
Appeal Decisions

Inquiry held on 20-23 and 27-30 August 2024

Site visit made on 20 August 2024

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th October 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/G5750/W/24/3343569

Abbey House, Bakers Row, Stratford, London, E15 3NB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Finebeam Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 23/01147/FUL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of a row of 2 storey terraced houses and a building of between 4 and 14 storeys to provide 74 residential units and associated landscaping and public realm improvements.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/G5750/W/24/3345943

Abbey House, Bakers Row, Stratford, London, E15 3NB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Finebeam Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 24/00499/FUL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing buildings and the erection a building of between 3, 5 and 9 storeys to provide 72 residential units and associated landscaping and public realm improvements.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of a row of 2 storey terraced houses and a building of between 4 and 14 storeys to provide 74 residential units and associated landscaping and public realm improvements at Abbey House, Bakers Row, Stratford, London, E15 3NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01147/FUL, subject to the subject to the conditions attached in Annex A.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. I held a case management conference on 26 June 2024, attended by the appellant and Council, at which the Inquiry format and main issues were agreed. At the conference, I was requested to consider the inclusion of amended plans for Appeal A, which were not before the Council at the time of its decision. Before the Inquiry, the appellant carried out a local consultation exercise which I considered to be appropriate in not denying natural justice to any party. I accepted the amendments to the Appeal A plans on 15 July 2024,

and my ruling issued to the parties on that date set out my reasons for allowing the amendments.

4. Also prior to the Inquiry, I accepted amended '**red line**' site plans that excised a small amount of land in response to a query for Transport for London. The alterations were minor and in accepting these plans I was confident that no parties would be adversely affected.
5. **The Council's decision notice for both applications included a reason for refusal** pertaining to the provision of waste and recycling facilities within the proposed developments. Prior to the Inquiry, the Council and appellant reached agreement on the points of difference between the parties, and consequently these matters were not for consideration by the Inquiry. In addition, the heritage impact in respect of appeal B was narrowed from three to one heritage assets, as considered below.
6. A consultation draft to update the *National Planning Policy Framework (2023)* (the Framework) was issued by the Government on 30 July 2024, and a Written Ministerial Statement was also released by the Secretary of State on this date. The potential effects of these documents were considered at the Inquiry, and the parties agreed that it would be unlikely that any post-Inquiry consultation would be required on the potential replacement Framework. I am satisfied that this remains the case.
7. Relevant development plan documents for these appeals are the *Newham Local Plan 2018*¹ and the *London Plan (2017)*.² **The Council's draft** Local Plan is in the Regulation 19 stage and has not yet been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. As such I give this minimal weight in my consideration of the main issues.

Main Issues

8. Both applications for planning permission were separately refused by the Council for similar reasons in each case. The main issues therefore apply to both appeals, and are:
 - The effect of the proposed developments on the character and appearance of the area;
 - The effect of the proposed developments on the historic environment;
 - The effect of the proposed developments on the living conditions of surrounding occupiers, with particular reference to outlook, daylight and sunlight;
 - Whether the proposed developments would provide an appropriate energy and living conditions strategy, with particular reference to renewable energy, the potential for overheating of internal spaces, and sunlight for future occupiers;
 - The effect of the proposed developments on the local housing supply, with particular reference to the provision of affordable housing and family accommodation.

¹ Core Document (CD) 13B

² CD 13A

Reasons

Character and appearance

Context and spatial relationship

9. Both appeal proposals include tall buildings. Appeal A would incorporate a building of 14 storeys, comprising the main built element within the proposal, along with a low-rise row of terraced houses. Appeal B proposes a similar number of units distributed around the site in a building of up to nine storeys. A three-storey block of 12 flats is on the site at present.
10. Together, London Plan Policies D1, D3 and D9, and Local Plan Policies SP1, SP2, SP3 and SP4 include requirements for development to optimise site capacity through a design-led approach, consider the existing surrounding context, provide high-quality design, and take matters such as good access to public transport into consideration. The appeals site is in an area characterised predominantly by low-rise development with some tall buildings. It is immediately adjacent to a Docklands Light Railway (DLR) station and consequently has an excellent Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL). It is also within areas identified for growth within the development plan, including the Olympic Legacy Opportunity Area and Elizabeth Line East Growth Corridor.
11. The Council has prepared character studies that inform both the existing and forthcoming Local Plans. Although the documents have no statutory status, they are useful in providing an analysis of the existing built form and identifying broad areas with the capacity for change. The *Newham Character Study (2017)*³ places a boundary between an industrial and Victorian to interwar typology on the site, and the updated 2024 study⁴ similarly identifies the site on the boundary of industrial, post-war inner suburb and historic inner suburb typologies. **I acknowledge the Council's concerns that the maps** shown within the studies are unclear as to the exact placement of boundaries between typology zones, stating that the DLR and Jubilee lines form a natural boundary. However I observed during my site visit that there is some **'leaching'** across the transit lines and that whilst the immediate site surrounds are low-rise residential, there are industrial development and high-rise residential uses that are further afield but visible close to the site.
12. **Following on from this, the Council's** Tall Building Annex appended to the 2024 study identifies potential locations for future tall building development. The appeals **site is outside any of these zones but is noted as having a 'non sensitive context'** to change.
13. There are tall buildings already in the area. Although the Council considers that the two nearby high-rise buildings at David Lee Point and Brassett Point are an unconvincing precedent for other high-rise development within the **area, they are nonetheless part of the established context for the area's built form.** Indeed, a walk around the streets surrounding the site reveals numerous views in which numerous other tall buildings can be observed. During my site visit I had an ever-present awareness of higher density, high-rise development amongst low-rise buildings. The often abrupt juxtapositions between tall and low-rise buildings seem to me to be part of the established character of the area.

³ CD 13C

⁴ CD 14A

14. Additionally, **site is included in the Council's Brownfield Land Register as a site** with net development potential of between 42 and 75 dwellings.⁵ No design modelling work was undertaken to determine whether this capacity could be accommodated on the site; rather, the figure was derived from the density matrix of the now superseded 2016 London Plan. Development at the upper end of this range would result in significantly higher dwelling densities than the existing development immediately surrounding the site. Nonetheless, when considered in conjunction with the policy and context matters above, these provide a useful starting point in considering whether the site would be suitable for higher-density development.

Individual scheme considerations

15. I shall separately consider the detailed design evidence in respect of each proposal, beginning with appeal A. In respect of built form, the row of terraced houses that would line the eastern boundary of the site are of least concern. The Council's **concerns** on this matter are in respect of the impact of the tall building on its surroundings, its appearance, and the layout of the site.
16. The proposed 14-storey building would be relatively slender when viewed in line with its north and south elevations, with slightly greater massing on its other sides. There would be a precipitous height difference between the tower and predominant two-storey form of neighbouring dwellings on Abbey Road and Bakers Road to the east, and those to the south of Abbey Road. As per my above considerations, the absence of a meaningful transition in heights is not wholly out of context in the area. There would be spatial separation between the tall building and these neighbours, enabling it to be appreciated as a separate element in the street scene. In views from Abbey Gardens, the orientation of the slenderer edge would avoid any unreasonable domination.
17. Brick would be the predominant external material. The use of different shades would add richness to the building that would be accentuated with the use of arches that **add interest and appropriately 'cap' the building, together with** acceptable window reveal depths. The shortage of active frontages at ground floor level facing the DLR station is regrettable, but there would be appropriate surveillance of this area from the floors above and a reasonable level of activity in this area generated by station users. The possibility of inclusion of additional detailing at ground floor level was discussed at the Inquiry and this would, in conjunction with appropriate landscaping, result in a more welcoming aspect. This could be dealt with through a planning condition. The open space within the site would be appropriately laid out to assist with legibility although the main building entrance may also require detailing to assist with legibility.
18. The Appeal B **scheme proposes a 'C'-shaped** block aligned to the Abbey Road, DLP station and Bakers Row edges of the site. The block is stepped down at the edges closest to existing dwellings, rising from three to nine storeys. This tallest element is roughly parallel with the DLR station, resulting in a rectangular-form block with an inset uppermost storey. A change in brick colour would differentiate the lower elements from the taller, with the latter predominantly proposed to use buff brickwork.

⁵ CD 22A

19. However, this brick would appear unrelenting when viewed from a distance, and when seen from angles in which the longer sides of the nine-storey element would be most apparent, the building would appear bulky and heavy in massing. This solidity would be only partly relieved by the regular balcony and window openings. The lower elements of the building are not wholly successful in melding with the taller element, with the latter dominating the smaller elements and the change in brickwork causing the former to appear **as 'add-ons' to the** nine-storey element. The stepped transition with existing dwellings would result in a clash between pitched-roof form of the houses and the more angular appearance of the flatted block.
20. At ground level, there would be active frontages around the external edges of the building. Building lobbies would be accessed from these elevations as well as the central courtyard. The service vehicle turnaround area on Bakers Row is located close to private ground-floor bedroom windows, and it is unclear whether this space would be defensible or open to the street, although this could be resolved through the provision of further details via planning condition.

