diagonal - a long street which climbs from +1.7m to +5.2 - form the main route. The gradients along this slope will be no greater than 1:21 with level rest points every 500 mm rise in height as a minimum, with seating and gardens en-route with level entry into the brand pavilions and other accommodation and cafe terraces. This is welcome but will need careful consideration at the detailed design stage.

98 Access into the brand and other units is yet to be developed but in principle tapering steps will be avoided and book ended with planting and integral seating, which is supported and should be secured by planning condition. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the proposed public bridges and dockside walkways are accessible and given these elements are due to come forward as separate applications, it is recommended that the applicant retain the services of a specialist accessibility consultant at the detailed design stage to ensure the principles of inclusivity are carried through at the reserved matters stage and that this should be secured by planning condition.

99 The size of this proposal is effectively creating a new neighbourhood, and it therefore provides an excellent opportunity to demonstrate compliance with the Lifetime Neighbourhood principles in line with policy 7.1, with an exemplar scheme, that enables all parts of the site, including waterways to be accessed by all residents and visitors. The applicant should retain an access consultant through the reserved matters applications so as to ensure that the landscaping, entrances, internal layouts and level changes, can be designed to ensure that step-free routes are available to all buildings and external spaces.
All the access related commitments outlined in the application in relation to the commercial, recreation and educational buildings, together with specifications in relation to the public realm should be secured at detailed design stage by way of condition. This includes a requirement that 10% of hotel bedrooms are wheelchair accessible, and investigating the possibility of a Changing Places facility. Step free routes to the dock edge must be ensured. A car parking management plan would be appropriate so as to ensure that there are sufficient blue badge spaces kept available for the accessible units, and the management of taxi drop-off and community transport points should also be subject to a management plan.

The applicant should also work with the Council at the reserved matters stage to ensure that the mix of wheelchair accessible units proposed meets locally identified need and Newham Council will be able to provide further information on this matter. The future marketing of the private wheelchair accessible homes should ensure that prospective purchasers are aware of the accessibility and adaptability of these units. Specific marketing to the disability community and to older people’s organisations can help to ensure that the people who will benefit from the units accessible design are made aware of their existence.

Planning conditions will be required to ensure that the proposals comply fully with London Plan policy 7.2 relating to access and inclusion.

Climate change and sustainability

GLA officers provided initial energy comments to the applicant on 19 November 2014 to which the applicant has responded. Some of these address the outstanding information request but there are some matters still requiring clarification as set out below.

Energy efficiency standards

A range of passive design features and demand reduction measures are proposed to reduce the carbon emissions of the proposed development. Both air permeability and heat loss parameters will be improved beyond the minimum backstop values required by building regulations. Other features include mechanical ventilation with heat recovery and low energy lighting and controls.

Evidence should be provided to demonstrate that the demand for cooling will be minimised in line with policy 5.9. The domestic modelling sheets provided suggest that the dwellings modelled are at high risk of high temperatures in summer, the applicant should demonstrate that measures are being integrated in the design to ensure that the dwellings will not overheat. This is particularly important given that the proximity of the airport will limit opportunities for natural ventilation. The updated energy statement should outline what steps are being taken to limit the maximum levels of glazing percentage in the detailed building designs. The current energy statement also suggests that passive shading will be provided. Further information on the levels of shading that will be adopted in the detailed designs should be provided.

In response to these comments, the applicant accepts that a condition is imposed requiring an overheating study to be undertaken as the design development progresses. Given the outline nature of the application this is accepted. However, it will be expected that the glazing percentage and levels of shading are optimised in the detailed designs to avoid the risk of overheating, and this will need to be evidenced by the aforementioned study.

District heating
The applicant has identified that the Excel district heating network is within the vicinity of the development. The applicant states that Cofely (who operate the network) have been consulted but that there is no timescale for extension of the network towards the development site. Evidence of recent correspondence with the network operator has been provided in the form of a letter dated 6 October 2014. This confirms that Cofely can make available supplies of low carbon district heating for the Silvertown Development from the Excel energy Centre. It also confirms that the operator has signed an agreement with the developer of another new build site in the vicinity, thus demonstrating that the network is expanding.

