

Jubilee Line Extension Impact Study

Development Impact Study 2002

Task 4 Case Studies

Tim Pharoah

For

Jubilee Line Extension Impact Study

Unit

University of Westminster

May 2002

Contents

Page

1 <i>Development demand - the LDMS Database</i>	2
--	----------

1 *Development demand – case study sites*

1.6 *Introduction to case studies*

- 1.6.1 This section of the report examines the case study development sites chosen for the Development Impact Study.
- 1.6.2 It includes an update on the position of the 40 case study sites contained in the baseline study. The information for this report was updated to April 2002. The baseline study reference numbers for these case studies is retained in this update.
- 1.6.3 In addition consideration has been given to a number of further sites not considered in the baseline study. These consist of sites where development demand or activity has arisen since the baseline study, and where a story in relation the JLE is considered to be significant. The case studies are organised sequentially from Southwark to West Ham.

1.7 *Southwark Station catchment*

All of the case study sites within this catchment fall within the London Borough of Southwark. Most of the sites in the Southwark and London Bridge station catchment areas are within central London.

SW1 197 Blackfriars Road

Formerly Orbit House, now “Southpoint”

The site lies directly opposite the Southwark station portal, and thus accessible to the station in less than one minute. The site was occupied by Orbit House, which served for many years as a book repository for the British Library. There was apparently little interest in the development potential of the site until the library was moved to the new St Pancras British Library. By this time the JLE was under construction and the new station at Southwark had been decided.

An application was received in 1998 to adapt the building for a mixed use development and the addition of four storeys. The speculative proposal was for retail, offices, 12 live/work units, 14 flats and a hotel to the rear, and permission was granted in November 1998. It appeared at the time that the inclusion of a hotel was a direct result of the site being on the pedestrian route between Southwark Station and the Tate Modern.

In 1999 the site changed ownership and the 1998 permission was not pursued. A new application was made in September 1999 to redevelop the site for a new office building (B1) with 11 storeys plus basement, providing prestigious headquarter space for around 3,000 people.

In January 2002 work began on demolishing Orbit House to make way for the new building “Southpoint”.

The impact of the JLE on this site is summarised as:

- The two speculative proposals both aimed to maximise value of the site taking account of JLE accessibility, but also other regeneration of the area including Bankside;
- The timing had as much to do with the cessation of the former library use and expiration of the lease on Orbit House as with the opening of the JLE;

- The hotel proposal appeared to reflect expectation of new tourist activity at this location brought about by the JLE to Tate Modern route. This was not carried through to the later proposal, however.
- Rebuilding for office use only reflects faith in the strength of the office market at this location, and this strength will almost certainly have been provided or boosted by the proximity of Southwark station.

The conclusion is therefore that the JLE had a positive impact in terms of maximising the value of the site. In terms of the community development aims of the Borough, however, it could be argued that the outcome redevelopment offers less diversity than the earlier scheme.

Another positive impact of the JLE is the fact that the new development is estimated to produce no net increase in traffic generation at the site. This is despite the large increase in employees at the site with the change of use from distribution and storage to offices. Car parking has been retained at the original 30 spaces, which closely reflects the maximum allowed for office development in Central London.

The new building – Southpoint – will have 25,274 sq m (272,000 sq ft) of accommodation on 11 storeys, 30 car parking spaces in the basement and a 303 sq m (3,262 sq ft) retail unit on the ground floor.

SW2 Colombo House

This site includes offices and a telephone exchange owned and operated by British Telecom. It is located close to Southwark station on the other side of the national rail viaduct at Waterloo East. Although its address is Joan Street, pedestrian access is from Blackfriars Road about 50m north of the station entrance.

There was an indication in 1994 that BT wished to intensify use of the site when they applied for a change of use from telephone exchange to offices. However, the scale of the change was modest at 3,696 sq m, and there is no indication that the permission has been taken up. The site still operates as a telephone exchange.

In terms of JLE impact, it seems clear that the increased accessibility has not produced a sufficient increase in potential value to cause BT to override operational considerations of their site. The increased accessibility will, however, have benefited existing staff on the site.

SW3 Bear Lane (Holiday Inn Express)

The site is about 350 metres from Southwark station, but otherwise public transport in the vicinity is poor. The hotel development proposal for the site was originally turned down on the grounds of loss of employment. The present Holiday Inn Express was approved following regional planning guidance calling for increased hotel accommodation to support the Eurostar Terminal, 800 metres to the west. The development was completed in 1998.

It is somewhat difficult to assess the role of the JLE in the development. On the one hand Southwark station has brought the site much closer to the Underground network, and thus more suitable than previously for uses that attract large numbers of people. A hotel fits this description as well as offices. The provision of one car parking space to 6 bedrooms suggests a much heavier reliance on public transport than would be the case for a hotel development away from areas that are accessible by public transport.

On the other hand, a statement accompanied the hotel planning application to the effect that there was little demand for offices in the area, suggesting that public transport accessibility is low relative to other central London locations. The hotel use may therefore be seen as more a function of a higher value being placed on hotel than office or other employment on “marginal” central London sites.

The area is being rapidly developed for mixed use schemes including residential, and the question is raised as to whether a residential scheme could have produced a higher value. This is answered by two factors. First, the site itself is constrained and facing a busy traffic route (Southwark Street) making it less than desirable as a residential location. Second, the land use policy for the area emphasises the retention of employment, and indeed this initially led to the refusal of a hotel use. Residential would have been an even greater departure from the UDP policy.