Conclusions on character and appearance main issue

21. In summary, the Appeal A scheme would have some minor shortcomings, but these could be remedied at the planning conditions stage. I therefore conclude in respect of Appeal A that the proposed development would not harm character and appearance of the area, and that there would be no conflict with Local Plan Policies SP1, SP2, SP3 and SP4, and London Plan Policies D1, D3 and D9, for the reasons set out above.
22. The Appeal B scheme would be bulky and incongruous amongst its surroundings, which would also result in a dominant and overbearing appearance. I conclude in respect of Appeal B that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, and would conflict with Local Plan Policies SP1, SP2, SP3 and SP4, and London Plan Policies D1 and D3, for the reasons set out above.

Historic environment

23. The scope of heritage evidence is limited to three assets on which the Council has identified harm caused by the proposed developments. The effects on Stratford Langthorne Abbey, a Scheduled Ancient Monument are relevant in respect of both appeals. The effects on the Three Mills Conservation Area and the group of grade-II listed buildings at 116-130 Abbey Lane are relevant to Appeal A only. The parties agree that no other statutory designated or non-statutory heritage assets would be affected by the proposal, and having considered the evidence I see no reason to disagree. The parties agree on the use of Historic England good practice guidance⁶ in considering heritage impact and I have been mindful of this approach in carrying out my assessments.

Stratford Langthorne Abbey ('the Abbey') – Appeals A and B

24. Abbey Gardens, which is directly opposite the site across Bakers Row, is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) and holds the only visible remains of the Abbey, which historic maps indicate to have spread across a large area. The

⁶ CD 15G

Historic England Official List Entry⁷ for the SAM is absent in detail with regard to the historic significance of the site, but details are provided by the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service in its responses provided in the **applications' consultation stages**.⁸ **The witnesses' evidence and an additional** advice note provided by the appellant set out further sources of information.⁹ Paragraph 206 of the Framework considers SAMs to be of the highest heritage significance and advises that substantial loss of, or harm to, a SAM should be wholly exceptional.

25. Much of the information relating to the Abbey is vague but there is enough to determine a clear impression of its heritage significance. Having served as an Abbey of importance within the Cistercian Order and amongst the populace of the time, but its buildings had disappeared by Victorian times. Demolition of the buildings in Abbey Gardens during the 20th century revealed the below-ground foundation remains of a guest house which are in situ and covered by shingle. **The Abbey's** gate opened onto a road that is believed to follow the route of Bakers Row.
26. The significance **of the SAM is derived from the Abbey's historic use as both a** centre of activity and religious purpose, together with the remains of its buildings. Although the Abbey would have been a place of tranquillity and contemplation, it also served as the nexus of the surrounding community. The present gardens reflect these roles in being both a place of reflection and a hub for community activities. The appreciation of its historical significance is assisted through the presence of interpretation boards.
27. **The SAM's** setting is limited to Abbey Gardens and surrounding areas in which the gardens can be seen and is limited by the absence of any above-ground visible remains. Although there may be other remnants yet to be unearthed, I do not consider that these affect the current setting.
28. The question of whether Abbey Gardens offer tranquillity was raised at the Inquiry. Whilst the gardens are visually pleasant in their current form, the frequent noise of passing DLR and Underground trains in near proximity, together with ambient urban noise, limits the ability of a user to experience conditions that might be described as tranquil. The gardens are undoubtedly of substantial value to the community as an open space and place for community activity and gathering, but these uses are not intrinsically linked to the SAM or its significance. The Abbey may have had tranquil areas within its demesne during its existence, but there is little to suggest that the location of the Gardens is in one of these areas. Indeed, there is greater evidence to suggest that the Gardens are located on a historic thoroughfare or passing place, which suggests that this particular location would have been anything but tranquil.
29. Buildings around the setting of the SAM are generally low-rise in nature, although tower blocks are visible, and are a mix of residential and industrial uses. Spending time in the garden, I was never aware of anything other than urban surroundings and activity. Moreover, the open space designation is only a few decades old, and **this site's latest iteration is but the latest in centuries** of changing uses and urban evolution. Although the setting of the gardens will

⁷ CD 22H

⁸ CDs 16E, 16F

⁹ ID 08

undoubtedly change with the addition of higher-density modern development in clear view from within, this will not affect the ability of the community to enjoy the site in the same way as it does at present.

30. In summary therefore, I consider that in both appeal cases there would be a change in the setting of the SAM, but there would be no harm to its significance. The existing building remnants, which appear isolated but are provided with context through interpretation boards, would not be altered, and there would be no harmful effect on the ability appreciate the significance of the SAM or the link between the Gardens and their historic use.

Three Mills Conservation Area ('the CA') – Appeal A

31. The *Three Mills Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Guidelines* (2021)¹⁰ set out the extent and significance of the CA, which encompasses the industrial area west of the appeals site. It is separated from the site by the transit lines and an Underground depot and currently has no visual relationship at ground level, but the tall building proposed in Appeal A would **be visible from within the CA. Briefly, the CA's significance lies within its** historic buildings, layout, tidal river channels and other waterways, and biodiversity and green areas. The potential for sight of the Appeal A proposal means that the appeal site would be within the setting of the CA.
32. Green and vegetated areas are a clearly visible feature of the CA and these have varying degrees of openness. Surrounding buildings are generally industrial in scale and appearance but large-scale residential development is also visible from many areas within the CA. In views towards the site in which the new tall building would be glimpsed, buildings are always visible alongside the green areas of the CA. Openness would not be significantly affected. The addition this building would add to the current character in which the natural and built landscapes interact but would not result in any harm to the setting or significance of the CA, nor the ability to appreciate either.

116-130 Abbey Lane – Appeal A

33. These grade-II listed buildings form a residential terrace row within the CA, visible from along Abbey Lane in both directions, and from an elevated position at various points along the Greenway. **Historic England's** Official List Entry for the buildings refer to their external architectural form and details and their significance lies in their architecture and their historic role in **providing accommodation related to the area's industry. Similarly to the CA,** their setting would extend to the appeal site were the proposed development to be allowed, as the tall building would be visible.
34. The proposed building would be glimpsed through vegetation in eastward views along Abbey Lane. These views are currently towards greenery, but the street itself has a mixed residential and industrial urban character. The proposed development would not interfere with the ability to appreciate the architectural features of the listed buildings nor their dominance in the immediate street scene.
35. In views from the Greenway, including in the context of a journey along the elevated route, the distinctive roofline of the listed buildings can be identified. Again, this occurs within an urbanised context and in all points along the

¹⁰ CD 15F

Greenway in the vicinity of the listed buildings, they are seen against a built background – most noticeably, the tall buildings of Stratford town centre. Historically, the now-removed gas holders that were located opposite the site would have dominated. Today, looking eastwards towards the appeal site, various tall buildings are visible. The listed buildings would remain in the foreground of Greenway views and the proposed building would appear some way in the distance, as demonstrated in the townscape views provided as evidence.¹¹ **The silhouettes of the buildings' roofscape** are, and would remain, clearly identifiable. The development would therefore not detract from the features of the building, nor harm their historic or architectural significance, or the ability to appreciate same.

Conclusion on historic environment main issue

36. I conclude that the proposed developments would not harm that historic environment or any heritage assets. There would be no harm to the significance of the SAM and listed buildings, and their particular significance and special character, together with the ability to appreciate these, would be preserved. The Appeal A development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. There would be no conflict with Local Plan Policy SP5 and London Plan Policy HC1, which together require developments affecting heritage assets to be sympathetic **to the assets' significance and settings** and appreciation from their surroundings, and to conserve and enhance, amongst other considerations.

Living conditions of surrounding occupiers

Daylight and sunlight

37. Effects on nearby properties have been calculated using the tests developed by the Building Research Establishment document *Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice* (2022).¹² This document is **considered to be the 'best practice' approach** to daylight and sunlight assessment within the industry and its application to these appeals is agreed by the Council and appellant.
38. Two methods of assessment have been used for daylight testing. Broadly, the vertical sky component (VSC) test measures the amount of daylight at a room opening such as a window, and the no sky line (NSL) test uses the internal measurements of a room to assess the level of daylight penetration. For sunlight testing the annual probable sunlight hours assessment (APSH) and winter probable sunlight hours (WPSH) tests have been used. All tests have various caveats and limitations and the guidance suggests a flexible approach to assessment in urban areas. However they remain the most appropriate for use in this appeal.
39. Various surrounding properties were tested and those which pass all relevant BRE tests are not disputed by the Council and appellant. Comparisons were drawn with other developments in the area where tall buildings are located in close proximity to those of a lower height, which were provided to demonstrate acceptability in areas of a similar built form context. However, given that I must consider the impact in the specific context relating to the

¹¹ Including those in CD 22O and CD 22P.