Connection to the network should be prioritised and the applicant’s argument that the proposed installation of on-site technologies (e.g. water source heat pumps) will not preclude the connection of the site heat network to the Cofely District energy scheme is not accepted. A condition should be included preventing the installation of on-site low carbon heat supply technologies (e.g. heat pumps) until an agreed point in the build out of the development. This will provide the maximum opportunity for agreement to be reached between the developer and the Excel energy centre operator.

The applicant is proposing to install a low temperature site heat network connecting all domestic and non-domestic buildings on site and the retained Millennium Mills building and has provided a drawing showing the route of the heat network linking all buildings on the site, however, the applicant should confirm that all apartments and non-domestic spaces will be connected to the site heat network.

The site heat network will be supplied from a single energy centre to be located in phase 1. The energy statement states that this will include sufficient space to accommodate plant capable of supplying all phases of the development. Further information on the location of the energy centre and the floor area, with and without connection to the Excel district heating network, should be provided as part of the outline planning permission to ensure that the energy centre is of sufficient size to accommodate plant for the whole development.

Combined Heat and Power

The applicant has investigated the feasibility of CHP. However, the applicant is not proposing this technology claiming that in the long term (assuming the planned decarbonisation of the grid materialises), greater savings can be achieved by an alternative solution. This is not an acceptable argument to discount CHP and go against the energy hierarchy.

Connection to the Excel energy centre district heating network should be prioritised over on site solutions. A reduction in regulated CO2 emissions of 7,337 tonnes per annum (20.6%) is estimated through the second part of the energy hierarchy should connection be achieved.

BE GREEN

Renewable energy technologies

The applicant has investigated the feasibility of a range of renewable energy technologies and is proposing to install the following renewable technologies if connection to the Excel district heating network is not achieved:

- Dock water open loop heat pumps to provide heating to the site heat network and cooling to the buildings located closest to the dock. Air source heat pumps to provide cooling to the non-domestic buildings not using dock water cooling.
• 5,300 sq.m. solar thermal to serve the dwellings but linked to the site heat network 8,980 sq.m. of solar PV across the development. Connection to the Cofely network should be prioritised over on site solutions. Should connection to the network not be possible in the short to medium term, in this case it is accepted that dock water heat pumps are proposed even though CHP would be a feasible option. This is an exceptional case as the site is located near the dock. As such it makes it a suitable site to take advantage of the opportunity to implement an innovative technology, using secondary heat sources, which would support the objectives of policy 5.8.

114 In response to the comments raised above, that applicant has noted that if the technology is installed then it would provide domestic hot water on a block by block basis, with the district heating meeting any shortfall. If this technology is proposed it should be integrated to provide heat into the site heat network infrastructure. The applicant is also considering the use of waste heat from transformers in conjunction with heat pumps to serve some of the buildings and has provided further information on how this will be achieved.

115 Evidence of correspondence has been provided confirming that licensing from the relevant statutory bodies to develop the dock water heat pumps is being investigated and that the proposals appear agreeable to the statutory body in principle.

116 Indicative roof layouts should be provided to demonstrate that the proposed area of solar thermal and solar PV panels can be accommodated within the development to realise the savings claimed.

117 Should connection to the Excel district heating network not materialise and an on-site renewable solution is proposed, a reduction in regulated CO2 emissions of 5,460 tonnes per annum is claimed through this third element of the energy hierarchy.

118 A reduction of 17,560 tonnes of CO2 per year in regulated emissions compared to a 2013 Building Regulations compliant development is estimated, equivalent to an overall saving of 38.3%. If connection is made, the CO2 savings exceed the targets set within Policy 5.2 of the London Plan.