SW4 Bankside Lofts Warehouse C3/B1 New Build Under Construction

This case study site provides a good example of the way in which both the image and activities of the south bank of the River Thames opposite the City of London are being transformed. Planning policy for the area had been to protect sites for employment use, and this case study site was formerly used for offices, printing works and car park.

The area has now given way to mixed use and residential development and activities in keeping with “high profile” city lifestyles. The question is to what extent this turn around has resulted from or been enabled by the JLE.

The area falls within the Central London Statistical Area and as such was already reasonable well served by public transport, with buses serving Blackfriars Road and Southwark Street and rail services at Waterloo, London Bridge and across the river at Blackfriars. The JLE has brought the Underground closer, with Southwark station being half the distance of Waterloo from Bankside lofts.

At this location, however, more than 400 metres from Southwark station, other factors appear more important for residential development, in particular the regeneration catalyst represented by the Tate Modern, the Millennium Bridge, the Globe, and the approach of a “critical mass” of high profile and visitor oriented activities within an easy walk of the City of London. Looking at it from a resident’s view, the JLE might be useful for accessing the west end, or Canary Wharf for employment, but the main appeal justifying the premium price of dwellings here is more likely to be the prestige of proximity to the river and the attractions mentioned, and the City within walking commuting distance.

The conclusion is that the JLE was one factor, but was unlikely to have been the key factor in the re-development of this site for high quality residential use.

SW5 St George's Circus

This site lies 550 metres from Southwark station (about 7 minute walk). It is in fact slightly closer to Elephant & Castle Underground station, with the Bakerloo portal at 450 metres. It is within an area designated in the UDP for employment.

The site is not built upon but is used as a commercially operated commuter car park. There have been signs of development interest both before and after JLE authorisation. Applications for an office block with basement parking were made in 1990, 1991 and 1992. Following concerns about over-development of the site, permission was finally granted in June 1992 for a scaled-down scheme, but this lapsed.

In 1999 permission was granted for a seven storey office block. Although the design of the building had changed in the interim, this was seen as a renewal of the 1992 permission. The arrival of the JLE in the interim did not lead to any re-opening of access issues. There was an application in 1995 for a 100-bed hotel, which might have been a response to anticipated demand following the JLE, but this was subsequently withdrawn for reasons that have not been disclosed.

The baseline study stated that parking provision for the proposed development conformed to the Council's maximum parking standard, but had not been scaled down in view of the site's accessibility by public transport. It should be noted, however, that the maximum allowed is restrictive in terms of commuting opportunities. At a ratio of one space per 1150 sq m, this would equate roughly to one employee in 50 being able to commute by car. Also, the Council did impose a planning condition to the effect that the car parking should not be used for commuter purposes.

The fact that no development has taken place on the site in more than 10 years could suggest one of two things

- The land owner (involved in all the applications mentioned) is seeking to establish the potential value of the site before proceeding with a development;
- The value of the site for development is not regarded as sufficient to make development worthwhile compared to the established car park use.

In either case it appears that the JLE has had no perceived impact on the value of the site. Timing of the applications was unrelated to the JLE

timescale, and later development proposals have been for somewhat smaller scale schemes than those proposed before JLE authorisation.

Two applications have been made for hotel development on the site. One in 1995 which was withdrawn, and another in 2001 which was refused. This might reflect interest generated by increased tourist presence due to the JLE, but the proximity of Waterloo International and South Bank University could equally be cited as possible factors.

The overall conclusion is that the value of the site and interest in its development has not increased as a result of the JLE. Nor has L. B. Southwark sought to allow or encourage development of higher density or intensity following the increased accessibility brought by Southwark JLE station.

SW6 Pocock Street/157-168 Blackfriars Road

This site lies about 250 metres south of the station portal on the main frontage of Blackfriars Road, which is designated in the UDP as an employment area. It includes Friars House, an office block dating back to the 1960s with its own basement car park, and an area to the rear used as a car park.

At the time of the baseline study Friars House was mostly vacant, indicating a weak demand for office space at the time. It was noted that a number of other former office buildings in the vicinity were being converted for residential use and it was expected that this could occur also for Friars House at some time in the future.

Since that time there has been little development interest in Friars House, but refurbishment for office use took place in the period 1999-2001 (a 1998 planning permission refers to refurbishment of the 6th floor). This indicates a strengthening of demand for offices in this location compared to five years before, but the role of JLE in this is not certain.

Most interest has been generated by the car park to the rear. Contrary to the impression given in the baseline study, car parking is not an activity that would be generated by the JLE. However, the JLE has been cited in planning discussions about the car park, to the effect that the high degree of public transport accessibility means that commuter car parking has been strongly resisted by L. B. Southwark. A permission was granted finally for a contract car park (i.e. season ticket holders), initially for a temporary period, but the use continues. Conditions are attached to the use of the car park, namely the setting of higher fees than were charged prior to the planning consent. It was also intended that the car park use was temporary until Friars House was re-let.

By March 2002 Friars House had been refurbished and was apparently fully occupied, but the car park to the rear was also in full use.

The conclusion from this case study is that confidence in the site as an office location has increased since the mid 1990s, perhaps due to a combination of an upturn in the office market after the early 1990s slump, but also supported by the arrival of the JLE. However, the strengthening of confidence has not resulted in pressure for the redevelopment or more intensive use of the car park site to the rear.