¹² CD 22J

appeal proposals and particular location before me, I have limited my assessment to these matters.

40. For Appeal A, there is uncertainty about whether 23 Bakers Row would pass the VSC test due to the addition of a window but other rooms including those facing the proposed development would be within acceptable parameters. There would be a minor adverse NSC at the property which gives a result slightly below acceptable parameters.
41. The external amenity space of 120 Abbey Road would be subjected to a 60% reduction in sunlight on the March equinox for the Appeal A scheme. This is a major adverse impact. However, two weeks after this date the reduction would be less, and would result in a pass.
42. A greater number of properties would be detrimentally affected by the Appeal B proposal, despite its lower overall height. Similarly with Appeal A, there would be a major adverse impact from a reduction in sunlight to the external amenity area of 120 Abbey Road for the Appeal B scheme, although with a greater impact of 75% on the March equinox. For Appeal B there would also be major adverse impact from a loss to the external amenity area of 118 Abbey Road, at 60%. Sunlight levels would increase in the weeks following the equinox, resulting in a pass at three and two weeks respectively.
43. In Appeal B, there would also be a major adverse impact resulting from a reduction of sunlight to the internal area of 118 Abbey Road. There would be minor adverse impacts from daylight losses to 44, 46 and 56 Pond Road. Although the VSC levels pass in all cases and some of the affected rooms are north facing, there would be an experiential loss of sunlight and daylight for residents of these properties.

Outlook

44. Residential properties closest to the appeals site front onto Bakers Row and Abbey Road, and are orientated so that they would be perpendicular to tallest elements of either appeal scheme. There would be no views of the buildings in frontward views from these properties, but they would be visible in diagonal rearward views from some of the rooms of these homes, particularly those closest to the site on Abbey Road. In garden views, the buildings would be clearly visible over the west side boundaries of rear gardens.
45. The separation distance of the tall building elements from the closest residential properties would be around 25 metres. Although the introduction of tall building elements in westward views from these properties would alter the outlook from these properties and result in some enclosing of these views from homes closest to the appeals site, the separation distance and the limited width of the Appeal A scheme would not result in conditions that would be significantly detrimental to living conditions. Although shorter in form, the greater enclosure of westward views of the Appeal B scheme would result in harm to the living conditions to the occupiers of properties closest to the site.
46. The tall building proposed in the Appeal A scheme would rise above these properties and appear overbearing in garden views for the occupiers of Bakers Row and Abbey Road. Any similar effect deriving from the Appeal B scheme would not be as great as a result of the shorter overall built form and would not result in harm to living conditions through overbearing.

47. There would be views of the proposed buildings from other streets close to the site, notably Pond Road. The introduction of a new tall building would appear within an existing low-rise context. However, views of the tallest elements of both appeal schemes would be of the narrowest sides of these buildings and whilst they would be clearly visible, the distance between the buildings and Pond Road properties would not result in harm to living conditions.

Conclusions on living conditions main issue

48. Significant daylight and sunlight loss resulting from the appeal A proposal would be limited to two properties and although there would be a major loss of sunlight to the garden of 120 Abbey Road, effects would be limited to the colder months and there would be no significant detrimental impact for at least half of the year. The internal impact to 23 Bakers Row is unclear but this property would pass the VSC test. Nonetheless there would be harm to the living conditions of occupiers of these properties.
49. The Appeal B scheme would be a greater impact on surrounding properties. Although some of the affected properties have low baseline conditions due to their north-facing aspect and would pass the VSC test, the impact would nonetheless be noticeable across multiple properties and would result in harm to the living conditions of their occupiers.
50. The Appeal A scheme would have a moderate overbearing impact on the Abbey Road and Bakers Row properties closest to the site, and the Appeal B scheme would have some minor enclosing impact on these properties. Both schemes would result in harm to the living conditions through a harmful impact on outlook.
51. I therefore conclude that the proposed developments would have a harmful impact on the living conditions of surrounding occupiers, with particular reference to outlook, daylight and difrsunlight. The proposals would conflict with Local Plan Policies SP2, SP3 and SP8 and London Plan Policies D1, D3 and D6. Together, these require development to provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, and minimise overbearing impact, amongst other considerations.

Energy strategy and potential effects on living conditions of future occupiers

52. **The Council's concerns in this area stem from the** issue that the current design phases do not include detailed design of energy networks throughout **the buildings' structure and that compliance with the Greater London Authority's (GLA) energy hierarchy cannot be demonstrated.** In Appeal A, this **was expressed in the Council's reason for refusal as being** the consideration of maximising opportunities for renewable energy use. In both appeals, there were concerns that there would be unacceptable overheating of proposed flats, and in the Appeal B scheme, that the proposed main internal amenity space of development would be unsuitable due to overshadowing.
53. **The buildings' location adjacent to significant noise sources warrants the need** for acoustic shielding within the building fabric, resulting in the need for comfort cooling. In conjunction with design measures such as the placement of balconies for shading, wall thickness and glazing proportions, I am not concerned that the single-aspect flats would be subject to overheating.

54. The appeal plans do not explicitly provide details of plant rooms and spaces within the building fabric for the infrastructure required to meet the energy needs of the building. Although there appears to be provision for these on the plans, the details have not been shown. Comparisons were made to a scheme **in New Kent Road designed by the appeal scheme's architect** that used similar dimensions within the building fabric to house energy infrastructure requirements.¹³ Considering the spaces between floors and in cavities it would appear that there would be sufficient space for the appropriate technology to be accommodated.
55. The potential for a future connection to an energy heat network has not been set out in detail. However, given the distance of existing networks from the site, I acknowledge that connection would be unfeasible in the foreseeable future. Passive provision for a heat work connection would be included should this become feasible in the future.
56. The appellant has used assumptions in the modelling, and I heard that they are used across the industry, including in other schemes allowed in Newham, and their use is referenced in the *GLA's Energy Assessment Guidance* (2022).¹⁴ The sources of the assumptions should be made clear. However, the **appellant's evidence** draws on average and baseline figures and these appear to be reasonable in the context of the examples provided in the evidence.
57. Further concerns were raised by the Council with regard to the costs to residents of the energy measures and achieving net zero. The fluctuation in energy costs is an appropriate reason for their deliberate omission although **the appellant's evidence notes** the intention of low running costs. Measures within the planning conditions and planning agreements would ensure net zero is achieved.
58. The Appeal B scheme is designed to arrange the built form around the external edges of the site around a central courtyard but this has the effect of shading the space through much of the year. I heard that this would reduce the attractiveness of this space to residents, although smaller outdoor spaces with greater access to sunlight would be available on the upper floors of the building. The availability of the nearby outdoor space of Abbey Gardens is a further **option for residents' recreation**. Although the overshadowing of the internal space is regrettable, there would be no significant harm to the living conditions of future occupiers.
59. In conclusion, although the proposed developments as submitted are not fully clear in their compliance with energy targets, the use of planning conditions and obligations would ensure such compliance. In addition, for Appeal B there would be no significant harm arising from the amenity space design. I therefore conclude that the proposed developments would provide an appropriate energy and living conditions strategy, with particular reference to renewable energy, the potential for overheating of internal spaces, and sunlight for future occupiers.
60. The proposals would not conflict with Local Plan Policies SC1 and SC2, and London Plan Policies D1, D3, D6, SI2, SI3 and SI4. Together, these require

¹³ ID09 and PID02

¹⁴ CD 15D

major development to be net zero carbon and to take account of the impacts of climate change, amongst other considerations.

Housing

61. The affordable housing position and the proportion of family housing to be provided is similar in respect of both appeals, which are considered together.

Affordable housing

62. Local Plan Policy H2 and London Plan Policy H4 set a target of 50% of all new homes to be provided as affordable housing. Development proposing fewer than the target range are required to provide a viability appraisal, which has been undertaken for both appeals. No affordable housing would be provided for either of the schemes, and the viability appraisals indicate that neither is viable. However, only small improvements in underlying conditions are required for each proposal to become viable. This position is agreed by the parties and no detailed examination of the viability appraisals was undertaken by the Inquiry, although detail was provided in written evidence.
63. The Newham Strategic Market Housing Assessment (2022) (the SHMA)¹⁵ identifies a need of 1,383 affordable homes per year to 2038. Over the past few years there has been on average 681 affordable homes completed each year, resulting in a significant shortfall. When considered in conjunction with a **doubling of the number of households on local authorities' housing waiting lists** and worsening affordability,¹⁶ there is a high unmet need for affordable housing in the area, with no clear prospect of improvement.
64. I have been referred to a previous Appeal Decision in which a scheme proposing no affordable housing but with an opportunity for future provision was dismissed, and the proposal was considered to conflict with the development plan.¹⁷ In the proposals before me, build and borrowing costs are high although I acknowledge the changed economic conditions in the intervening years. The currently improving economic situation provides some optimism that affordable housing would be provided through the early- and late-stage reviews set out within the planning obligations.
65. The Council and appellant have agreed that the appeal developments do not conflict with affordable housing policies,¹⁸ and I do not disagree. Nonetheless, the affordable housing position has an impact on the overall planning balance of the appeal schemes, as considered below.

