12 March 2010

Skylines Village, Isle of Dogs

in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets

planning application no. PA/10/00182

Strategic planning application stage 1 referral (new powers)

The proposal
Erection of building ranging in height from 2 to 50-storeys comprising 806 residential units, 123-bed hotel, 2,020 sq.m. of retail/commercial floorspace, 6,900 sq.m. of office floorspace, a school and creche for 584 pupils with sports hall and a community center.

The applicant
The applicant is ZBV (Skylines) Ltd and Skylines (Isle of Dogs) Ltd, and the architect is Farrells.

Strategic issues
The principle of a residential-led mixed-use development in the Isle of Dogs Opportunity Area is in the interest of good strategic planning in London. However, concern is raised over the design of the proposal. Further information is also required on affordable housing, access, climate change and transport to ensure compliance with London Plan policies.

Recommendation
That Tower Hamlets Council be advised that while the application is generally acceptable in strategic planning terms the application does not comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 73 of this report; but that the possible remedies set out in paragraph 75 of this report could address these deficiencies.

Context
1 On 10 February 2010 the Mayor of London received documents from Tower Hamlets 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 has until 23 March 2010 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. This report sets out information for the Mayor’s use in deciding what decision to make.
2 The application is referable under Category 1A of the Schedule to the Order 2008: “Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats or houses and flats”. Category 1C: “Development which comprises or includes the erection of a building more than 30 metres high and is outside the City of London”.

3 Once Tower Hamlets 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.

Site description

4 The 1.44-hectare triangular shaped site is located on the Isle of Dogs, just south of West India Dock and Canary Wharf. The site is bounded by Marsh Wall to the north, 3-storey residential blocks to the southeast and Limeharbour to the West. The site contains 59 small-scale business units ranging from two to three storeys in height and a vegetated bank which drops down to the residential properties behind.

5 The A1261 Aspen Way, accessed at the Preston Road Roundabout, is the nearest section of the Transport for London road network, which lies 900m to the north. The site lies 200 metres to the east of South Quay Docklands DLR station, which has recently been relocated to accommodate the 3-car train upgrade. Crossharbour DLR station (on the same line) is located 250 metres to the south of the site, and Canary Wharf Underground station (Jubilee line) is 600 metres from the site to the northeast. Five bus routes can be accessed within 300 metres of the site (nos. 135, D3, D6, D7 and D8). The public transport accessibility level of the site is 5.

Details of the proposal

6 Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of six buildings ranging in height from two to 50-storeys comprising:-

- 806 residential units.
- 123-bed hotel.
- 2,020 sq.m. of flexible commercial floorspace (A1-A5).
- 6,900 sq.m. of office floorspace (business centre).
- 5,575 sq.m. creche and private school for 584 pupils with 1,765 sq.m. sports hall.
- 1,075 sq.m. community centre.

7 A breakdown of the residential unit is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Social rented</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedroom</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 bed house</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case history

8 On 24 April 2009 and 29 July 2009 pre-application meetings were held between the applicant and the GLA to discuss the proposed re-development of the site. An advice note reference PDU/2427KH04 was issued on 8 May 2009 and PDU/2427KH10 on 11 August 2009.

9 The applicants also presented the proposal to the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor for Policy and Planning, Sir Simon Milton on 25 November 2009.

Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance

10 The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- **Principle of development**  
  *London Plan; PPS1*
- **Density**  
  *London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG; draft revised interim Housing SPG*
- **Affordable housing**  
  *London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG, Housing Strategy; draft revised interim Housing SPG*
- **Urban design**  
  *London Plan; PPS1*
- **Tall buildings/views**  
  *London Plan; RPG3A, View Management Framework SPG, draft Revised View Management Framework SPG*
- **Access**  
  *London Plan; Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG; Planning and Access for Disabled People: a good practice guide (ODPM)*
- **Child play space**  
  *London Plan; Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation SPG,*
- **Climate change**  
  *London Plan; PPS1, PPS3; PPG13; PPS22; the Mayor’s Energy Strategy; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG*
- **Transport**  
  *London Plan; the Mayor’s Transport Strategy; PPG13*
- **Crossrail**  
  *draft London Plan Alteration; draft Crossrail SPG*

11 The Tower Hamlets Core Strategy submission document, Interim Core Strategy and Isle of Dogs Area Action Plan and the Draft Replacement London Plan 2009 are also material considerations.