The JLE can therefore be seen as part of the background against which the use of Friars House as a viable office space has been revived. This is in contrast to demand on adjacent sites where employment use has given way to some extent to residential use. The Council appears to have had limited success in limiting the use of land to the rear as a commuter car park, but on the other hand its continued use as such does to indicate strong pressure for development whether prompted by the JLE or general market factors.

Additional case study site

SW7 Former Works, Pocock Street

This site was formerly a works and the UDP intention was to retain employment in the area. A proposal was submitted in 1998 for a mixed use scheme and in 1999 Outline Planning Consent was granted for 2,994 m² of office space and 24 units, and 28 parking spaces. This figure is significantly lower than the Council's parking standards for the area. This could be interpreted as reflecting the site's proximity to public transport services.

In 2000 an outline planning application was submitted by the London Institute (an organisation representing five art colleges across London) for an eight storey building comprising two floors of business use and six floors of student residential accommodation. The halls of residence were intended for students at two of the Institute's colleges in Camberwell and the Elephant and Castle.

Prior to submission of the planning application, the applicant was asked by the Council to justify the use of the Pocock Street site as a residential development. The Institute argued that the site was suitable for two reasons; firstly that there are few other alternative sites within Southwark where they do not compete against higher private residential values, and secondly that "the new student accommodation [needs to be] be located within easy reach of the major new campus at Elephant and Castle whilst at the same time being accessible to its other sites in Central London. The new Jubilee Line will provide excellent public transport links to the rest of London, so sites close to Zone 1 Jubilee Line stations were preferred"

Discussions with Council officers focused on the lack of employment space in the scheme. The applicants responded by suggesting that site was better suited to residential use as there was no demand for office space within the area. However the evidence produced related to the pre-JLE period and the argument was not accepted by Southwark. Thus the planning application was amended to include included 15,000ft² of employment space on the ground and first floors. Planning officers accepted the precedent for a mixed-use development had been set by the approval of the previous scheme (in 1998) and the provision of a small amount of office floorspace within the scheme was considered sufficient to enable a recommendation for approval.

The application was unpopular with local residents and local councillors who argued that it was detracting from the employment objectives of the UDP policy designation for the site. The Committee report shows that officers were satisfied that the scheme contained a similar mix of uses and floor space to the previous application and that the applicants would be more willing to accept parking space limits due to the nature of the accommodation.

Officers recommended approval and the application was referred to the Secretary of State (as a departure from the UDP). The application was not called-in and permission was granted subject to a S106 agreement. A condition was attached to the planning permission preventing student tenants from keeping cars locally.

There is no evidence that any account was taken of changing market circumstances before and after Southwark JLE station was opened. Evidence of extensive pre-application site searches by the London Institute suggests that the timing of the application is related more to the availability of the site than the opening of the JLE. However, as acknowledged in discussion of the previous application, the JLE is likely to have influenced the Councils decision to allow a mix of residential and office uses in the first place and therefore set a precedent for the acceptability of this application.

There is no evidence to suggest that the scale of the development was directly influenced by the JLE. The Council limited the height and scale of the application to 8 storeys, the same height as adjoining Friars House. However, the expected low car ownership amongst students helped to justify a high site coverage with minimal car parking provision.

The location of a student hall of residence on this site satisfied a very specific need of the London Institute but the proximity of the JLE also had specific attractions to the applicants as shown by the supporting statement submitted with the application: *“The hall of residence is within easy walking distance of the London College of Printing at Elephant and Castle. It is near to bus routes and to the new Jubilee Line Underground Station, giving access to Central London and other sites used by the London Institute. Car ownership and use by able-bodied students residents is therefore unnecessary.”*

1.8 *London Bridge Station catchment*

LB1 161-165 Tower Bridge Road

A former tannery, which had fallen derelict, was redeveloped for a 195-bed hotel (Travel Inn) with associated parking and an entrance road. The hotel was applied for in 1998 and completed in 1999.

Although within the defined catchment of London Bridge station, the site is not well located in relation to the station. The crow-fly distance appears on the map to be 600 metres, but the safest and most practical walking route from site entrance to station forecourt is almost double at 1150 metres, about a 15 minutes.

This helps to explain the conclusion that development of the site for hotel use had little if anything to do with the JLE. Although London Bridge as the nearest underground station includes the JLE, the applicants referred more generally to accessibility of the site to rail and underground services at London Bridge together with Tower Hill and Tower gateway (DLR) on the north side of the Thames. Parking provision for the hotel was 47 spaces (24%) and limited specifically to promote the use of public transport. Cycle storage and a coach drop off point were also provided.

The case study is interesting in that it provides an example of what has become a familiar pattern of change on the south bank of the Thames over the past decade, namely the shift in planning policy aspirations away from the protection of former industrial and commercial land for employment use, in the face of property market realities.

The hotel use in fact provided a certain amount of employment, and the developer also provided a local training facility as part of the planning agreement. In this way the development has contributed more to the local community than would have been the case with luxury apartments. The latter use is what tends to predominate on other sites in the London Bridge catchment.

Although public transport accessibility was a consideration and influence in the hotel scheme, there is no evidence that the JLE affected the type, timing or scale of development on this site.

