

## Westferry Printworks, Isle of Dogs

in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets

planning application no. PA/15/02216

---

**Factual updates, clarifications and corrections** This section sets out various factual updates, clarifications and corrections which need to be considered in conjunction with the Representation Hearing Report originally published on 19 April 2016.

**The proposal** – states the proposals include the erection of nine buildings. This should in fact read ten buildings.

**Drawing numbers and documents** – the following documents were omitted from the list in the Representation Hearing Report and should have been listed:

Landscape plans

5932-001 Rev C; 5932-002 Rev A; 5932-003 Rev B; 5932-004 Rev A; 5932-005 Rev B; 5932-001 Rev C;

School plans

5130473-ATK-01-GA-1.002 Rev P2; 5130473-ATK-02-GA-1.003 Rev P1; 5130473-ATK-03-GA-1.004 Rev P1; 5130473-ATK-04-GA-1.005 Rev P1; 5130473-ATK-05-GA-1.006 Rev P1; 5130473-ATK-XX-EL-3.000 Rev P1; 5130473-ATK-XX-EL-3.001 Rev P1; 5130473-ATK-XX-EL-3.002 Rev P1; 5130473-ATK-XX-GA-1.000 Rev P2; 5130473-ATK-XX-SE-2.000 Rev P1; 5130473-ATK-XX-SE-2.001 Rev P1; 5130473-ATK-XX-SE-2.002 Rev P1

**Para. 8** – since publication the applicant has questioned the estimated construction and end user training obligations.

Against the Tower Hamlets Section 106 SPG the applicant calculates that the construction training initiative contribution should be £474,952 (rather than £496,116). This is based on the total GIA area for the scheme multiplied by 4 (118,738 x 4 = £474,952).

In addition, the applicant calculates that the end use training initiative should be £107,916 (rather than £77,617). This is based on the HCA (2015) employee yield below (265 x 20% x £2,040).

	NIA	HCA 2015	FTE
B1(a) general office	2216	12 sqm NIA per FTE	185
A1 retail	183	18 sqm NIA per FTE	10
A3 restaurants / cafes	1254	18 sqm NIA per FTE	70
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>265</b>

The final contributions will be clarified with the Council and secured through the detailed drafting of the section 106 agreement.

**Paras. 8, 413, 433** – state a Crossrail contribution of £3,810,513 is to be secured. It is confirmed that the application site is outside of the Isle of Dogs Crossrail Charging Area and therefore the Crossrail Charge is not applicable. This figure therefore relates to the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), not Crossrail as incorrectly stated.

The applicant is updating the estimated CIL contribution in light of the revised affordable housing provision and taking account of the amount of floorspace currently in use (see further amendment below). The final payment will be confirmed by the Council as the collecting authority.

In addition, the CIL contribution is incorrectly included under the list of draft Heads of Terms. The CIL cum is collected under a different legal framework and will not form part of the section 106 agreement.

**Para.9** – The recommended condition relating to the retention of the historic dock cranes should be removed as the cranes are outside of the application boundary.

**Para.180** – should read “...the application includes a total of 1.95 hectares of public open space which equates to 72% of the overall site area...” The quantum of public open space is correct, however, the 72% figure relates to the proportion of the site not covered by buildings and includes private amenity space in the courtyards, not publicly accessible open space. Notwithstanding this, the level of public open space remains unchanged and exceeds policy requirements.

**Para.20,186 &191** – Since publication of the Hearing Report, it has come to light that the existing building has been in use on short term lets. While this has some implications on the calculation of total CIL payments liable, this does not alter the conclusions set out in the employment section of the report (paragraphs 186 to 195).

**Para.237** – Children’s playspace: The GLA child yield calculation stated in the report relates to the original housing mix based on 11% affordable housing and following the receipt of a revised affordable housing offer of 20% (based on habitable rooms) from the applicant, this figure has been superseded. In accordance with the methodology set out in the Mayor’s Play and Informal Recreation SPG, the GLA has calculated, based on the revised housing mix, that the development is expected to generate a child yield of 193 children; an additional 32 children, which equates to a revised play space requirement of 1,930 sq.m. As set out in the report, the proposals would provide 3,495 sq.m. of dedicated playspace, which significantly exceeds the revised policy requirement. Therefore, the conclusions remain as per paragraph 240 of the hearing

report; in that this aspect of the development is strongly supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.6.

### ***Representations made to the Mayor***

Since publication of the report, the Mayor has received a further five representations from local residents. The representations raise objections to the proposals with regards to the daylight and sunlight impacts of the proposed school building on properties at 16 to 19 Claire Place; increased traffic congestion generated by the school and construction; bus capacity and infrastructure; towers are too tall; impact on views from Waterridge Close and Old Bellgate; impact on sailing centre.