Climate change adaptation

119 The applicant has submitted a sustainability statement, which includes an assessment against the GLA’s standards. The applicant states that it is intended that all homes meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4, and with all of the relevant London Plan policies and the Mayor’s SPG.

120 The documents set out a number of techniques proposed to reduce energy consumption and cut carbon emission, with commitments to using high performance building fabric, shading systems, low energy lighting, energy efficient appliances, metering, high levels of insulation, and by maximising natural sunlight and solar gain when the reserved matters applications come forward.

121 Suitable worded conditions would be expected to ensure that these commitments are secured in the reserved matters schemes to ensure compliance with London Plan policies relating to climate change adaptation.

Noise and air quality

122 The entire development lies within the 63dB noise contour, a noise level which is classed as ‘moderately annoying for the community’. The north-eastern corner of the site which is proposed pre-dominantly for residential use lies within the 66 to 69 dB noise contour and the proposed primary school sits on the 66dB contour. Substantial mitigation measures will be required to
ensure acceptable internal ambient noise levels in these locations and these will need to be secured by condition.

123 The noise and vibration assessment within the environmental statement has been externally assessed on behalf of Newham Council to verify the results. Further work may be required in terms of ambient noise and vibration levels which may impact on the development proposal, particularly those development plots which are considered to have a high probability to significant environmental/sensitivity effects with the associated aircraft noise and the noise to be generated by mechanical plant during construction.

124 Planning conditions are required to ensure compliance with London Plan policies 7.14 and 7.15.

Aviation safeguarding

125 The submitted technical assessment seeks to identify any matters of conflict with London City Airport, this has concluded that the proposals would not result in any unresolvable conflicts with the airport’s current and approved future operations. Due to the proximity of the development site to London City Airport, a portion of the site falls within the Public Safety Zone and this limits the development that may occur. This area is identified on Parameter Plan 5: Open space as OS7 and is anticipated for use as a dockside park which may be travelled through but where congregating is not permitted. The development would fit within the height constraints associated with the airport although special arrangements may be required during construction of the taller buildings close to the flight path.

126 Mitigation and management measures are likely to be required and these should be secured by planning condition.

Transport

127 A Transport Implementation Strategy and a Development Infrastructure Funding Study (DIFS) are currently being prepared by TfL, the GLA and Newham Council for the Royal Docks area within which this site is located. These identify the transport and other infrastructure and services required to support development and put forward funding options and update and follow on from an earlier joint study.
Overall Assessment

128 In principle Transport for London (TfL) accepts the land uses proposed and encourages the developer’s objectives of maximising public transport use and walking and cycling. However, as the developer is aware this approach requires funding and on site and off site provision towards delivery of a suitable network of quality links and services and of sufficient capacity. At the pre-application stage TfL worked with the Council and the applicants on traffic analysis and provided advice on DLR and bus requirements including improved links thereto.

129 TfL expect to see heads of terms for the funding and delivery of necessary transport mitigation agreed and included in the Council’s committee report. These will include a package of improvements needed to make this large scale development acceptable in transport terms and in accordance with the London Plan. These improvements are also necessary to ensure that new job opportunities are accessible to both local residents and those who live further away.

130 The application sets out the impact according to land use and total end state. There are ongoing discussions which will enable the identification of suitable triggers for transport improvements and associated Grampian style brakes on development related to cumulative impacts as the development is built out and occupied. These will need to be agreed before the application is referred back at Stage II.

Bridge to Custom House

131 It is noted that the applicant intends to seek detailed planning permission for the pedestrian and cycle bridge over the RVD separately to this outline application. Whilst the distance involved would be similar to existing, the proposed new bridge would be at a similar level to the dockside avoiding the lengthy staircase or unreliable lift access currently. This bridge would therefore better enable passengers to access Crossrail and DLR services at Custom House reducing pressure on Pontoon Dock station as well as improving the actual and perceived accessibility of the site. If permission is granted for the Silvertown Quays development a Grampian condition should be imposed and/or relevant legal mechanism which would link the build out and occupation of the development (including the separately applied for use of Millennium Mills) and its associated transport impacts with delivery of this improved crossing of the dock. To avoid unacceptable impacts upon Pontoon Dock station this new bridge should in TfL’s assessment be delivered at the same time as occupation of Millennium Mills or, if earlier, Phase 1 of the rest of this development.