The development was a response to a demand for hotel facilities in the area, close to the Tower of London and other tourist attractions on the other side of Tower Bridge, and this benefit was combined with a desire

on the part of the Council to see more vitality in Tower Bridge Road. The redevelopment of the vacant site was considered to be an enhancement to the appearance of the area and give a presence to Tower Bridge Road. This appears to have been achieved. Tower Bridge Road has now become a residential location as well as home to a variety of commercial and light industrial uses, providing a fairly vibrant mix of activity.

LB1A - Additional case study site

Case study LB7 is also on Tower Bridge Road. The site in between these two case studies (LB1 and LB7) has also been redeveloped since the time of the baseline study. The mixed-use scheme comprises a new office building and Apartments on the corner of Tanner Street and Tower Bridge Road, and to the rear of this development is a conversion combining refurbished offices with loft apartments. In combination the schemes have had a considerable impact on the appearance and vitality of this major thoroughfare and conservation area. The JLE may have played a role in this by providing a further layer of public transport accessibility for the area, but this cannot be specifically identified as having been a significant or distinct catalyst for the developments in Tower Bridge Road.

LB2 “London Bridge City” – “More London”

This is the largest site in the central London sector of the JLE corridor. It is really a combination of sites shown on the plan to form what is now called “More London” (formerly described as “London Bridge City”). An additional site has been included since the baseline study, and this is shown on the plan as LB2 A.

The whole scheme, or set of schemes, completes the redevelopment of the stretch of the south bank of the Thames between London Bridge and Tower Bridge.

Accessibility to the JLE at London Bridge is between 250 and 750 metres (the site itself is 500 metres in length) via Tooley Street. The crow-fly distance to Tower Hill and Tower Gateway Underground stations is somewhat less, but the walking route via Tower Bridge results in distances well over a kilometer to the nearest part of the site.

There is no evidence to suggest that the JLE specifically influenced the scale of development, although the site’s proximity to London Bridge Station interchange was influential in the Council’s acceptance of high density development, low car parking and the mix of uses sought by the developers.

This case study and the amount of development included are of a sufficient scale to raise issues that are somewhat different from other case study sites in the central London sector of the JLE corridor. On the one hand, the JLE at London Bridge has added to a level of public transport accessibility that was already high. A history of pre-JLE applications for office development led to the conclusion in the baseline study that the JLE had no specific additional impact.

On the other hand, the volume of development and the resulting employees and other visitors attracted to the area is such that it will have a significant impact on the passenger flows to and from London Bridge station. The JLE has provided extra passenger capacity to enable this increase to occur with concomitant avoidance of increased congestion that otherwise would have occurred.

Also, the intensification of development around in the catchment generally (of which this case study site is a significant component) has been a factor in the promotion of plans to re-build London Bridge Station, including better connections between the street and platforms of both suburban and Underground station platforms.

Overall, although the development is a large and significant one in terms of the JLE corridor, the role of JLE itself is not seen as being either large or significant. An argument can be made, however, for the impact of the JLE on the inclusion of a hotel in the final proposals for the site (no hotel was included in previous proposals). The JLE may have increased the location's suitability for hotel accommodation by virtue of the increased accessibility specifically to the West End as opposed to the City. (Other planning applications in the vicinity suggest that this area is viewed as a good hotel location, and the JLE may equally have had a role in this).

Overview of the development as at March 2002

This site represents the majority of the More London development that has been masterplanned by Fosters and Partners. The whole More London development covers 5.3 hectares (13 acres). The scheme was originally called London Bridge City.

Planning permission has been granted for a gross total of 269,421 sq m (2.9m sq ft) of development to be completed in 2005. It is envisaged that up to ten buildings will be built to house a working community of 15,000. It will include the new GLA HQ, a hotel, Grade A offices and shops, cafes, bars and restaurants. Construction began in 1999.

The northern part of the eastern parcel has been titled Potter's Fields, formerly London Bridge City Park. Most of the eastern parcel is outside the current "More London" masterplan, and at March 2002 was in continued use as a coach and car park. It is intended to become the main landscaped public space linking the current public space to the east of the GLA site. A total of 51% of the development's surface will be public or open space. Through the office developments in the western parcel will be a diagonal walk linking Tooley Street with the riverside.

The western parcel of the site (to the west of Potter's Field) incorporates the built elements of the masterplan and intervening public spaces. The case study site boundary identified in the baseline study does not incorporate the proposed Building Six in the south western corner of the masterplan. This is the additional site referred to here as LB2 A.

The GLA building or 'City Hall' was expected to be completed by mid-2002. It occupies the north eastern corner of the western parcel of land. It is intended to be a landmark for the capital designed by Fosters and developed by CIT Group. There are ten floors above the ground floor

comprising 185,000 sq ft of floorspace. The building also includes space open to the public on the lower ground, ground and first floors including a cafeteria, display area, library and other facilities. On the top floor of the building will be "London's Living Room" with public access, exhibitions, receptions, coffee bar and views across London. Surrounding the building will be a large public open space.

To the west of the GLA building will be an open space and then the Ernst and Young building which started construction in July 2001. This ten-storey development will consist of 46,450 sq m (500,000 sq ft) of office space. It will define the diagonal pedestrian route from London Bridge Station to Tower Bridge. Ernst & Young will move in during 2003.

To the south west of the GLA building will be the ten storey, 44593 sq m (480,000 sq ft) office development of Building Three. Construction had not begun in March 2002 and no tenants had been assigned.