Principle of development

12 The site is located within the emerging indicative boundary of the Isle of Dogs Opportunity Area, which is identified in the London Plan and the draft replacement London Plan as being capable of accommodating at least 10,000 additional dwellings and 110,000 new jobs. It states the “conversion of surplus business capacity south of Canary Wharf could add to this, helping to meet London’s strategic housing need and support a wider mix of services for residents, workers and nearby communities” (paragraph 5.75). Mixed-use developments and densities which support the Isle of Dogs interdependence with central London and the Central Activities Zone are also supported.

13 The provision of residential accommodation on the site is further supported by London Plan policy 3A.1 and policy 3.3 of the draft replacement London Plan, which seeks to increase London’s supply of housing. Policy 3A.3 seeks to ensure that development proposals achieve the maximum intensity of use compatible with the local context, the design principles in policy 4B.1 of the London Plan and 3.5 of the draft replacement London Plan and with public transport capacity.
Policy 3A.24 of the London Plan and 3.19 of the draft replacement London Plan supports the provision of new educational facilities.

The principle of a mixed-use redevelopment of the site is therefore supported in strategic planning terms.

**Density**

London Plan policies 4B.1 and 3A.3 outline the need for development proposals to achieve the highest possible intensity of use compatible with local context, the design principles of the compact city, and public transport accessibility. Table 3A.2 of the London Plan provides guidelines on density in support of policies 4B.1 and 3A.3. The density matrix is repeated in the draft replacement London Plan, although the policy seeks to optimise rather than maximise density.

The proposal has a residential density of 1519 habitable rooms per hectare. This exceeds the guidance range provided in table 3A.2 of the London Plan which identifies central sites with a public transport accessibility level of five as being suitable for developments between 650 – 1,100 habitable rooms per hectare. However, given the height of the proposal and subject to the design, residential quality and open space issues and given the predominance of studio, 1 and 2-bedroom market units, this density is not out of context with the character of surrounding development and the site’s Canary Wharf location.

**Affordable housing**

London Plan Policy 3A.10 requires borough councils to seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mix-use schemes. In doing so, each council should have regard to its own overall target for the amount of affordable housing provision. Policy 3A.9 states that such targets should be based on an assessment of regional and local housing need and a realistic assessment of supply, and should take account of the London Plan strategic target that 35% of housing should be social and 15% intermediate provision, and of the promotion of mixed and balanced communities. In addition, Policy 3A.10 encourages councils to have regard to the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development, and to the individual circumstances of the site. Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements. Policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the draft replacement London Plan also seek to maximise affordable housing provision when negotiating on individual residential and mixed-use schemes.

Policy 3A.10 is supported by paragraph 3.52, which urges borough councils to take account of economic viability when estimating the appropriate amount of affordable provision. The ‘Three Dragons’ development control toolkit is recommended for this purpose. The results of a toolkit appraisal might need to be independently verified.

Where borough councils have not yet set overall targets as required by Policy 3A.9, they should have regard to the overall London Plan targets. It may be appropriate to consider emerging policies, but the weight that can be attached to these will depend on the extent to which they have been consulted on or tested by public examination. The target of 25% affordable housing as set by the Tower Hamlets UDP was not saved by the Secretary of State in September 2007 as part of the saved policies exercise.

The proposal provides 21% affordable housing by units and 25% affordable housing by habitable rooms. The applicant has submitted a Three Dragon’s toolkit assessment with a covering report.
22 Dependant on the market values at the time of completion the proposal may be able to provide more or less than 25% affordable housing. It is understood that Tower Hamlets Council will instruct an independent appraisal of the financial viability assessment. The findings of which should be submitted before the application is referred back to the Mayor.

23 Given the intention to build this proposal in a series of phases over several years, by which time the housing market may have improved, a more appropriate solution would be to assess the viability of the provision of affordable housing on commencement of each phase. The mechanism for which can be secured through the section 106 agreement.