Provision of family housing

66. Local Plan policy H1 states that on sites capable of delivering ten or more dwellings, 39% should be three-bedroom homes for families. Where there is less than this amount, a detailed viability appraisal should be submitted.
67. Both appeal proposals would deliver a similar proportion of three-bedroom dwellings. Of the 74 units in the Appeal A scheme, 23 would have three bedrooms, representing around 31% of the total number of homes, and within the 72-unit Appeal B scheme there would be 22 three-bedroom units,

¹⁵ CD 14B

¹⁶ CD 19A

¹⁷ Appeal Ref: 3200299, date of decision: 31 January 2024

¹⁸ CD 18A

representing around 30%. In both schemes the remaining flats would have either one or two bedrooms.

68. **The Council's concerns on this matter stem from the high demand for family accommodation** within the borough, with three-bedroom homes representing the highest amount of need across both market and affordable tenures, at around 54% of total need. Previous appeal decisions have been provided by both the appellant and Council to support their positions, demonstrating varying levels of family accommodation being allowed locally. However, given the flexibility provided by Policy H1 in allowing such variations with appropriate justification, this could be expected. In this instance, the **proposals' ability to support** greater numbers of three-bedroom units was not fully tested within the viability assessments.
69. However, during the appeals process the appellant provided additional viability testing which was subsequently reviewed by the Council. This modelled alternative unit mix options for both schemes and concluded that, in addition to a net overall loss in the numbers of proposed dwellings, the **proposals' viability would be further** reduced. Although the scale of the additional loss is minimal in comparison to the overall scheme values, any additional loss to the poor viability position would negatively impact the prospects of delivery. Additionally, there remains some need for one- and two-bedroom homes within the area. Accordingly, whilst I acknowledge the high demand for family accommodation within the borough, I am satisfied that the proposals sufficiently demonstrate that the maximum possible number of three-bedroom dwellings would be provided and that the proposed unit mix is appropriate.

Conclusions on housing main issue

70. Neither proposed development would have a harmful impact on the local housing supply, with reference to the provision of affordable housing and family accommodation. There would be no significant conflict with Local Plan Policies H1, H2, SP1, SP2 and SP4, and London Plan Policies H4, H5, H6 and H10, which together require proposals to address local housing needs with appropriate provision of new homes, amongst other considerations.

Other Matters

Housing land supply

71. Other housing matters were discussed at the Inquiry which, although not directly correlating with main issues, nonetheless have a bearing on my consideration of the Appeals. Chiefly among these were demand and supply matters.
72. Paragraph 77 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to identify sites that are able to accommodate a minimum five-year supply of housing, or a four-year supply if the provisions of paragraph 226 apply. These include having a draft Local Plan in the Regulation 19 stage, where that plan identifies proposed allocations towards meeting housing need. The appellant considers that, because the proposed housing target in the draft Local Plan is significantly short of the housing need, the proposed **allocations do not "meet housing need"**. As such the provisions of paragraph 226 would not apply.

73. The London Plan sets an annual minimum housing target of 3,850 homes for Newham, to 2029. The appellant considers that this figure would increase to 4,760 when land within the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) area is subsumed into Newham in the near future.¹⁹ The draft Local Plan sets an annual housing delivery target of between 2,974 and 3,836 to 2029, which includes sites allocated for housing delivery.²⁰ The appellant has assessed this against an objectively assessed need (OAN) of 5,330 homes as set out in the evidence base for the London Plan.²¹
74. For consideration of the four-year housing land supply position, Framework paragraph 226 requires draft Local Plans to contain proposed allocations “**towards**” meeting housing need. There is no requirement in the wording for housing need to be met in full through allocations in an emerging draft plan to be considered suitable for the four-year period. Moreover, the detail of housing supply and its sources is a purpose of the forthcoming draft Local Plan Examination. Accordingly, given that the draft Local Plan is at the Regulation 19 stage for the purposes of these appeals I consider that the four-year period should apply.
75. Delivery of housing in recent years has been 84%, or 60% when assessed against the London Plan annual housing target for Newham. Assessed against the OAN, delivery is 51%.²² This is a significant shortfall and given the future delivery expectations, there is no evidence to indicate that housing supply rates meet the high demand for homes in the area.
76. I acknowledge that in aiming to achieve an appropriate housing supply, the Council is facing several barriers. **Much of the Council’s housing is expected to** be delivered on large strategic sites, which often take many years to develop and can face delivery delays for many reasons. The draft Local Plan will address some of the issues of deliverability and effects on housing supply.
77. However, at the present time, the Council considers that it can demonstrate a deliverable housing land supply of 2.14 years. **The appellant’s calculation of a** housing land supply of 1.82 years was not pursued in detail in the Inquiry, and I have insufficient evidence to accept this figure. Nonetheless, coupled with the above considerations and low affordability in the area, a four-year housing land supply of 2.14 represents a poor position.

Section 106 agreements

78. Draft s106 Agreements were provided in advance of the Inquiry, with completed agreements signed by the appellant and Council submitted shortly after closing. Given that obligations may constitute a reason for granting planning permission only if it meets the tests set out in Regulation 122 of the *Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010* and paragraph 57 of the Framework, it falls to me to reach a finding on their acceptability. The provisions considered in this section apply to both appeal schemes. Where contributions differ between appeals, this is noted.
79. Although neither development includes affordable housing at present, provisions within the agreements oblige the appellant to undertake early- and

¹⁹ CD 19G

²⁰ CD 14H

²¹ CD 22X

²² CD 18A

late-stage reviews to secure the onsite delivery of affordable housing if viability permits. Affordable housing would be provided with a 60/40 split between social rented and London Shared Ownership tenures. Any affordable housing would be converted from open-market housing on site in the first instance, although clauses allow for in-lieu contributions for off-site provision if the Council chooses to accept this or if the affordable housing cannot be provided on the site. Given the market conditions set out above, these provisions are necessary and comply with Local Plan Policies H1 and H2, and London Plan Policies H4, H5, H6 and H7.

80. Travel Plans for both developments would alert residents to their travel mode choices and provide monitoring, with separate contributions of £5,265 for both implementation and **monitoring. Three years' membership of a car club** would be provided for each new resident of the developments, together with £50 driving credit, to help support households in choosing to make less frequent trips by car. These provisions satisfy Local Plan Policies SP8 and INF2 and London Plan Policies T4 and T6.
81. A £2000 payment would be provided for the costs and monitoring of a controlled parking zone around the appeal site, in which future occupiers would be unable to obtain parking permits, except for disabled users. This is necessary to mitigate the effects of potential parking demand and to preserve highway safety and is a secure method of achieving car-free development that complies with Local Plan Policy INF2 and London Plan Policy T6.
82. The document requires the parties to enter into an agreement for works to secure alterations and improvements to the highway, including the provision of three on-street Blue Badge parking bays with electric charging points, rehabilitation of pedestrian routes along Bakers Row and Abbey Road, and improved drainage. A new heritage interpretation board would also be provided along the Abbey Gardens boundary. The works would be fair and reasonable in scale and comply with London Plan Policies T2, T4 and T5.
83. An employment skills and training contribution of £94,890 would ensure a commitment that at least 35% of construction-phase jobs would be reserved for borough residents. Other measures would include the creation of trades apprenticeships and internships and would provide compliance with Local Plan Policies J1 and J3 and London Plan Policy E11.
84. Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures for the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation would be provided and are considered in detail in the relevant section below.
85. A contribution of £15,000, payable in stages, would secure the services of a gardener to maintain Abbey Gardens for three years. This would be necessary due to the increased maintenance burden resulting from additional users living on the appeal site. The contribution complies with Local Plan Policies S1 and INF9.
86. An education contribution of £50,183.46 would support the provision of secondary education facilities in the borough. Education planning for secondary school places is undertaken at a borough-wide level in Newham and the Council seeks contributions from all new housing development irrespective of the location in which new school places are forecast. Students can travel outside of their home areas to access their schools and as such this

is appropriate. The contribution would enable compliance with Local Plan Policies INF8 and INF9 and London Plan Policy S3.