Some buildings on the Tooley Street frontage in front of the location for Building Three remain and are awaiting demolition. They are not within the case study site.

To the west of Building Three will be Building Four, a ten storey mixed-office development of 32,516 sq m (350,000 sq ft). Planning permission was submitted for this site – Plot Four – on 1/2/02 (rear of 123-137 and 139-41 Tooley St) for construction of the ten-storey B1, A1, A2, A3 mix and servicing and parking. This too awaited construction and tenants.

Plot Seven – bound by the Thames, Potter's Field Braidwood Street and 123-37 Tooley St. Application (31/1/02) for seven-storey office, B1, A1,2,3. This has been approved in the masterplan. The retail element will include a supermarket.

In front of Building Four on the site of 143-53 Tooley Street (now demolished) planning permission has been submitted (1/2/02) for the site known as Plot 9, to construct a theatre with supporting retail, educational facilities and offices.

To the west of Building Four will be a hotel that will wrap around the western corner of new flats at Aston Webb House that have been built by Hamptons International and Thomsett Group Plc. The flats are a conversion of the Grade II listed 1901 Boord & Son's distillery head office. There are a total of 14 luxury flats

Outside of the case study site – in the south western corner - will be Building Six, an eight floor, 197532 sq ft office development with 875 sq metres of retail that received planning permission in January 2001. Bacon & Woodrow – pensions and investments consultancy – confirmed in November 2001 that it would occupy 58000 sq ft of Building Six with a possible extension of 23000 sq ft. They will move in during 2003. Construction began mid-2001 and is expected to be finished by the end-2002.

LB3 127-129 Long Lane Community

C3 New Build Under Construction

The baseline report states that this site is 500 metres from the JLE station. The actual walking distance, however, is around 700 metres. Nevertheless, for a residential development this still represents high accessibility by public transport.

Planning permission was granted in 1997 for 14 flats which were completed in 1999.

This scheme may be seen as part of a growing robustness in the local housing market. The JLE is one of a range of factors that brought this about, but cannot be identified as a key factor.

LB4 Magdalen Street

This case study is a former warehouse which has been converted to provide a mix of uses including flats, live-work units, together with C1, A3 and D2 leisure.

It lies about 300 metres (baseline study incorrectly said 100 metres) from the JLE station to the east via Tooley Street.

Given that the building is close to the London Bridge railway viaduct and arches, conversion for predominantly residential use is an indicator of how good location can overcome severe environmental disadvantages. This is highlighted by the high cost of development involving demolition and rebuilding behind existing facades. The development surplus was sufficient for s106 contributions to be agreed, for example for the implementation of on-street parking restrictions and the provision (off site) of affordable housing units.

The JLE has no doubt played a part in boosting the benefits and value of this location, in particular by providing a wider range of access to the West End and to Canary Wharf employment. But there are other strong factors, notably the proximity of riverside developments (including case study LB2) and availability of City of London employment within 10-20 minute walking distance.

Although the conversion work was completed in 2001, not all of the units had been let by March 2002. This may indicate a slackening of the market, perhaps due to a short-term over-supply of similar developments in the area. There are other sites close by which were on offer with potential for offices and light industrial (under the railway viaduct).

An earlier application for medical student accommodation was related to the site's proximity to Guys Hospital. There is no evidence that subsequent applications for residential and mixed use were influenced by the timetable of JLE construction.

The proximity of the site to London Bridge transport interchange apparently influenced on the low level of parking provision agreed for the site, but there is no evidence in the planning discussions of specific JLE influence.

LB5 144-152 Bermondsey Street

This site lies 800 metres (10 minute walk) from the JLE station. Given that the site has been, and continues to be used primarily for storage and distribution (Recall Total Information Management), neither the JLE nor London Bridge interchange generally can be held to be of much relevance.

The locality is the subject of Supplementary Planning Guidance and the Bermondsey Street Area Action Plan, aimed at securing regeneration and improved vitality of the area. The case study site is designated in the 1995 UDP for employment.

There have been no applications on the site, suggesting no interest in more intensive employment use, or redevelopment for other uses.

The conclusion is that the JLE has had no impact on this site.

LB5A Additional case study site

It may be noted that other sites in the vicinity are being converted from industrial, storage or commercial use to residential and mixed use. An example lies immediately south next to 74-84 Long Lane, west of Crosby Row, where a vacant site and derelict site awaiting demolition has been acquired by Berkeley Homes.

LB6 Leathermarket Court

The site's proximity to the London Bridge transport interchange (about 700 metres distant) was influential in justifying reduced parking standards (and higher densities) and is likely to have influenced the site's marketability as a residential location. There is little evidence that the addition of the JLE added significantly to the overall accessibility judgment.

The site is now occupied by a gated residential development with 107 flats and secure on-site parking. This was the result of two post JLE authorisation planning permissions and construction was completed in 1997. Up to March 2002 there had been no further planning applications relating to the site.

The overall conclusion remains as given in the baseline study, that the JLE had no definable impact on the development of the site.

LB7 Vinegar Yard

This case study site has been the subject of major development activity since the JLE authorisation. Warehouses dating from the mid 18th century were vacated in 1992 and have been undergoing conversion for a mix of residential, live-work and small business uses. The site lies 700-800 metres from the JLE station, although the route is indirect and no buses link the two. It is within the Bermondsey Action Area Plan which encourages mixed uses.