In addition, a further letter of support was received, welcoming the provision of local facilities (including the school) in addition to new housing.

At the time of writing this Addendum Report, the number of signatures on the petition from the Docklands Sailing and Watersports Centre (DSWC) referred to in paragraph 138 of the Hearing Report had increased 998 signatures.

The **Docklands Sailing and Watersports Centre** has continued discussions with the applicant and the GLA and further correspondence has been received since the publication of the report. This has been shared in full with the Deputy Mayor.

As a result of further discussions, the applicant has increased its mitigation package to £546,000, in response to detailed costings provided by the DSWC. This is based on the cost of a fit for purpose, adaptable pontoon in addition to new equipment including more stable boats. While the DSWC have welcomed the increased offer, it has set out that the proposals will result in a substantial amount of lost revenue due to the altered wind conditions impact on commercial sailing, in addition to additional staffing and operation costs associated with the alternative operations. On this basis the DSWC are seeking further financial mitigation.

Notwithstanding the above, the increased mitigation package is welcomed will enable the delivery of the infrastructure required to provide an appropriate level of mitigation against the worse impacts of the development and is supported.

### **Impact of revised affordable housing offer**

In its letter dated the 22 April 2016 to the Assistant Director – Planning at the GLA (appended to this report – appendix A), the Council acknowledged and welcomed the revised affordable housing offer of 20%, however, it noted that it still remains considerably below its development plan targets.

The Council also set out that it intended to seek an assessment of the GLA's independent review of the supporting financial viability appraisal and subsequent Council reviews, but raised concerns that it would be unable to do so in sufficient time before the hearing date of 27 April 2016.

The Council also raised further issues with regards to the implications of the increased quantum of affordable housing on the findings in the existing environmental statement (ES) and set out that it would normally require additional documentation to assess whether it would lead to any new significant effects. The Council stated that it would consider any such submission as 'further information' under Regulation 22 of the EIA Regulations, which requires further statutory consultation.

With regards to this point, the GLA consider that any potential impact would be from the change in population characteristics of the development as a result of increased affordable/social rented units; namely a difference in total population and an increase in child yields. Given that the overall quantum of housing and mix remains unchanged, the overall magnitude in change of total population is not considered to be significant enough to materially change the findings already set out in the ES with regards to the populations socio-economic impact and amenity space requirements. As clarified above in the revisions to paragraph 237, while the increased level of affordable housing would potentially generate an additional 32 children, the playspace requirements are adequately met by the generous provision already proposed in the development.

Notwithstanding the above, it is recognised that the increased child yield would generate some additional demand for school places at the primary and secondary level. Given the inclusion of land for a new 1,200 pupil secondary school within the application, the additional demand for secondary school places would be adequately met by the development and is assessed as part of the existing ES. With regards to primary school places, it is acknowledged that there will be a minor increase in demand for primary school places, compared to that assessed in the ES. However, the magnitude of change is not considered to alter the overall conclusion of the assessment of a minor adverse impact, in this regard.

Overall, as set out in the GLA's response to the Council dated 25 April 2016, the GLA is satisfied that the information in its possession is adequate to enable an assessment to be made of the likely significant effects of the changes to the proposed affordable housing provision. On assessment of the available information, the likely change in population characteristics is not anticipated to reduce the overall socio-economic benefits, or materially alter the conclusions of the environmental statement.

Furthermore, on 26 April 2016, the Council shared the findings of a further review it had carried out on the GLA's independent assessment of the applicant's viability assessment. In summary, the Council's consultant set out that the GLA advice is deficient in the areas of private sales values, development programme and site value and that should these be addressed, it would further enhance the scheme value and capacity for increased affordable housing, as set out in the Council's previous independent advice. The report is appended in full for the Deputy Mayor's consideration (appendix B).

It is important to note that the Council's previous independent reviews were considered in detail as part of the the GLA's independent review. On this basis, GLA officers consider that the assessment carried out and used to inform its conclusions regarding the revised affordable housing offer are robust.

---

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development and Projects):

**Stewart Murray, Assistant Director - Planning**

020 7983 4271 email [stewart.murray@london.gov.uk](mailto:stewart.murray@london.gov.uk)

**Colin Wilson, Senior Manager - Planning Decisions**

020 7983 4783 email [colin.wilson@london.gov.uk](mailto:colin.wilson@london.gov.uk)

**Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)**

020 7983 4895 email [justin.carr@london.gov.uk](mailto:justin.carr@london.gov.uk)

**Jonathan Finch, Senior Strategic Planner (case officer)**

020 7983 4799 email [jonathan.finch@london.gov.uk](mailto:jonathan.finch@london.gov.uk)