87. A carbon offset contribution of £55,027 for Appeal A and £47,880 for Appeal B would make the development the equivalent of zero carbon, with the contribution used to reduce carbon emissions across the borough. The amounts and justification comply with Local Plan Policies SC1 and SC2 and London Plan Policies SI 2 and SI 3.
88. A monitoring fee of £15,000 would cover costs associated with ensuring compliance with either s106 agreement. This is necessary to ensure that the relevant agreement is executed in accordance with its provisions and provides compliance with Local Plan Policy INF9 and London Plan Policy DF1.
89. The various sums within the agreements are necessary and justified and I am satisfied that the Council could rely on the documents to secure the contributions. Moreover, I am content that the obligations meet the requirements of the statutory and acceptability tests.

Habitat Regulation Assessment: Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation

90. The appeals site is within the 6.2 kilometre zone of influence (ZOI) of the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC). *The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017* (as amended) (the Habitats Regulations) requires the decision maker to undertake an Appropriate Assessment (AA) where there are likely significant effects caused by proposals, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. This responsibility falls to me as the competent authority in the context of these appeals.
91. This SAC is an important recreational and environmental resource which could be visited by future occupiers of the appeal proposals. In this regard the proposals, when considered cumulatively with other development in the ZOI, could potentially affect qualifying features of the SAC, with particular regard to its unique flora and fauna including protected species, through increased disturbance as a result of recreational activity.
92. The Council is a signatory to the Epping Forest SAC Governance Agreement, which requires development within the ZOI to contribute towards the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures (SAMM) for the SAC. To this end the Council has adopted a SAMM tariff payable for new residential development within the ZOI, secured through planning agreements.
93. The section 106 agreements include obligations for a SAMM contribution of £3,719.24 for Appeal A and £3,618.72 for Appeal B. These amounts comply **with the Council's SAMM tariff**. Natural England has confirmed that it does not object to the proposals, subject to the payment of the appropriate tariff and completion of a Habitats Regulations Assessment.
94. I am satisfied that the section 106 agreements provide a sufficient mechanism to enable the delivery of proportionate and relevant mitigation pursuant to the **Council's strategy for development which could affect this SAC**. In making this decision I have had regard to the specific qualifying features of the SAC and the ways in which its conservation objectives could be affected by the proposals. I find within my AA that, subject to the provision of the appropriate mitigation, the proposals would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of

the SAC. They would accord with provisions of Habitats Regulations insofar as they seek to secure the long-term protection of SACs and mitigate any adverse effects on their integrity.

Other submissions by interested parties

95. Local residents objected to the proposals. In addition to those already considered as main issues, matters of objection included a lack of appropriate access arrangements, pressure on local infrastructure including local medical services, concerns over potential disruption to the DLR and Jubilee Lines and the potential for structural damage to neighbouring properties. Appropriate planning conditions would address most of these concerns and mitigate harmful impact, and the provision of the local Community Infrastructure Levy would contribute towards the improvement of local infrastructure.

Planning Balance

96. The Council is not able to demonstrate a viable housing land supply. Given that I have found that there would be no harm to statutory heritage assets, **the 'tilted balance' set out in the Framework is engaged (paragraph 11 including footnote 8)**. This requires that where the policies which are most important to determining the application are out of date, that the decision maker grant permission unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. I consider the policies which are the most important to determining the application are those set out in the Council reasons for refusal and in my conclusions on each of the main issues.
97. Both appeal schemes would provide benefits. That the development would make a significant contribution to the number of homes in the borough, which is not providing new homes in numbers to meet an identified need, and that these new homes would contribute towards meeting that need, is apportioned significant weight. The provision of affordable housing in the future would also meet an identified need, but although there is a strong likelihood of some affordable housing being provided due to the marginal viability of the schemes and the changing economic conditions, I cannot be sure as to the degree to which this would satisfy the need. Accordingly, this consideration is afforded only minor beneficial weight.
98. Other benefits include the obligations of the planning agreements and conditions that go beyond mitigating the expected demand from future occupiers. These are contributions for temporary construction jobs and economic impacts, and proposed highway improvements, which are of moderate beneficial weight. Minor beneficial weight derives from the provision of biodiversity net gain measures in respect of Appeal B only.
99. Harm to character and appearance in respect of Appeal B carries significant weight. The amount of harm to the living conditions of occupiers on sites surrounding the appeals site differs between proposals. Harm in respect of the Appeal A scheme is apportioned moderate weight, while the greater impacts of the Appeal B scheme are attributed significant harmful weight.
100. No harm has been identified in respect of energy in both appeal schemes, and for the impact on character and appearance in respect of Appeal A. For these matters, there would be no additional benefits other those required to deliver

the scheme and mitigate its impacts, and these considerations are therefore neutral in the overall balance. Likewise, provisions within the planning agreements for travel plans, CPZ monitoring, the car club, the SAC SAMM contributions, provision of a gardener for Abbey Gardens, the education contribution and the carbon offsetting contribution would mitigate the **schemes' impacts and have neutral weight.**

101. In separately weighing the planning balance for each appeal, I find in respect of Appeal A that the adverse impacts of granting permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. However, in respect of Appeal B, I find that adverse impacts of granting permission would result in harmful conditions and that these would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

Conditions

102. I have assessed the list of conditions proposed by the parties against the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)²³. These were discussed at the Inquiry and subsequently refined, and conditions for Appeal A are included at Annex A. In accordance with section 100ZA(5) of the Act, the appellant has agreed to those conditions which would be pre-commencement conditions.
103. Conditions 1 and 2 are applied for the absence of doubt, and condition 3 is to ensure that there is no significant harm to the living conditions of surrounding occupiers. Condition 4 is to ensure that the development does not harmfully impact on transport infrastructure and condition 5 is applied in the interests of human health and to ensure that any contamination is appropriately mitigated. Condition 6 is included to ensure that there is no significant harm to the living conditions of future occupiers of the development, and conditions 7 and 8 are to protect heritage assets.
104. Condition 9 is applied to safeguard against surface water flood risk, protect the environment and respond to climate change, and condition 10 is applied in the interests of creating safer communities. Condition 11 is applied to protect underground infrastructure, and condition 12 is to meet the needs of future occupiers in respect of internet connectivity. Conditions 13, 14, 15 and 27 are to preserve the character and appearance of the area and ensure a high quality of design is achieved. Condition 16 is to meet the needs of households with mobility issues.
105. Condition 17 is applied to ensure that any necessary measures to mitigate overheating risk are implemented prior to construction. Conditions 18 and 20 is to ensure that adequate servicing can be provided to the site. Conditions 19, 24 and 26 are to ensure that the development makes the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions. Conditions 21 and 22 are to promote and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport, condition 23 to support the development of green roofs and the greening of development sites, condition 25 to ensure that the building and its materials can be adapted or reused over its lifetime, and conditions 28 and 29 are applied to ensure that access around the site is properly maintained during construction.

²³ PPG reference ID: 21a-003-20190723; revision date: 23 07 2019.

Conclusions

106. In respect of Appeal A, the adverse impacts of granting permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. The proposal complies with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations to indicate that I should determine the appeal otherwise than in accordance with the plan. For these reasons, the appeal is allowed.
107. For Appeal B, I find that the harm from the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal, such that the proposal does not represent sustainable development. As well as the policy conflicts that I have identified, the proposal does not comply with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations to indicate that I should determine the appeal otherwise than in accordance with the plan. For these reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR

ANNEX A: CONDITIONS FOR APPEAL A
(Appeal ref: APP/G5750/W/24/3343569)

1. The development to which this permission relates must be commenced no later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby approved shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:

Drawing Title	Drawing Number	Rev.	Date
Site Location Plan	19025 E0-001	P2	25.06.2024
Proposed Site Plan	19025 P0-100	PI	04.07.2024
Proposed Roof Plan	19025 P0-101	PG	01.07.2024
Proposed Ground Floor Plan	19025 P1-100	PI	04.07.2024
Proposed 1st Floor Plan	19025 P1-101	PG	01.07.2024
Proposed 2nd-3rd Floor Plan	19025 P1-102	PG	01.07.2024
Proposed 4th Floor Plan	19025 P1-104	PG	01.07.2024
Proposed 5th Floor Plan	19025 P1-105	PG	01.07.2024
Proposed 6th-8th Floor Plan	19025 P1-106	PG	01.07.2024
Proposed 9th-10th Floor Plan	19025 P1-109	PG	01.07.2024
Proposed 11th-13th Floor Plan	19025 P1-111	PG	01.07.2024
Proposed Roof Plan	19025 P1-114	PG	01.07.2024
Section A-A	19025 P2-100	PC	28.03.2024
Section C-C	19025 P2-102	PC	28.03.2024
Station Elevation	19025 P3-001	PG	01.07.2024
Bakers Row Elevation	19025 P3-002	PC	28.03.2024
Abbey Road Elevation	19025 P3-003	PC	28.03.2024
Garden Elevation	19025 P3-004	PC	28.03.2024
Courtyard Elevation 1	19025 P3-005	PC	28.03.2024
Courtyard Elevation 2	19025 P3-006	PC	28.03.2024