DLR

The methodology and results of DLR trip generation and assignment are in line with previous discussions with TfL. A large number of peak hour trips would be attracted to DLR, with those at Pontoon Dock station to and from the west being of most concern. 2,700 AM peak hour arrivals from the west, 3,055 PM peak hour departures to the west and 3,931 two-way trips to/from the west in the Saturday peak hour are expected. These trips will place considerable pressure on both line and station capacity. Enhancements in train capacity and the accessibility of the station are necessary to mitigate the impacts of this development and support its commercial success.

Line capacity

132 The combined impact of the consented and currently proposed London City Airport schemes and the Minoco Wharf and Silvertown Quays developments is that the capacity of the peak DLR Stratford International services is expected ultimately to be exceeded by at least 10%. To meet this additional demand whilst maintaining existing necessary capacity and frequency on the other services seven additional railcars are required to allow Stratford International services to be lengthened to 3-car.
Section 106 contributions towards these additional railcars have already been secured from London City Airport and the Minoco Wharf developers. A further contribution has been agreed with London City Airport (subject to the ultimate decision on the current application) to provide another. These contributions are additional to use of the extra fares revenue generated by these schemes.

The all-day profile of high demand from Silvertown Quays is expected to generate significant fares revenue. Some of this revenue must cover the additional operating costs of longer trains, and much of the remainder will continue to pay down debt accrued in the construction of the City Airport, Woolwich Arsenal and Stratford International extensions serving the site. However, it is expected that the extra revenue could also go towards the £18m cost of extra railcars. Thus an additional developer contribution is not sought in this case subject to the other necessary transport mitigation being funded by the developer and/or other non TfL sources as the increased fares revenue is not likely to be sufficient to cover these costs of station improvements as well as obtaining the additional rail cars.

**DLR station capacity and North Woolwich Road footbridge**

TfL does not seek a contribution towards improvements at Custom House station. Passengers going to/from the Silvertown Quays development will be impacted by congestion but the driver for these improvements is to enable better interchange between the DLR Beckton branch and Crossrail and so instead contributions are being sought from developers on this branch.

Even allowing for the use of Custom House DLR and Crossrail station by some passengers and assuming the new RVD bridge, the development generates a huge volume of additional traffic through Pontoon Dock station, much in excess of that from previously envisaged developments at Silvertown Quays.

The platforms at Pontoon Dock are 13m above street level and on the opposite side of North Woolwich Road to the development. There is therefore significant new pressure on both horizontal (cross-street) and vertical access to the platforms. Whilst a large amount of vertical capacity is technically available through the two stairs to each platform, the 13m rise from street level means a mechanised solution is required to transport most passengers to platform level, in line with station design guidance and observed behaviour of existing passengers.

TfL consider that the following interventions are needed to ensure that the new demand generated by the development can access and egress trains comfortably and safely:

- A footbridge across North Woolwich Road into the DLR station mezzanine level
- Extension of the mezzanine level
- Escalators between street level and mezzanine level
- Escalators between mezzanine level and platform level.

Other developers in the area have already made significant funding commitments to DLR line capacity for which as noted above TfL is not expecting any direct contribution from the applicant. The developer has proposed a solution at Pontoon Dock relying on three additional lifts in total, and some associated works. Although a lift based solution would provide the minimum necessary mitigation of the impact of the development, TfL considers that a station upgrade scheme which provides escalators would provide greater advantages and an improved station
environment for users of Silvertown Quays (and other neighbouring uses) to overcome the issue of level changes and access. Such an escalator based scheme would better enable delivery of the developer and GLA / Newham Council’s objectives (cross ref to “principle of development” section) to open up job opportunities to local people and support the commercial success of the development. On the basis that this mitigation is only required if the Silvertown development goes ahead, TfL is commencing a station feasibility study which will provide increased certainty on the scope of a station upgrade, although costs will still be subject to risk assumptions at this early level of detail.