The site has been developed in stages with B1 and C3 uses included in three applications in 1996, 1997 and 1998. The most recent application in 2001 is for conversion of the Gatehouse building for a further 40 flats, and this was a modification of a 1999 application for mixed B1 and C3 use. By March 2002 only this north east corner of the site remained for development, though various units on other parts of the site were available to let.

The timing of development activity appears to have been the result of market conditions and influenced by the Bermondsey Action Area Plan after the adoption of the UDP in 1995. The scale and character of the development was influenced by the listed status of warehouse buildings on the site. Public transport was cited in support of low levels of car parking provision, but the JLE was not specifically identified.

The conclusion is that the JLE played no specific role in bringing forward development of this site, other than its general thickening of public transport accessibility for the locality.

1.9 *Bermondsey Station Catchment*

All the case study sites fall within the London Borough of Southwark, for which the UDP was adopted in 1995 and was under revision during the period of this study.

BE1 Willow Walk

This site is 1250 metres (15 minute walk) from the JLE station portal (not 900 metres as stated in the baseline study). A 1998 application for development of the site for a mixture of B1, B2 and B8 uses was completed in 1999.

The application was consistent with UDP policies on employment, density and car parking, and there is no evidence that any specific consideration was given to accessibility afforded by the JLE.

The overall conclusion is that the site is too remote from the JLE station to expect any impact, and no such impact was apparent from the development process.

BE2 Tamarind Court, Curlew Street

The site is part of a major transformation that has taken place over a ten year period of the former spice warehouses east of Tower Bridge.

The site, which is 900-1100 metres from the JLE station (depending on the route chose), was perceived by Council planners to be poorly served by public transport and the JLE does not appear to have changed this point of view. The developer was willing to undertake the project with limited resident car parking facilities, and this initially raised concerns. No provision was made via legal agreements for additional linkages (bus or walkways) to Bermondsey station.

The key planning application was approved in 1997 for a mix of residential units and office space and a small amount of associated leisure use such as a gym. Parking is provided at ground and basement levels. The scale and form of the development and parking provision is in line with both UDP and the Butlers Wharf Master Plan.

The development occurred at a time when the area was experiencing a significant growth in the development of new and converted luxury residential accommodation. Most former warehouse buildings within the area are in the process of or have finished being redeveloped or converted. The principle driving force behind this was the combination of earlier investment in Butlers Wharf (mixed housing and retail), the river and dockside frontages and the suitability of the original high quality warehouse buildings for conversion. There is no evidence that any increased development interest was shown in the area after the announcement and construction of the JLE.

The overall conclusion is therefore no JLE impact.

BE3 Old Jamaica Road

This elongated site is 300-500 metres from the station portal and was formerly in use for a mix of industrial, storage, residential uses and a pub and open space. It is a difficult site being adjacent to the north side of a railway viaduct, and offering a relatively narrow strip of land between the railway and Old Jamaica Road.

Indication of planning interest in the area is apparent from the production of Supplementary Planning Guidance approved in 1997, which designated the area for employment supplemented by open space and residential uses.

A further planning initiative followed in 2000 when the Council commissioned consultants to prepare the “Bermondsey Spa Regeneration Masterplan”, subsequently to be adopted as a further Supplementary Planning Guidance.

The western half of the site was in use during the late 1990s as a construction site for the JLE. In 1999 a planning application was received for the restoration of the 45 railway arches to provide light industrial premises, together with limited A1 and A3 uses. The whole development was completed in 2001 to form the Old Jamaica Road Business Estate. Parking provision was slightly lower than UDP standards, but no specific mention of the JLE was made in justifying this.

In March 2002 the eastern half of the site remained derelict and awaited development applications in line with the UDP designated use for housing and community open space. There was no immediate prospect of such an application coming forward.

In conclusion, other than the negative impact of preventing other development taking place on the site whilst it was used as a JLE construction site, there is no evidence of a JLE impact on development activity on this site.

It should be noted, however, that a large area on the opposite side of Old Jamaica Road was the subject of significant development interest by the beginning of 2002, with developers preparing possible schemes for a mixture of new building and refurbishment to provide a major mixed use. Such a scheme (which had not yet resulted in a planning application, and which therefore cannot be revealed in detail) may well

be regarded as a response to the JLE, and in turn could prompt redevelopment of other sites in the area. Including this case study site.

BE4 Webster Road

The formerly derelict site, lying 400 metres (200 metres crow-fly distance) from the station portal, has been developed for ten terraced houses (Wimpy “Town Houses”).

This case provided an early indication of a development response to Bermondsey JLE station, with the JLE mentioned in support of the 1998 planning application. However, this view is not reflected in later planning cases where the Council did not make reference to the station or other public transport links. More significantly the developer opted for off street parking rather than a greater number of housing units on the site, suggesting that the accessibility to the JLE was not a determining factor in the type or scale of development. The timing of development interest could be interpreted as being influenced by the JLE given the site’s previous history of dereliction and no development activity.

BE5 Mayflower Street

Community C3 New Build Complete

This site is roughly equidistant (about 600 metres, not 400 metres as stated in the baseline study) from both Bermondsey and Canada Water stations, though the walk to Bermondsey is a good deal simpler; hence the inclusion in the Bermondsey catchment case studies.

