

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

Between the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and Chalegrove
(represented by GVA Grimley)

In respect of representations 100, 337, 342, 338, 339, 340, 341.

**London Borough of Tower Hamlets
Managing Development DPD
Local Development Framework**

Statement of Common Ground – Chalegrove (represented by GVA)

LBTH Managing Development DPD Examination in Public

This Statement sets out at Appendix One the issues which Chalegrove seeks to address at the aforementioned Examination in Public. In doing so, it is considered to accurately represent the level of agreement which exists between both parties in respect of each element.

GVA
For and on behalf of Chalegrove

Michael Bell
For and on behalf of LB Tower Hamlets

NB: The outstanding issues to which this Statement relates were discussed at a meeting between GVA (representing Chalegrove) and LB Tower Hamlets on 23 August 2012, the attendees were:

Attendees: Peter Farnham (LBTH)
Julian Carter (GVA Grimley)

Appendix One: Common Ground

Issue	Policy Reference	Position: Chalegrove	Position: LB Tower Hamlets	Agreement
Off-site provision of affordable housing.	DM3: Delivering Homes.	<p>Summary: Viability testing should be central to the Borough's policy for the maximisation of affordable housing provision whether that be on site, off site or payments in lieu. This is particularly important in the current economic climate and the policy should be amended to address this matter of clarification.</p> <p>Proposed amendment: Reference to be made to viability at policy DM3 (3) (a) (iii).</p>	<p>LBTH propose amending the wording of paragraph 3.8 to read: "If affordable housing is proposed to be provided off-site there should be no over-concentration of one type of housing in any one place and a minimum of 50% affordable housing must be provided overall (<i>subject to viability</i>)" (insertion in italics).</p>	<p>No Position agreed.</p> <p>It is recognised that the Borough's proposed amendment introduces reference to viability.</p> <p>Chalegrove seek that the amendment be made to policy rather than the supporting text.</p>
Affordable Housing	DM3: Delivering Homes	<p>We are concerned that as drafted Policy DM3 seeks to maximise affordable housing delivery without explicit reference to viability. Viability testing should be central to the Borough's policy for the maximisation of affordable housing provision whether that be on site, off site, payments in lieu or variations in tenure. This is particularly important in the current economic climate and the policy should be amended to address this matter of clarification. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, DCLG, 2011) includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the planning system. This notes that local planning authorities should prepare local plans with sufficient flexibility to respond to rapid change (para 14).</p>	<p>No amendment proposed.</p>	<p>No position agreed.</p>

Issue	Policy Reference	Position: Chalegrove	Position: LB Tower Hamlets	Agreement
Building Heights	DM1	Summary: We do not consider that a transition between the scale of Canary Wharf and the City Pride site is necessary or justifiable.	No amendment proposed.	No position agreed.

Issue	Policy Reference	Position: Chalegrove	Position: LB Tower Hamlets	Agreement
Building heights.	DM26: Building Heights.	<p>Summary: The indicative building heights hierarchy is arbitrary and unjustified on the basis of national and best practice guidance, the Borough's evidence base and existing permissions.</p> <p>Proposed amendment: Delete part 1, Figure 9 and Figure 10 of Policy DM26.</p>	No amendment proposed.	No position agreed.

Issue	Policy Reference	Position: Chalegrove	Position: LB Tower Hamlets	Agreement
Local job creation and investment.	DM15: Local job creation and investment.	<p>Summary: The blanket requirement for 'approximately 12 months' marketing evidence is inappropriate for B1 Class Uses due to current and anticipated supply and impacts on the development process.</p> <p>Proposed amendment: DM15 is revised to state: "The upgrading and redevelopment of employment sites outside of spatial policy areas will be supported. Development should not result in the loss of active and viable employment uses, unless it can be shown, through a marketing exercise, that the site has been actively marketed (for approximately 12 months) or that the site is demonstrated as being unsuitable for viable refurbishment or redevelopment for continued employment use due to its location, accessibility, size and condition."</p>	No amendment proposed.	No position agreed.