141 Further discussions will be required between TfL, the applicant and Newham Council to agree an approach which will mitigate the impacts of the Silvertown Quays application at this station. It is expected that a capped fixed cost contribution will be sought, beyond which TfL would take the cost risk. This contribution would be linked to the anticipated cost of a lift based solution proposed by the applicant (albeit the sum will need to be somewhat higher than the £3.3m currently offered by the developer as the latter only covered the lifts themselves). TfL would seek funding from elsewhere for an overall station upgrade beyond the basic lift solution to deliver the wider benefits and mitigation referred to above, although it must be recognised by all parties that securing this funding cannot be guaranteed.

In terms of the required footbridge across North Woolwich Road, further discussions are required as to how the applicant can provide this as part of their development, how costs are referenced, and for agreement of ownership and maintenance. Given that it is essential to serve the development and that it is assumed in determining the necessary Pontoon Dock station improvements its delivery should be subject to a Grampian condition and appropriate legal agreement linked to when the street level crossing alone is no longer adequate. The design and specification of the bridge will need to be subsequently agreed with DLR as it would connect directly to Pontoon Dock station and Newham Council as highway authority for North Woolwich Road over which it would cross.

142 TfL expect that existing capacity at the station will have been utilised by other developments (for which s106 contributions have already been committed) by the time Phase 1 is being occupied such that the bulk of the station upgrade would be justified. These works would also provide a welcoming customer experience at the development’s front door from the outset. By Phase 3 sufficient further demand should justify the provision of the North Woolwich Road footbridge to avoid placing undue pressure on vertical movement between the street and the platforms (and upon the pedestrian at grade crossing of North Woolwich Road) on the street-to-mezzanine escalators, as well as providing the landing location for the footbridge in DZ4. In addition to a delivery agreement, Grampian conditions should be included in any permission to ensure improvements can take place in step with demand. The bridge landing point within the development should also be safeguarded as appropriate.

143 The final applicant contribution and funding guarantee for the Pontoon Dock station improvements, informed by the feasibility study, and obligations for the delivery and subsequent maintenance and management of the two new bridges to agreed specifications and associated triggers will need to be determined and secured in an appropriate legal agreement backed up with Grampian conditions as appropriate. These will need to be agreed prior to the application being referred back at stage II. In addition, appropriate infrastructure protection agreements with DLR are required to ensure that all potential impact on this infrastructure is fully mitigated.

Buses

144 The transport assessment calculations assume more bus routes are within walking distance of the site and higher vehicle capacities than exist in reality. The TA predicts 692 bus trips in the AM peak hour (of which 558 are inbound) and 625 trips in the PM peak hour and 391 bus trips in
the Saturday peak hour. The TA also indicates a willingness of the developer to provide a 
contribution to mitigate these impacts including unspecified ‘upgrades to existing bus facilities on 
North Woolwich Road’. Improved bus stops and access thereto on Connaught Bridge and 
Connaught Road may also be required.

145 It is apparent that additional capacity and/or bus links will be required to serve a 
development of this size and type. New and improved links will provide better connections to 
existing residential areas in Newham to improve accessibility to the new employment opportunities 
at the development as well as enable the provision of sufficient bus capacity and frequency to 
meet the demand expected to be generated. As the applicant does not propose operation of buses 
within the site, these enhanced services will use existing public highway, North Woolwich Road, 
Connaught Road and Connaught Bridge.