3. No works shall commence until a Demolition and Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Demolition and Construction Management Plan shall include:
 - a) existing conditions survey of adjacent public highways;
 - b) details of demolition and construction trips and mitigation measures;
 - c) site access and exit arrangements including wheel washing facilities;
 - d) vehicular routes and booking systems;
 - e) proposed temporary access and parking suspensions;
 - f) site compound arrangements;
 - g) methods for protection of adjacent highway infrastructure;
 - h) air pollution control measures;
 - i) assessment of matters likely to cause nuisance to adjoining occupiers accompanied by mitigation measures;
 - j) community liaison about potential disturbances/disruptions

Works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Demolition and Construction Management Plan. Hours of work on the site shall be 08:00-18:00

Monday to Friday; 08:00-13:00 Saturday and at no time on Sundays or Public Holidays.

4. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until detailed design and method statements, in consultation with London Underground and Docklands Light Railway, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - a) detailed design and Risk Assessment Method Statements
 - b) base-line radio impact survey
 - c) tower crane base design, certification and Risk Assessment and Method Statement
 - d) details of accommodation of the existing DLR structures
 - e) details of access to elevations of the building
 - f) details of potential security risk to railway, property or structures
 - g) details of mitigation measures of noise and vibration arising from the adjoining railway operations within the structures
 - h) Ground Movement & Impact Assessment
 - i) Movement Monitoring Action Plan

The development shall thereafter be carried out in all respects in accordance with the approved design and method statements, and all structures and works comprised within the development hereby permitted which are required by the approved design statements in order to procure the matters mentioned in paragraphs of this condition shall be completed, in their entirety, before any part of the building hereby permitted is occupied.

5. The application was accompanied by a Phase I Contamination Assessment; Prepared by Land Science; Dated 30 November 2022; Reference: LS6624, which identified the need to undertake basic ground investigation works.
 - a) No development (except for demolition works) shall commence until an investigation into ground conditions is undertaken.
 - b) The report of the investigation and proposals for any remediation required shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to construction works.
 - c) All works shall be carried out/implemented in accordance with the details approved.
 - d) Prior to occupation, a validation report shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing, demonstrating that remediation works were undertaken and completed in accordance with the approved remediation strategy.
6. The application was accompanied by a noise report Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment - Abbey House, Bakers Row, Stratford Report Reference: 10031/JL 31 Date: 27 March 2023 which identified the development was impacted by external noise.

- a) Before works start on site (except for demolition works), a report shall be submitted to and approved by the Council showing specific noise mitigation measures as set out in the Noise and Vibration Assessment. In particular, regard shall be had to the requirements set out in paragraphs 7.3.2 to 7.4.2.
 - b) Prior to occupation, the applicant shall conform in writing that the agreed noise mitigation measures have been installed.
7. No demolition below slab level or development shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1 then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

- a) The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- b) Where appropriate, details of a programme for delivering related positive public benefits
- c) The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the stage 2 WSI.

Written schemes of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with **Historic England's Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London**. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

8. No development save for demolition to slab level and archaeological investigations shall take place within the proposed development site until the applicant has produced a detailed scheme showing the complete scope and arrangement of the foundation design and other below ground works, which have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

9. Surface Water Drainage Detail:

- a) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced (except **for demolition works**) until a fully detailed (i.e. 'As built') surface water management scheme for the development, consistent with the approved '**Sustainable Drainage Assessment**' document (Ref. 78225.01R4 - dated 30/8/2023) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- b) Post development peak runoff shall be restricted to a maximum of 2 l/s, for all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year with an additional 40% allowance for future climate change.
- c) Detail of drainage scheme ownership, management and maintenance arrangements shall be submitted to Planning Authority for approval before site occupation.
- d) A verification report demonstrating what works were undertaken and that the drainage scheme was completed in accordance with the approved surface water management scheme shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before site occupation.
- e) The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved detail.

10. Community Safety – Secured by Design:

- a) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted (except for demolition works), details of the measures to be incorporated into the development demonstrating how the principles and practices of the '**Secured by Design**' scheme and local crime prevention measures recommendations have been included shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Metropolitan Police Designing Out Crime Officers, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.
- b) Prior to the first occupation or use, a SBD certificate or letter from Metropolitan Police Designing Out Crime Office showing full compliance will be required.

11. No piling shall take place until a Piling Method Statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved Piling Method Statement.

12. Prior to commencement of the development (except for demolition works), the applicant shall submit detailed plans demonstrating the provision of sufficient ducting space for full fibre connectivity infrastructure within the development in line with London Plan Policy SI 6.
13. Prior to the installation of the façades, full scale mock up façade panels for each building type (including the 14-storey tower, the 4-storey block, and the mews houses) to be constructed for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The number and scope of the mock up façade panels are to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to their construction. Each full scale mock up façade panel shall comprise a full window bay of window frame, cill, reveal and header details, and surrounding brickwork. The development shall only be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
14. No above ground works shall be commenced until details showing the proposed hard and soft landscaping are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following:
 - a) Full details of plants and trees (common and Latin names, size and pot height; density or number, tree girth and method of growth i.e. container or open ground) and plans for replacement of any trees removed as a result of the construction works;
 - b) Full details of all boundary treatments proposed around the site
 - c) Maintenance schedule
 - d) Full details of materials to be used on paved areas and other hard surfaces
 - e) Suppliers or manufacturers
 - f) Guide to construction
 - g) Paving/fencing/colours/finishes
 - h) Location of lighting and details of lighting levels (wattage)
 - i) Any play equipment (specs, manufacturer, British or European Standard)
 - j) Any features or artworks
 - k) All furniture
 - l) Measure to enhance biodiversity (including bird and bat boxes)
 - m) Full details of the green roof including specification and management and maintenance plans.

- n) Full details of the off-site public realm improvements at the entrance to the Abbey Road DLR station.

Any plants or trees that die or are removed, damaged or diseased within a period of FIVE years from the substantial completion of the development shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species.

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the approved hard and soft landscaping scheme is constructed and installed in accordance with the details to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and shall be permanently maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

15. Above ground works to the development hereby approved shall not commence unless and until detailed, annotated drawings (plan/section/elevation, 1:20 at appropriate paper size) of the following have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

- a) Principal features on the facades (including the 14-storey tower, the 5-storey block, and the mews houses) e.g. bay studies
- b) Ground floor frontages including entrances, glazing and signage zones, infill panels on plant rooms/bike stores etc.
- c) Parapets, roof edges, copings, rooftop plant screening, lift over runs etc.
- d) Head, jamb and sill details, including profiles, for typical openings and all ground floor entrances and doors to balconies / terraces
- e) Details of key architectural metalwork / screens / gates
- f) Details of boundary treatments
- g) Details of balconies and terraces including floor finishes
- h) Details of soffits and canopies
- i) Details of green / brown roof system

16. Accessible and Adaptable Units:

- a) No construction works above ground level hereby permitted shall commence on site unless and until 1:50 plans showing the detailed layout of residential units being provided as wheelchair accessible/adaptable (for market and affordable housing tenures respectively), and floor plans showing the locations of these units, have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and the development shall be built in accordance with the approved details.

- b) No above ground works shall commence on site until a detailed Accessibility and Inclusive Design Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, outlining the measures ensuring an accessible and inclusive environment, both internally and externally, including but not limited to, level entrances to all the proposed buildings, pedestrian routes, lift specifications, accessible toilet provision. The approved details shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Statement.

90% of the residential units hereby approved shall conform to the requirement of Category M4(2) (Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010 (HM Government 2015) and retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

No less than 10% of the residential units hereby permitted shall conform to the **requirements of Category M4 (3) [“Wheelchair User Dwellings”] of Schedule 1** to the Building Regulations 2010 (HM Government 2015) and retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

17. Overheating

- a) Prior to the commencement of above ground works, details of the provision of comfort cooling measures to mitigate overheating risks, consistent with the approved Thermal Comfort Analysis; Prepared by Ensphere; Dated April 2024; Document Reference: 22-E091-019, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- b) A verification report demonstrating what works were undertaken and that the measures to mitigate overheating risks were completed and how energy demand was reduced at each stage of the cooling hierarchy in accordance with the approved scheme shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before site occupation.
- c) Measures to mitigate overheating risks shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

- 18. No above ground works shall commence unless and until details of the storage, management and collection of refuse and recyclables, including bulky waste storage, have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

The waste storage and collection area(s) shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development. It shall be retained in accordance with the approved plans and documents. The waste and recyclables from the development shall be managed and made available for collection in accordance with the approved details in perpetuity.

19. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of final energy performance, consistent with the approved Energy Statement; Prepared by Ensphere; Dated April 2024; Document Reference: 22-E091-018, shall be submitted to the Council, demonstrating that the development meets the carbon reductions set out in Policy SI 2 of the London Plan.
 20. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, details relating to a delivery and service plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Council, showing clear vehicle sweep paths and based on up to date information in relation to overall vehicle movements associated with all sites require servicing from Bakers Road, and such delivery and servicing plan to be implemented thereafter.
 21. The development shall not be occupied until a minimum of 128 cycle parking spaces have been installed in accordance with the approved details drawing 19025 PO-100 Rev PI for residents. Details of the provision of an additional 3 cycle parking spaces provided in the public realm for visitor parking to be submitted to LBN. Such spaces shall be retained thereafter for this use only.
 22. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall include:
 - a) targets for reducing the number of commuting trips that are projected to be made to and from the Development by private car and in particular the number of single occupancy trips
 - b) means of publicising public transport and sustainable transport alternatives
 - c) monitoring of traffic and data before and after the implementation of the development
 - d) a programme for implementation of the approved Travel Plan
 - e) **the contact details of the 'Sustainable Travel Manager' and 'Travel Plan Coordinator'**
 - f) a methodology and a programme for monitoring, reviewing, maintaining, and developing the Travel Plan in relation to the targets set out including **the Appointment of any 'Travel Plan Coordinator'**
- The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Travel Plan.
23. Within 3 months of implementation of the approved soft landscaping schemes pursuant to Condition 14, an Urban Greening Factor Statement shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, confirming the final UGF that the development hereby permitted has achieved. The development shall achieve a final UGF of 0.4.

24. Prior to first occupation of the development the post-construction tab of the **GLA's Whole Life**-Cycle Carbon Assessment template should be completed in line with the **GLA's Whole Life**-Cycle Carbon Assessment Guidance.

The post-construction assessment should be submitted to the GLA at: ZeroCarbonPlanning@london.gov.uk, along with any supporting evidence as per the guidance. Confirmation of submission to the GLA shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority, prior to occupation of the development.

25. Prior to the occupation of the development, a post-construction monitoring **report should be completed in line with the GLA's Circular Economy Statement** Guidance. The post-construction monitoring report shall be submitted to the GLA, currently via email at: circulareconomystatements@london.gov.uk, along with any supporting evidence as per the guidance. Confirmation of submission to the GLA shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority, prior to occupation of the development.
26. Prior to the occupation of any Development Building, details of the location, layout and specification of the Photovoltaic Panels to be installed and connected on the roofs of the buildings shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the panels shall be installed prior to the occupation of the relevant block and retained thereafter.
27. No items other than those shown on the approved drawings (including, but not limited to, rainwater pipes, flues, grills, vents, CCTV units, lighting, alarms, or cable run boxes) to be installed on any public facing elevation without written consent from the LPA.
28. Access to all public footways surrounding the site must be maintained during the demolition and construction phases of development.
29. Any damage to the existing public highway (including footways within the locality) during demolition and construction works shall be renewed and repaired to the appropriate Local Highway Authority standards.

ANNEX B: APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Thomas Hill, **King's Counsel**

Instructed by Luke Raistrick

He called

David Taylor MRTPI
Neil Cawood MAPM MRICS
Pete Jeavons
Felix von Bechtolsheim ARB

Partner, Montagu Evans LLP
Director, CPMC Surveying
Managing Director, Ensphere
Associate Director, ColladoCollins
Architects

Luke Raistrick MRTPI

Founder / Managing Director, Centro
Planning Consultancy

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Jonathan Welch, Counsel

Instructed by Ola Olukushi

He called

Sarah Drysdale IHBC
Cosmin Ticleanu MSL
Alex Maguire CEng MCIBSE
Toby Johnson RIBA
Chloe To MRTPI
Olusola Olukoshi
Ada Egot

Associate, Arup
Principal Consultant, Lighting, BRE
FLOH Consulting Ltd
Managing Director, Haworth Tompkins
Senior Planner, Newham
Senior Planning Solicitor, Newham
Education Place Planning Commissioner,
Newham

INTERESTED PERSONS

T Lang
L Holland

Local resident
Local resident

ANNEX C: DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE INQUIRY

- ID01 **Appellant's opening statement**
- ID02 **Council's opening statement**
- ID03 Appearances for the appellant
- ID04 Final Drawing references
- ID05 Appeal A draft s106 agreement

- ID06 Appeal B draft s106 agreement
- ID07 Floor to glazing ratios
- ID08 **Appellant's heritage representations advice note**
- ID09 Typical section detail
- ID10 **Appellant's** letter on 240-minute heat map and sunlight bands

- ID11 Education information pertaining to s106 agreements
- ID12 *Education Places for All 2023-2027*, Newham Council
- ID13 Appeal A final draft conditions
- ID14 Appeal B final draft conditions
- ID15 Transport for London note on use of public transport accessibility levels

- ID16 26 Park Road details
- ID17 **Council's closing submissions**
- ID18 **Appellant's closing submissions**

ANNEX D: DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE INQUIRY

- PID01 s106 education contributions – Newham Council response
- PID02 **Council's** preliminary review of New Kent Road scheme
- PID03 **Appellant's response on s106 education contributions**
- PID04 Appellant's response on energy and thermal comfort**
- PID05 Appeal A section 106 agreement
- PID06 Appeal B section 106 agreement

ANNEX E: CORE DOCUMENTS

Ref	Title
Appeal A – Application Submission	
1A	Planning Statement – May 2023
1B	Design and Access Statement – May 2023
1C	Heritage and Townscape Visual Impact Assessment – May 2023
1D	Daylight and Sunlight Report – Neighbours – May 2023
1E	Financial Viability Assessment – May 2023
1F	Energy Statement – April 2023
1G	Overheating Assessment – May 2023
1H	Transport Assessment – April 2023
1I	Architectural Drawings – May 2023
1J	Landscape Statement – March 2023
1K	Fire Statement – April 2023
1L	Wind Assessment – April 2023
1M	Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment – March 2023
1N	Proposed Accommodation Light Assessment – May 2023
Appeal A – Determination Period	
2A	BNP Paribas Financial Viability Assessment Review – July 2023
2B	Energy Statement – August 2023
2C	GLA Financial Viability Assessment Review – September 2023
2D	Request for Extension of Time – 10 th October 2023
2E	Daylight and Sunlight Response – 16 th October 2023
2F	Financial Viability Assessment Response – 17 th October 2023
2G	Heritage and Townscape Advice Note – 17 th October 2023
2H	Sustainability and Energy Response – 17 th October 2023
2I	Waste Strategy Technical Note – 17 th October 2023
Appeal A – Decision Making	
3A	GLA Stage 1 Report – 4 th September 2023
3B	Committee Report – 6 th October 2023
3C	Committee Report Update – 17 th October 2023
3D	GLA Stage 2 Report – 30 th October 2023
3E	Decision Notice – 1 st November 2023
3F	Committee Minutes – 21 st November 2023
Appeal B – Application Submission	
4A	Planning Statement – February 2024
4B	Design and Access Statement – February 2024
4C	Heritage and Townscape Visual Impact Assessment – February 2024
4D	Daylight and Sunlight Report – Neighbours – February 2024
4E	Daylight and Sunlight Report – Self Test – February 2024
4F	Financial Viability Assessment – February 2024
4G	Energy Statement – February 2024
4H	Overheating Assessment – February 2024
4I	Transport Assessment – February 2024
4J	Architectural Drawings – February 2024
4K	Landscape Statement – February 2024
4L	Fire Statement – February 2024
4M	Wind Assessment – February 2024
4N	Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment – February 2024
Appeal B – Determination Period	
5A	BNP Paribas Financial Viability Assessment Review – April 2024
5B	Proposed Ground Floor Plan – May 2024

Appeal A – **Appellant’s Statement of Case**

- 6A Appeal Form
- 6B Appeal Statement of Case – April 2024
- 6C Appendix 1 – Design, Heritage and Townscape Statement
- 6D Appendix 23 – Daylight and Sunlight Statement
- 6E Appendix 26 – Viability Statement
- 6F Appendix 37 – Waste Statement
- 6G Appendix 41 – Overheating Statement