24 This option prevents the applicant agreeing to provide a percentage of affordable housing that they cannot realistically deliver and ensures the proposal complies with London Plan policy to provide the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing should the market improve during the lifetime of the permission and construction.

25 Of the affordable housing units, 73% will be marketed as social rented and 27% as intermediate. This complies with existing London Plan policy, however, the draft replacement London Plan seeks a move towards developments providing 60% social rented units and 40% intermediate units.

26 The Mayor's Housing SPG provides a London wide target for the mix of unit sizes within developments. The table below compares the proposed mix of units against the targets within the SPG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Social rented</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPG</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>SPG</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3 bed</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed +</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 The Mayor’s draft London Housing Strategy seeks 42% of all social rented and 16% of intermediate housing units to have at least three bedrooms or more. The proposal provides 40% of all social rented units with 3-bedrooms or more and 25% of intermediate units with 3-bedrooms or more.

28 Whilst the proposal fails to meet the Mayor’s London wide targets the overall offer of family sized accommodation is welcomed and in keeping with the sites location at the northern end of the Isle of Dogs. Tower Hamlets housing department should ensure it is satisfied the proposed mix will meet the needs of the residents. The applicant should also confirm that the proposed mix will secure grant funding from the Homes and Community Agency.

**Urban design**

29 Good design is central to all objectives of the London Plan and is specifically promoted by the policies contained in Chapter 4B. London Plan Policy 4B.1 sets out a series of overarching design principles for development in London. Other policies in Chapter 4B and elsewhere in the London Plan set out design requirements relating to specific issues. London Plan policies 4B.9 and 4B.10, which set out specific design requirements for tall and large-scale buildings, are applicable to the proposal. Chapter 7 of the draft replacement London Plan sets out design related policies.
30 The application site lies at a point of marked transition in land use, built scale and overall character; the areas to north of Marshwall and west of Limeharbour being predominately large-scale commercial development on the fringes of the Canary Wharf cluster and that to the south being predominately established residential development on the northern edge of Cubit Town of between two and five storeys. This transition is to an extent reflected in the commercial buildings currently on the site which are relatively small in scale and embody elements of domestic architecture. The areas to north of Marshwall and west of Limeharbour are subject to proposals, at various stages of fruition, for their intensification. These are likely to lead to diversification in land uses, particularly through additional residential development, and buildings of greater scale than at present. The latter will make the transition in scale and character across the site more marked than at present.

31 The applicant has provided a thorough contextual analysis that recognises the transitional nature of the site within the wider Isle of Dogs context. The proposed design would though, clearly reflect the existing and emerging scale and form of development to the north and west rather than a transition between this and that to the south. The proposed layout logically places a series of buildings along Limeharbour and Marshwall and creates a public square at the corner of Limeharbour and Marsh Wall. The latter is a positive feature that would offer the locality necessary relief from the increasingly dense development along these streets and the noise associated with the elevated DLR track. The square would be suitably enclosed and animated by the uses and buildings surrounding it and the routes connecting to it, which would facilitate and promote a new pedestrian link through the site to the residential neighbourhood to the southeast. The southern part of the site would be given over to a raised amenity space and buffer planting to mitigate the relationship of the proposal with residential area to the south.

32 The proposed buildings would step up in scale along Limeharbour and Marshwall with the two tallest towers at the corner of these routes reaching 40 and 48 storeys (136 and 165 metres AOD respectively for comparison the Broadgate tower is 161 metres). Whilst the stepping of the proposed buildings would respond to the scale of development fronting both Marshwall and Limeharbour at the edges of the site the tallest buildings would nonetheless be around 50–75 metres from the nearest residential development immediately to the southern of the site. This would result in an awkward and inappropriate spatial relationship and would compromise the privacy and amenity of this existing development. Whilst the site could be suitable for tall buildings these will need to form part of a robust masterplan that considers the wider site context and, in particular, fully and satisfactorily addresses the spatial relationship and integration with the residential area to the south. The Council and the applicant should pursue this in collaboration with neighbouring landowners in order to bring about a more comprehensive design solution for the area.