146 TfL is undertaking a review of the bus service network in south Newham consequent upon 
Crossrail and new developments coming forward. The outcome of this work and further discussion 
is that TfL and the developer have agreed that a contribution towards pump priming of two bus 
service enhancements is considered necessary mitigation at a total cost of £2.2 million for the first 
five years of operation (after which TfL would fully cover running costs). This sum has been 
determined in the context of a wider package of bus service improvements to which all major 
developers in the area are contributing. Once the phasing is clarified, suitable trigger points for the 
service enhancements, bus stop improvements and consequently developer payments should be 
agreed and secured in the S106 agreement.

Car and Cycle Parking

147 Whilst proposed car parking provision is within relevant London Plan standards, TfL will 
encourage the developer to reduce levels as reserved matters applications are made, especially as 
public transport and walking and cycling links are improved. This approach will make more efficient 
use of the land and reduce impact on the local and strategic highway network. Amongst other 
measures, the developer should explore the potential for shared use of car parking given the 
proposed mix of uses on the site and differing patterns of demand.

148 The application does not include a comprehensive parking strategy, and as such, any 
permission which is granted should include a Car Parking Management Plan condition. The use of 
car parking should be monitored and managed through Travel Plans for each element of the 
scheme. These Plans should be secured, enforced, monitored and reviewed as part of the s106 
agreement.

149 The provision of blue badge bays and EVCPs, in line with London Plan standards should 
also be secured by condition together with suitable facilities for taxis, coaches and private hire 
vehicles.

150 Existing parking controls around the site are variable. A Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) may 
be required to limit off site parking by residents, staff and visitors to the development. Funding for 
the establishment of such a zone and a restriction on occupiers from securing an on-street parking 
permit should be included within the s106 agreement.

151 The travel plan anticipates that a car club would be set up. TfL requests that dedicated car 
club parking spaces are provided on site and 5 years of free membership for the first residents of 
each dwelling is included within the s106 agreement.

152 The applicant should confirm that cycle parking will comply with current standards 
including those in the Further Alterations to the London Plan. The provision of cycle parking and 
other cyclists’ facilities should be secured by a condition.
TfL is currently investigating the potential to expand its Cycle Hire scheme, and it is welcomed that the submitted documents refer to providing cycle hire facilities across the development. It is recommended that a condition is imposed requiring the subsequent identification and safeguarding of sites for cycle hire docking stations and a contribution of £197,000 for one medium sized station is secured by legal agreement. In the event that the Mayor’s Cycle Hire Scheme does expand to the development, TfL would find alternative funding for additional docking stations on the other safeguarded site(s) recognising that there are other sources of demand. If it does not then the developer, TfL and Newham should agree at that point how best to deliver cycle hire.

Highway impact and measures

TfL, Newham and developers’ consultants have worked together to agree traffic modelling requirements for the traffic modelling of the wider Royal Docks road network.

The TA shows that Airport Roundabout goes over capacity with the Silvertown Quays proposals. It also shows that existing congestion and delays at North Woolwich Road roundabout are exacerbated by the development. There will also be impacts on the wider Royal Docks highway network. To address these issues TfL considers that both junctions should be signalised thus better managing and coordinating flows along this part of the SRN.

TfL supports in principle the proposal to design the access junctions for the development to allow for four lane operation on North Woolwich Road. However there will need to be ongoing discussions and agreement about the approach for the whole of North Woolwich Road including how pedestrians and cyclists can be appropriately accommodated in this corridor.

An appropriate mechanism for securing the delivery including funding of the highway improvements and associated works (including bus infrastructure) as part of the development’s transport mitigation should be identified by the Council in discussion with TfL and the applicant, in the wider context of securing improvements across the Royal Docks highway network to serve all the major developments coming forward. Separate approvals from TfL under the Traffic Management Act and for the signals as well as from Newham as the highway authority will also be required.

It is recommended that a condition is secured requiring the preparation and approval of a programme for implementation of the highway and associated works as part of the development’s reserved matters and details applications. These arrangements would enable planning of both the other approvals processes and the actual implementation of the works.