Appeal A – Additional Submissions

- 7A Area Schedule – April 2024
- 7B Energy Statement – April 2024
- 7C Daylight and Sunlight Report – April 2024
- 7D Architectural Drawings – April 2024
- 7E Transport Assessment – April 2024
- 7F Architectural Drawings – July 2024
- 7G Overheating Assessment – April 2024
- 7H Final Architectural Drawings – July 2024

Appeal B – Decision Making

- 8A Committee Report – 30th April 2024
- 8B Decision Notice – 15th May 2024
- 8C Committee Minutes – 18th June 2024

Appeal B – **Appellant’s Statement of Case**

- 9A Appeal Form
- 9B Appeal Statement of Case – June 2024
- 9C Appendix 1 – Design, Heritage and Townscape Statement
- 9D Appendix 22 – Viability Statement
- 9E Appendix 30 – Daylight and Sunlight Statement
- 9F Appendix 33 – Overheating Statement
- 9G Appendix 35 – Waste Statement

Appeal B – Additional Submission

- 10A Architectural Drawings – July 2024
- 10B Final Architectural Drawings – July 2024

Appeal A – LB Newham Statement of Case

- 11A LB Newham Statement of Case – 20th June 2024
- 11B Appendix 1 – Pre-app Letter – 4th September 2020

Appeal B – LB Newham Statement of Case

- 12A LB Newham Statement of Case – 19th July 2024

Development Plan and Evidence Based Documents

- 13A London Plan – March 2021
- 13B LB Newham Local Plan 2018
- 13C Newham Character Study 2017
- 13D Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment September 2016

Emerging Development Plan and Evidence Base Documents

- 14A Newham Characterisation Study 2024
- 14B Newham Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2022
- 14C Site Allocation and Housing Trajectory Methodology Note – July 2024
- 14D The Regulation 18 Consultation Report
- 14E GLA Representations on Regulation 18 Local Plan
- 14F Appellant Representations on Regulation 18 Local Plan

- 14G Appellant Representations on Regulation 19 Local Plan
- 14H Draft Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19) - June 2024
- 14I Small Sites Intensification Guidance (2024)

Planning Guidance Documents

- 15A Small Site Design Codes London Plan Guidance June 2023
- 15B London Housing Design Standards London Plan Guidance June 2023
- 15C Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance July 2012
- 15D Energy Assessment Guidance June 2022
- 15E Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Assessments London Plan Guidance March 2022
- 15F Three Mills Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Guidelines
- 15G The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (GPA 3)
- 15H National Design Guide – October 2019

Consultation Response at Application Stage

- 16A Historic England Comments – 2018
- 16B Historic England Comments – 2023
- 16C Historic England Comments – 2024
- 16D Transport for London Property Services Comments – April 2024
- 16E Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) Letter – July 2023
- 16F Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) Letter – April 2024

Relevant Judgments and Appeal Decisions

- 17A R (on the application of) Forge Field Society & Others v Sevenoaks DC & Interested Parties [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin)
- 17B Forest of Dean DC v SSCLG & Anor [2016] EWHC 421
- 17C North Wiltshire District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment and Clover (1993) 65 P&CR 137
- 17D Gladman v SSHCLG & Corby BC & Uttlesford DC [2021] EWCA Civ 104
- 17E City of Edinburgh Council v. Secretary of State for Scotland and Others [1997] UKHL 38; [1998] 1 All ER 174; [1997] 1 WLR 1447
- 17F R (LB Hillingdon) v Mayor of London [2021] EWHC 3387
- 17G Pagham Parish Council v Arun District Council [2019] EWHC 1721
- 17H Bramshill v SSHCLG [2021] EWCA Civ 320
- 17I Palmer v Herefordshire Council & ANOR [2016] EWCA Civ 1061
- 17J Pugh v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government & Ors [2015] EWHC 3 (Admin)
- 17K Bedford v SoS for DCLG / Nuon UK Ltd [2012] EWHC 4344
- 17L Barnwell v East Northamptonshire District Council [2014] EWCA Civ 137
- 17M Edith Summerskill House Decision: 20/01283/FUL (LPA ref.) & APP/H.5390/V/21/3277137 (PINS ref.)
- 17N Monkhill Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities And Local Government [2019] EWHC 1993 (Admin) (24 July 2019)
- 17O Monkhill Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government & Anor (Rev 1) [2021] EWCA Civ 74 (28 January 2021)

Appeal Documents

- 18A Statement of Common Ground – Planning
- 18B Statement of Common Ground – Design
- 18C Statement of Common Ground – Heritage
- 18D Statement of Common Ground – Daylight and Sunlight
- 18E Statement of Common Ground – Overheating
- 18F Statement of Common Ground – Viability
- 18G Draft Conditions – Appeal A
- 18H Draft Conditions – Appeal B

Proofs of Evidence

- 19A LPA Proof of Evidence – Planning
- 19B LPA Proof of Evidence – Design
- 19C LPA Proof of Evidence – Heritage
- 19D LPA Proof of Evidence – Daylight and Sunlight
- 19E LPA Proof of Evidence – Overheating
- 19F LPA Proof of Evidence – Viability
- 19G Appellant Proof of Evidence – Planning
- 19H Appellant Proof of Evidence – Design
- 19I Appellant Proof of Evidence – Heritage
- 19J Appellant Proof of Evidence – Daylight and Sunlight
- 19K Appellant Proof of Evidence – Overheating
- 19L LPA Rebuttal Proof of Evidence – Planning
- 19M LPA Rebuttal Proof of Evidence – Daylight and Sunlight
- 19N LPA Rebuttal Proof of Evidence – Overheating
- 19O Appellant Rebuttal Proof of Evidence – Planning
- 19P Appellant Rebuttal Proof of Evidence – Design
- 19Q Appellant Rebuttal Proof of Evidence – Heritage
- 19R Appellant Rebuttal Proof of Evidence – Daylight and Sunlight
- 19S Appellant Rebuttal Proof of Evidence – Overheating
- 19T Appellant Rebuttal Proof of Evidence – Viability

Pre-inquiry Documents

- 20A **Inspector’s Pre-conference Note**
- 20B **Inspector’s Case Management Conference Agenda**
- 20C **Inspector’s Case Management Conference Post-meeting Note**
- 20D **Inspector’s Note on Amended Plans**

Pre-Application Discussions

- 21A Design Review Panel Report
- 21B **Design Review Panel Chair’s Workshop Report**
- 21C Design Review Panel Design Document
- 21D Design Review Panel

Other Relevant Documents

- 22A LB Newham Brownfield Land Register
- 22B Building Regulations Approved Document L Volume 1: Dwellings (2021 Edition)
- 22C Building Regulations Approved Document L Volume 2: Buildings other than dwellings (2021 Edition)
- 22D Heat Networks: Code of Practice for the UK (2020)
- 22E CIBSE Design Guide: Heat Networks (2021)
- 22F **The Government’s Standard Assessment Procedure for Energy Rating of Dwellings, Version 10.2 (February 2022)**
- 22G Building Regulations Approved Document O Overheating (2021 Edition)
- 22H Official List Entry - Stratford Langthorne Abbey Scheduled Ancient Monument
- 22I Official List Entry - 116-130, Abbey Lane E15
- 22J **BRE Report ‘Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice’**
- 22K **BS EN17037:2018 ‘Daylight in buildings’.**
- 22L Labour Manifesto 2024
- 22M Panel Report into the Examination of the London Plan – October 2019
- 22N Letter from Secretary of State to London Mayor – March 2020
- 22O Accurate Visual Representations – Appeal A
- 22P Accurate Visual Representations – Appeal B
- 22Q 2018 Refused Application – Committee Report

22R	2018 Refused Application – GLA Stage 1 Report
22S	2018 Refused Application – GLA Stage 2 Report
22T	21/01628/LA3 – Committee Report
22U	21/01628/LA3 – Daylight and Sunlight Report – Neighbours
22V	21/01628/LA3 – Daylight and Sunlight Report – Self-test
22W	GLA Viability Response (Appeal A)
22X	Extract from draft London Plan 2017 – Housing Targets
22Y	Draft NPPF – July 2024
22Z	Written Ministerial Statement – July 2024
22AA	Bromley by Bow Gasworks – Committee Report
22BB	Crown Wharf – Committee Report
22CC	English Heritage Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance – 2008
22DD	17/01847/OUT – Committee Report
22EE	132 Estcourt Road – Daylight and Sunlight Report

CIL Compliance Statement Related Documents

23A	CIL Compliance Statement – Appeal A
23B	CIL Compliance Statement – Appeal B
23C	Calculated Cost per Job – Best Practice Note
23D	LBN Regeneration Officer’s Comments
23E	LBN Education Officer’s Comments – Appeal A
23F	LBN Education Officer’s Comments – Appeal
23G	LBN Travel Plan Guidance