There are two former office buildings on the site which were converted to mixed use office and residential above following applications in 1995 and 1996. The schemes were approved by LDDC.

Car parking became an issue, with the applicants and LDDC arguing that proximity to Rotherhithe station (not JLE stations) meant that a level of provision lower than UDP standard was justified. Southwark Council made representations to get the amount of residential parking increased, and eventually a compromise was reached. This suggests that the developer was somewhat more aware of the potential benefits of public transport accessibility than was the Council. This view is supported by other case studies, especially in the Canada Water catchment (see below).

The other point of interest is that the planning policy for the area included the retention of employment. This was achieved in the context of the original mixed use scheme, but the number of employees will be lower than that accommodated in the original single use office buildings. Moreover, a 1998 planning application sought to convert the ground floor office space to further flats, and at March 2002 the office space in the other building was vacant. This suggests a low demand for offices in this location despite the accessibility of the JLE. This reinforces the general hypothesis that 600 metres is too great a distance to have an impact on demand for employment uses.

The conclusion from this case study remains as stated in the baseline study, that the JLE had no discernable impact on the development of the site.

1.10 *Canada Water station catchment*

All the case study sites fall within the London Borough of Southwark, for which the UDP was adopted in 1995 and was under revision during the period of this study.

CW1 Lower Road East

The site is about 850 metres from the JLE station near the southern catchment boundary. Surrey Quays station (East London Line) is only 300 metres on the way, and this could be regarded as a feeder to the JLE as far as this site is concerned. There is no direct feeder bus however, since the site lies on a one-way gyratory system that separates the bus routes.

The site was mostly vacant for many years as a result of a road widening safeguarding line, although a public house remained on the site and was still functioning in March 2002.

Although the Council in 1996 indicated that mixed use development would be appropriate on the site (once the widening safeguarding had been removed), the first indication of developer interest in the site was an application in 2000 for a 64-bed care home. By March 2002 this had been completed on the south-eastern portion of the site. There is a landscaped car park between it and the Dreadnought public house.

A residential care home is not regarded as the sort of development that would have been prompted by the JLE, and certainly not at such a great distance from the station.

It may safely be concluded that the JLE has had zero impact on the development prospects for the site.

CW2 Surrey Quays Road

The site, or rather sites, is on the north east side of Surrey Quays Road between 200 and 400 metres east of the JLE station portal.¹ The sites form part of a larger scheme including four sites identified for development in a joint plan by the Council and LDDC in the 1980s.

The planning history reveals a rather shallow understanding of the potential benefits of development oriented towards public transport accessibility. Canada Water station in March 2002 stood in splendid isolation, with development just visible beyond a sea of roads and car parking. The story, however, is beginning to unfold in a more satisfactory way, and the impact of the JLE interchange is beginning to show itself on the sites identified on the plan.

The Surrey Quays shopping development is now acknowledged by the Council to be poorly related to the JLE station, and the intention is to produce a new master plan for the entire area with the principal aim of developing a more robust district centre.

Developments that were reported in the baseline study were of low density and with large amounts of car parking, double the minimum standard in the adopted UDP. The UDP was adopted in 1995; a year after the publication of PPG13, which stated that planning authorities should revise their parking standards in new developments from minimum to maximum standards. It is apparent that the LDDC continued to make decisions that ran counter to this approach, while L.B. Southwark appeared unable or unwilling to insist on this new approach, even on sites in council ownership.

The baseline study concluded that the JLE had

- influenced the content of the 1994 development brief for the area, and
- influenced subsequent schemes in terms of their orientation and the treatment of the spaces, footpaths and linkages around them.

¹ The site description in the baseline study is completely incorrect and should be ignored. The baseline study included a number of errors also in terms of site numbering and identification.

The present author would take issue with these conclusions in favour of the Council's conclusion that the proposals represented a "shopping environment aimed entirely at the car user". The same conclusion can be drawn about the mixed leisure and restaurant/bar scheme (12,320 sq m with 669 car parking spaces), approved by LDDC on the site immediately south of the identified case study site.

In March 2002 the case study sites had been fully built out with two single storey retail "sheds", but only one of these was occupied.

Despite the fact that these retail schemes were approved only in 1996, and completed by 1999, applications were submitted in August 2001 for redevelopment as follows:

- Site D received permission for the construction of 1x7, 5x8, 1x9 storey blocks of 251 residential units, 22 live/work units and business/retail units with car parking
- Site E received an application for offices and telehotel by Foreign Property APS. The hotel would be built over six storeys whilst the offices would range from five to 18 storeys.

This represents a more realistic response to the sites' proximity to the Canada Water interchange, and is a strong indication of a positive development impact of the JLE. The new applications suggest that the reality of the JLE once opened prompted a major rethink by development interests and the planning authority, both perhaps encouraged by the rapidly changing national and regional planning policy context in favour of public transport oriented development.

The conclusion is that the JLE initially had little impact on the scale and type of development, and that in terms of public transport oriented development theory, the potential of the site was not recognised by applicants, the LDDC or Southwark Council.

More recently this potential is being recognised, and has led to proposals for much more intensive use of the sites. On the other hand, open and under used land remains in proximity to the JLE station, with little evidence of development interest, The Council's proposed master plan for a new district centre for the area may stimulate the take of JLE opportunities in future.

CW3 Globe Wharf

The site and its relation to JLE.