33 The material submitted does not demonstrate that the proposed buildings would attain the level of design quality expected of tall buildings in London. The supporting townscape assessment illustrates that, whilst the proposal would not harm the protected view from Greenwich Park where it would be viewed against the Canary Wharf cluster, it would be unattractive some in middle distance and local views. The appearance of the buildings should be reviewed and refined to enhance their appearance to comply with the London Plan.

34 The plans suggest that the internal configuration of the residential accommodation would broadly comply with existing and emerging strategic policy on residential design quality. The consideration given to maximising dual aspect units is particularly welcomed. There is concern regarding the successful integration of the proposed school into the scheme and further details are required to be confident that its needs could be adequately met and that it would not harm residential amenity. The design and management of the amenity space, and particularly security
and inclusive access matters, also need further clarification to confirm compliance with the London Plan.

35 In summary the proposal would be inconsistent with London Plan policies 4B.1, 4B.9 and 4B.10. The applicant should fully address the matters raised above to remedy this.

Access

36 Policy 4B.5 of the London Plan and 7.2 of the draft replacement London Plan expects all future development to meet the highest standard of accessibility and inclusion. This, together with the London Plan’s supplementary planning guidance ‘Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment’, underpins the principles of inclusive design and the aim to achieve an accessible and inclusive environment consistently across London. Policy 3A.5 of the London Plan and policy 3.8 of the draft replacement London Plan requires all new housing to be built to ‘Lifetime Homes’ standards and 10% of all new housing to be designed to be wheelchair accessible to meet the full range of housing needs.

37 The applicant has submitted a detailed access strategy which described the accessibility of all uses. All of the residential units and the communal lifts, corridors and stairs will comply with the Lifetime Homes standards. Whilst 10% of residential units have been designed to be wheelchair accessible. However, the applicant has not submitted plans detailing the location and tenure of the wheelchair accessible units or a plan showing how these units go beyond the Lifetime Homes Criteria. This should be submitted before the application is referred back to the Mayor.

38 Policy 3D.7 of the London Plan seeks to increase the quantity and quality of wheelchair accessible accommodation in London. Policy 4.5 of the draft replacement London Plan states 10% of all new hotel rooms should be affordable. The applicant should also confirm the proportion of wheelchair accessible hotel rooms to be provided and submit plans detailing their location and an example of their layout before the application is referred back to the Mayor.

Child play space

39 Policy 3D.13 of the London Plan and policy 3.6 of the draft replacement London Plan sets out that “the Mayor will and the boroughs should ensure developments that include housing make provision for play and informal recreation, based on the expected child population generated by the scheme and an assessment of future needs”. Using the methodology within the Mayor’s supplementary planning guidance ‘Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation’ it is anticipated that there will be approximately 289 children within the development. The guidance sets a benchmark of 10 sq.m. of useable child playspace to be provided per child, with under-5 child playspace provided on-site. As such the development should make provision for 2890 sq.m. of playspace.

40 The applicant has supplied a child play strategy that uses the methodology from the Mayor’s SPG. Overall the provision and quality of child play space within the development is good and complies with London Plan policy 3D.13. The development provides 2,180 sq.m. of on-site child play space for children aged 0 to 11 in three designated areas as well as a sports hall attached to the school which will be open for use outside of school hours for local residents. To supplement the onsite play space the applicant proposes that children aged over 11-years can use the existing recreation area at St John’s park including tennis courts and play ground. It may therefore be necessary for the applicant to provide funding for the improvement or maintenance of St John’s Park. This should be negotiated with Tower Hamlets Council.
Climate change mitigation

41 The climate change policies as set out in chapter 4A of the London Plan and chapter 5 of the draft replacement London Plan collectively require developments to make the fullest contribution to the mitigation and adaptation to climate change and to minimise carbon dioxide emissions (policy 4A.1).

Be lean

42 The applicant has broadly followed the energy hierarchy in Policy 4A.1. Sufficient information has been provided to understand the proposals as a whole and to verify carbon dioxide savings in principle. Baseline emissions have been calculated using a suitable modelling tools (SAP and SBEM software) and is estimated to be 2,067 tonnes of carbon dioxide per year for a building regulations 2006 part L compliant development. Baseline emission calculations do not appear to include unregulated uses. This should be updated accordingly.