Local connectivity, wayfinding and information

The applicant has assessed the existing condition of the pedestrian and cyclists’ environment including bus stops in the vicinity of the site and identified necessary enhancements to serve the development including improving connections with existing residential areas and other developments. Legible London signing should also be provided within and close to the development. Newham and the applicant should agree how these improvements will be delivered. Given the options which exist and to encourage use it is also recommended that real time public transport information is provided in communal areas of the development.

Deliveries & Servicing

A Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) should be secured by condition to minimise highway impact and maximise safety especially of pedestrians and cyclists during construction. Consideration of options for use of the River Thames and/or the docks during site clearance and
construction should also be a condition of any permission. A detailed Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) should be secured by condition. There may be a good opportunity reduce vehicle trips through centralised management and occupiers contracting with shared suppliers which would reduce traffic impact and achieve more efficient and sustainable servicing of the development.

Estate Management

161 As the development would be a private estate, suitable arrangements, secured in the s106 agreement and by condition, should be put in place to ensure and manage and maintain public access including by taxi, coach and private hire vehicle. Public Realm and Open Space Management Plans and also an event management plan should also be secured.

Design code

162 TfL considers that there should be some updates/revisions to the submitted Design Code, ideally with references to other guidance, such as the Royal Docks Public Realm Materials and Elements Palette, adopted in February 2011, and the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) published December 2014. The LCDS includes a Cycling Level of Service Assessment which is a tool which can be used to assess the design of street types at the detailed design stage and could be referenced in the an updated Design Code and/or condition or legal agreement.

163 As a fundamental principle following from Mayoral expectations, London Plan policy and the above mentioned guidance, cycling as well as walking should be actively encouraged throughout the development. This principle should be clearly stated in the Design Code and secured through the legal agreement. Where it is proposed by the applicant that cycling should be discouraged or prevented then a full justification is expected and a suitable alternative route which also meets the particular desire line should be identified and subsequently provided. Currently there is no justification given for cycling not being permitted on the proposed Diagonal and the west-east bridge across the Pontoon Dock mouth and in the latter case TfL’s concerns are compounded by the absence of a convenient alternative. The absence of a clearly designated walking and cycling route along the dock edge is also of concern. TfL would be pleased to be involved in future work in the development of a strategy for a site wide walking and cycling network within which detailed proposals for a particular phase or zone would fit.

164 For primary routes, it should be clarified that the design code will allow for a segregated cycle way beside the highway where justified by demand, safety considerations and/or other factors e.g. serving the proposed school site in DZ6. One option would be to recognise in the Code that on street parking could be replaced by the cycleway.

165 Although the developer does not wish bus services to run through the site at present, to future proof the scheme the proposed primary road network carriageway should continue to be capable of accommodating two way operations (i.e. 6.5 metre wide plus potential for inset bus stops). The Design Code refers to drop-off/pick-up points for taxis, Dial-a-Ride and community transport but should also ensure that appropriate provision is made for coaches, minibuses and private hire vehicles serving the development.

CIL

166 Whilst Mayoral CIL is payable, the site is just within the 1km zone within which s106 Crossrail contributions are due. The amount of Mayoral CIL will be determined by Newham as phases of the scheme come forward for development. Newham has also introduced its own CIL scheme. Whilst all but the bus service enhancements required as transport mitigation are included in the Council’s Regulation 123 list, it is understood that members will prioritise use of the funding for other forms of infrastructure, hence the need to secure funding through alternative legal...
agreement with the developer and other sources. Both CIL payments have been taken into account in the viability assessment.

Summary

167 TFL considers that the following transport infrastructure and services need to be delivered at appropriate trigger points to make sure this development is in accordance with transport policies and objectives of the London Plan. The transport mitigation requested is as follows:

- Pontoon Dock DLR station: amount to be determined;
- Royal Victoria Dock new bridge: applicant to fund at their cost risk to agreed specification or developer contribution, amount to be determined;
- North Woolwich Road footbridge: applicant to fund at their cost risk to agreed specification or developer contribution, amount to be determined;
- Bus Service Pump Priming: £2,200,000 (on the assumption that other enhancements are secured from other developers);
- Cycle Hire docking station: land plus £197,000 for installation works at one of the sites;
- North Woolwich Road and Connaught Bridge highway improvements including pedestrian, cyclist and bus facilities: amount/delivery mechanism to be agreed with Newham in consultation with TFL (on the assumption that other improvements are secured from other developers);
- On site network of pedestrian and cycle routes including wayfinding signage and real time information: work in kind;
- Car club: parking spaces and free first occupiers’ membership for 5 years;
- CPZ: costs of feasibility study and if agreed, installation.