43 Energy efficiency and conservation measures are applied beyond that normally incorporated into a 2006 Building Regulations compliant design. This incorporates measures such as passive designs, enhanced thermal performance of the building fabric and enhanced electrical efficiency and conservations measures such as U-values, air permeability, variable speed drives for pumps and fans, high efficiency boilers, energy efficient lighting etc. The applicant has estimated that a carbon emission reduction of 15.5% on the baseline emissions (does not include unregulated uses). The applicant should update the reductions to also include unregulated uses.

Be clean

44 Wood Wharf and Barkantine district heating networks were identified as potential networks that the development could link into. The Wood Wharf development (due to be operational post 2020) was discounted, as timescales were incompatible with the proposed Skylines scheme. The Barkantine district heating scheme however could potentially supply between 1 and 2 MW of heat to the development provided the necessary pipework is laid which has an estimated capital cost of £1000/m. The Barkantine is however, planning to expand its network along Millharbour, which would significantly reduce cost. It may therefore be possible to provide part of the heating and hot water requirements in future. The current Skylines design assumes that such provision may not be available and therefore incorporation of combined heat and power plant and gas fired boilers has been allowed for.

45 The applicant proposes to install a district heating system fed by to combined heat and power plant units via thermal stores to provide majority of the space heating and hot water requirements to all the dwellings, the school and the hotel. The district heating will connect to the four main blocks to connect to the central heating systems via plate heat exchangers.

46 The potential to link to the proposed Barkantine scheme is welcomed. The applicant should ensure that the Skylines development is designed to be compatible with the Barkantine district-heating scheme. The applicant needs to clarify how the site wide heating system will develop in the context of the phasing of the development. The applicant should provide information about the number of energy centres proposed, location and size of these and show indicatively that enough space has been allocated for the proposed equipment, including combined heat and power plant, thermal stores, boilers, heat exchangers, pumps and future district heating connection equipment etc.

47 The applicant should provide indicative plan showing how the development’s district heating system will link the buildings. The applicant should investigate supplying the offices and retail spaces with heating through the site wide heating system.
Two gas fired combined heat and power units will be installed in the development to feed a community heating system serving the apartment, the school (including sports hall) and the hotel.

The proposed combined heat and power unit for Block A and B has thermal and electrical capacities of 233kWth and 200kWe respectively. For blocks B1 and C the proposed combined heat and power unit has capacities of 350kWt and 238kWe. The combined heat and power will provide most of the heating and hot water for the development (approximately 69-74%).

Combined heat and power will reduce carbon dioxide emissions by a further 42% over and above the reductions due to energy efficiency measures (does not include unregulated uses). The applicant should update this reduction to also include unregulated uses.

The applicant should clarify the combined heat and power strategy in the context of the phasing of the development. It is not entirely clear when and where these combined heat and power units would be installed, it is envisaged that these would be installed in a single energy centre, the applicant should confirm.

The combined heat and power communal heating system would provide a majority of the heating for the blocks and supplemented by block-local gas boilers. The applicant needs to confirm that the conceptual strategy is to size the heat exchangers for full capacity.

The applicant has indicated that cooling will not be provided in dwellings or hotel bedrooms. Overheating will be minimised mainly through passive measures and via use of operable windows to provide natural ventilation during the summer. Cooling will be provided in hotel bedrooms via the use of high efficiency air-cooled screw type chillers, which feeds a chilled water system. Cooling will be required in areas subjected to high solar loads (not specified) in the school via fresh air supply. Cooling will be incorporated in the central air-handling units. This will be fed via a high efficiency split unit or air-cooled screw/scroll chillers. High efficiency water-cooled heat pump system will be used to provide cooling in B1 and retail units.

The applicant should revisit the ground source cooling option. It is envisaged that this would provide a robust cooling strategy.

The applicant proposes to incorporate 1,100 sq.m. of photovoltaic panels, which will provide 136kWp of electricity. This would provide a further 6% carbon reduction to the baseline. Detailed photovoltaic panel calculations have been provided.

The applicant should provide drawings showing the amount of roof that is available within the development and that could be used to install photovoltaic modules with suitable orientation and free from shading. The applicant should explain why the other areas are not available for this application. The applicant should endeavour to maximise the carbon dioxide reductions through the use of photovoltaic panels.

The following condition should be attached to any grant of planning permission to secure the provision of photovoltaic panels:

“Upon the completion of development no less than 1,100 sq.m. of roof mounted solar photovoltaic panels with a southern component and absent of significant shading throughout the year should be mounted on the roof of the development”.

Be green

The applicant proposes to incorporate 1,100 sq.m. of photovoltaic panels, which will provide 136kWp of electricity. This would provide a further 6% carbon reduction to the baseline. Detailed photovoltaic panel calculations have been provided.

The applicant should provide drawings showing the amount of roof that is available within the development and that could be used to install photovoltaic modules with suitable orientation and free from shading. The applicant should explain why the other areas are not available for this application. The applicant should endeavour to maximise the carbon dioxide reductions through the use of photovoltaic panels.

The following condition should be attached to any grant of planning permission to secure the provision of photovoltaic panels:

“Upon the completion of development no less than 1,100 sq.m. of roof mounted solar photovoltaic panels with a southern component and absent of significant shading throughout the year should be mounted on the roof of the development”.

Climate change adaptation
The London Plan promotes five principles in policy 4A.9 to promote and support the most effective adaptation to climate change. These are to minimise overheating and contribute to heat island effects; minimise solar gain in summer; contribute to flood risk reduction, including applying sustainable drainage; minimising water use; and protect and enhance green infrastructure. Specific policies cover overheating, living roofs and walls and water. These policies have also been carried over into the draft replacement London Plan.

The proposal provides extensive green and brown roofs, sustainable urban drainage, a rainwater harvesting system for landscape maintenance, low flow appliances and water meters. The provision of which should be secured by condition.

**Comments from Transport for London**

The overall proposed level of parking provision is in line with London Plan policy 3C.23 and draft London Plan policy, 6.13 although TfL would request that parking for the hotel and offices is limited to operational needs only. In recognition of the good accessibility, TfL welcomes the restraint based approach to car parking provision for the residential elements, although requests that appropriate provision of accessible parking bays is made for all uses, and that at least 20% of the proposed parking provision should be equipped with charging infrastructure for electric vehicles. TfL would also recommend considering the provision of car club bays, and that a clause is included in the Section 106 agreement preventing residents of the proposed development from having access to on street parking permits.

In order to comply with TfL cycle parking standards, a minimum of 944 residential cycle parking spaces should be provided. The cycle parking proposed for the other uses are compliant with TfL’s minimum standards.

TfL requests further information with regard to the trip generation of the proposed school in order to fully assess the impact of this on the strategic highways and public transport networks. TfL requests that the trip generation for the school element of the scheme is reassessed with the use of further appropriate survey material.

TfL welcomes the provision of a temporary drop-off/pick-up bay, although considers that this should be redesigned to allow a 15 metre coach to set down and pick up at the site, in line with London Plan Policy 3C.23, and draft replacement London Plan policy 6.13.

TfL agrees that there will be sufficient capacity on the DLR and Jubilee Line services to accommodate the proposed development in line with London Plan Policy 3C.19 and draft replacement London Plan Policy 6.3. As approximately 40% of peak hour trips would be made by DLR, it is likely that end users of the proposed development will rely heavily upon South Quay station. TfL would therefore welcome further discussion with Tower Hamlets Council and the applicant regarding a contribution towards improved access to the eastern end of the platforms, closest to the Skylines site.

TfL would also welcome further discussion with Tower Hamlets Council and the applicant regarding a financial contribution towards improving bus capacity in the Isle of Dogs, which is currently at capacity. The applicant should assess the quality and accessibility of the two closest bus stops on site and contribute towards their upgrade if necessary.