168 TFL’s advice to the Mayor is that without a clear funding commitment by the applicant to deliver the necessary transport mitigation as well as appropriate legal mechanisms to secure this, the application would not be acceptable and planning permission should not be granted.

169 Conditions should be secured for: a programme for highway works; Car Park Management Plan, and blue badge and EVCP provision; Cycle parking and facilities; Cycle Hire strategy and safeguarding docking stations within the site; DLR Infrastructure Protection; Delivery Servicing Plan; Construction Logistics Plan and associated documents; pedestrian and cycle links, Public Realm and Open Space Management Plan and Event Management Plan.

170 In addition the section 106 agreement should secure the Travel Plan preparation, approval and monitoring and that occupiers are exempted from obtaining CPZ parking permits.

Local planning authority’s position

171 Newham Council is presently reviewing the application and is targeting a committee date of 24 February 2015.
Legal considerations

172 Under the arrangements set out in Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor is required to provide the local planning authority with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view.

173 Unless notified otherwise by the Mayor, the Council must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order if it subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, in order that the Mayor may decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the Council under Article 6 of the Order to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. There is no obligation at this present stage for the Mayor to indicate his intentions regarding a possible direction, and no such decision should be inferred from the Mayor’s statement and comments.

Financial considerations

174 There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion

175 London Plan policies on opportunity areas, employment, retail, office, housing, urban design and heritage, climate change and transport are relevant to this application. The application raises significant strategic issues and complies with some London Plan policies but not with others, as detailed below:

- **Principle of development**: a mixed use development with commercial, leisure and housing uses in the Royal Docks and Beckton Waterfront Opportunity Area and Enterprise Zone is in accordance with strategic and local objectives and is supported.

- **Brand accommodation and retail**: The proposed ‘sui generis’ brand building use is innovative. While this could potentially be supported, given the quantum proposed, robust control mechanisms will be required to ensure the brand-related retail and the associated A1 to A5 retail elements do not negatively impact on town centres in the wider sub-region and more local centres.

- **Housing**: Negotiations are ongoing in relation to viability and affordable housing. The indicative housing mix has been agreed in line with the Council’s local housing needs. A review mechanism is likely to be necessary given the level of affordable housing currently proposed.

- **Urban design and heritage**: Given the outline nature of the proposals the design code secured through the legal agreement.

- **Inclusive design**: Provisions should be made to secure inclusive design matters through the legal agreement and/or planning conditions.

- **Climate change**: The applicant has broadly followed the energy hierarchy to achieve carbon dioxide emission reductions of 38%. Further detail is required on the site heat network, energy centre, PV and overheating. Sustainable drainage elements should be addressed and the wider sustainability measures proposed should be secured by way of condition.

- **Noise/air quality**: Provisions to address any identified issues will need to be secured by planning condition.
• **Aviation safeguarding:** Provisions to address any identified issues will need to be secured by planning condition.

• **Transport:** Substantial mitigation is required to address the transport impacts of the proposed development. These will need to be agreed and secured by planning condition and/or legal agreement to ensure that the proposal complies with the London Plan.

176 Given the outline nature of the proposal, much of the detail is to be decided at a later stage through the reserved matters applications. As such, and to provide comfort, it is recommended that provisions are made in the necessary legal agreements to secure the design and residential quality (through the design code) and the housing, climate change, inclusive design and transport elements of the proposal in line with the London Plan.