TfL requests that the applicant contributes to the maintenance and upgrade of Lea Valley Walk, which forms part of the strategic walk network in line with adopted London Plan Policy 3C.2 and draft London Plan Policy 6.10. Works to improve the pedestrian realm immediately surrounding the development site should also be secured as part of any planning permission.
The draft travel plan submitted for the residential, workplace and school elements of the proposed scheme is welcomed in line with London Plan Policy 3C.2, although further work is required. In addition, TfL recommends that appropriate real-time information be provided within the development in order to further encourage use of public transport. TfL requests further details of such provision within the scheme and the developer should allow £20,000 for any implementation.

The commitment to submit a construction management plan is welcomed, and should be accompanied by a construction logistics plan. Given the location, serious consideration should be given the use of water-based transport where possible. TfL also requests the submission of a delivery and servicing plan which should seek to rationalise servicing arrangements.

Policy 3C.12A of the Proposed London Plan Alterations states that “In view of the strategic regional importance of Crossrail to London’s economic regeneration and development, developments which contribute to the transport needs that the project will wholly or partly address will be required to contribute towards its funding through the use of planning obligations, in accordance with relevant legislation and policy guidance”. This is underpinned by London Plan Policy 6A.4 (and as amended in the Proposed London Plan Alterations), which establishes the strategic priorities for planning obligations. This states that affordable housing and transport should generally be given the highest importance. Using the methodology within the October 2009 version of the supporting draft Supplementary Planning Guidance, a contribution would not be required, as the proposal would not provide uplift in B1 (office) floorspace. Should the recent Examination in Public panel report recommendations (which currently propose a rate of £183 per sq.m. for offices, £117 per sq.m. for retail, and £80 per sq.m. for hotels) be adopted, a contribution of £714,420 will be sought. In this respect, TfL requests clarification of the gross external area of the proposed A1 (retail) provision and welcomes further discussion about this matter.

Local planning authority’s position

The application is likely to be reviewed by Tower Hamlets Council’s planning committee in March 2010.

Legal considerations

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. 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

There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion
London Plan policies on the principle of development, density, affordable housing, urban design, access, child play space, climate change and transport are relevant to this application. The application complies with some of these policies but not with others, for the following reasons:

- **Principle of development**: The proposal provides a mix of commercial and residential uses and seeks to optimise the development potential of the site; as such it complies with London Plan policy 2A.5 of the London Plan.

- **Density**: Given the height of the proposal and the predominance of studio, 1 and 2-bedroom market units, this density is not out of context with the character of surrounding development and the site’s Canary Wharf location. As such it complies with policy 3A.3 of the London Plan.

- **Affordable housing**: The findings of the independent appraisal should be submitted. The applicant and Tower Hamlets Council should consider methods to secure phased viability assessments or a claw back mechanism to ensure the proposal provides the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing to comply with policy 3A.9 and 3A.10 of the London Plan.

- **Urban design**: The proposal is inconsistent with London Plan policies 4B.1, 4B.9 and 4B.10.

- **Access**: In general the proposal has a high standard of accessibility. However, further details of the wheelchair accessible residential units and hotel bedrooms are required to ensure compliance with London Plan policy 3A.5 and 4B.5.

- **Child play space**: Overall the provision and quality of child play space within the development is good and complies with London Plan policy 3D.13.

- **Climate change mitigation**: Further information is required to assess whether the application complies with the London Plan energy policies in chapter 4.

- **Climate change adaptation**: The proposal includes green roofs, sustainable urban drainage, a rainwater harvesting system and water efficient and low flow appliances. As such the proposal complies with the climate change adaptation policies contained within chapter 4A of the London Plan.

- **Transport**: Further information and discussion is required with the applicant and Tower Hamlets Council is required to ensure the proposal complies with the transport policies of the London Plan detailed in chapter 3A.

Whilst the application is broadly acceptable in strategic planning terms. On balance, the application does not comply with the London Plan.

The following changes might, however, remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies, and could possibly lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan:

- **Affordable housing**: The information requested should be submitted before the application is referred back to the Mayor.

- **Urban design**: The applicant should fully address the matters raised in this report before the application is referred back to the Mayor.

- **Access**: The information requested in the report should be submitted before the application is referred back to the Mayor.
• **Climate change mitigation**: The further information requested in this report should be submitted before the application is referred back to the Mayor.

• **Transport**: The additional information and discussion requested should be submitted/carried out before the application is referred back to the Mayor.