The baseline study gave a false impression of the accessibility of this site to the JLE, stating a distance of 400 metres compared to the actual walking distance of 850 metres, a 10 minute walk. Moreover, the walk is partly along paths that are not well lit or overlooked, and would in practice be unrealistic for use after dark. There are two bus links, but one of these does not operate after 6pm, and the other takes a circuitous route. The two services leave from different stops towards Canada Water, which means that passengers would have to take their change on which is likely to arrive first. The return journey would be less of a problem because both routes leave from the the Canada Water interchange, where waiting facilities are available.

Another option for residents, and a site visit revealed evidence of this being chosen, is to take a bus to Bermondsey JLE station, which is served by two routes (225 and 381) both operating through the evening.

The upshot of this site analysis is that Globe Wharf is not unambiguously within the walking catchment of the JLE, but is dependent to an important degree on feeder bus services. This means that ascribing development impact to the JLE is more dubious hypothesis.

Although during the 1980s Southwark Council had sought to retain the site in employment use, a permission for conversion to flats was granted by LDDC in 1987. Neither this nor an application for offices in 1988 was taken forward. It was not until 1996 that a further application for conversion of the existing buildings to flats was taken up. Construction was started in 1997 and was completed by the time of the June 2000 update of this case study.

Discussions with the marketing agency suggested that proximity to the JLE is a selling factor, but the riverside location is the main attraction for prospective purchasers.

The overall conclusion is that the potential for development for residential had already been established prior to JLE authorisation. The timing of the development appears to have been related to market

conditions rather than the JLE programme. There is therefore no evidence that the JLE had impact on the development of this site.

CW4 Renforth Street Pumping Station Pumping Station

The site in relation to the JLE

The case study site lies immediately adjacent to the JLE Canada Water interchange. However, a wall separates the two, and residents must take a circuitous route to reach the station portal, involving a 450 metre walk (5 minutes) including through an open space that may be perceived as unsafe after dark.

The development application was processed without any discussion of how a more direct route could be provided. Residents in other housing nearby would also benefit from the provision of a new cut-through.

This is an example of the way in which planning authorities have been slow to adopt the principles of public transport oriented development.

Development impact

The pumping station use had been discontinued for many years, and development potential was established with three planning permissions prior to JLE authorisation. Neither these nor a further permission in 1995 were taken up, however.

Construction of the scheme to provide 53 dwellings (part conversion, part new-build) was complete by March 2002, although units had not been occupied. The type of development is in keeping with the residential nature of the area and is unlikely to have been directly influenced by the JLE.

The decision to begin development of the site in 2000 and not before (despite gaining consent in 1995) suggests that the opening of the JLE may have influenced the timing of the development. It is likely that the site has benefited from improved public transport accessibility due to its proximity to Canada Water Station. As a result the marketability of residential units in the area is likely to have improved with the opening of the station. This may have helped to produce scheme viability on a site that had both design constraints and heavy costs involved in converting the listed building to residential units.

There is also an indication that density and parking standards were breached in view of the proximity to the JLE station, but the amounts involved are too marginal to offer concrete evidence.

The overall conclusion is that the proximity of the site to the JLE station had no impact on the scale or type of development, and that no effort was made to maximise the proximity advantage by any footpath link between the two sites. The opening of the JLE station may, however, have been the spur to eventual construction of the much delayed scheme.

CW5 Baltic Quay Docks

The site in relation to the JLE

The site was perceived by its owners as being poorly served by public transport but that this situation would improve with the opening of the JLE station at Canada Water, which was claimed to be “nearby” or “10 minutes walk”. In fact the site is at least a 15 minute walk, and not a pleasant one at that.

Development impact

The JLE had been used as an argument in planning applications for the inclusion of office and retail development on the site, in line with the LDDC aspirations for the Surrey Docks area. Southwark quite rightly were sceptical of this view, especially given that Surrey Quays shopping centre lies between the site and the JLE station.

In fact the final applications (resulting in the development of the site that was completed by 2000) were for residential use only, converting offices and an unsuccessful retail unit to residential use. The final type of development is regarded as the product of property market fluctuations, however, rather than any influence of the JLE. In particular the office market in docklands at the time was weaker for offices than for residential. The scheme was completed in 1998.

The overall conclusion is that the site is too remote from the JLE station to seriously construct a hypothesis of JLE impact on its development.

Canary Wharf station catchment

The case studies in this catchment are of particular interest in terms of non-residential development. Non-residential applications are too few in number to allow analysis through the LDMS database. The emphasis for non-residential development is therefore through the case studies, and Canary Wharf catchment provides the greatest proportion of such development within the JLE corridor as a whole, as shown in the chart of non-residential applications.

The baseline study focused on two types of case study sites: firstly a group of sites within 500 metres of the JLE station, and secondly riverside sites that were fairly remote from the JLE station.

South of the JLE was Arrowhead Quay (CF1). After the baseline study there was a step change in planning interest in the sites south of Heron Quays, and the area has been the subject of a masterplanning exercise, and the creation of a development partnership. The area concerned is now referred to as “Millennium Quarter” which includes but which is much larger than the Arrowhead case study site. As a consequence, case study CF1 has been expanded to deal with the Millennium Quarter.

CF1 Millennium Quarter (incorporating Arrowhead Quay)

The story of the Arrowhead Quay site gives a good background to understanding the plans for the wider Millennium Quarter. By the late 1980s the character of the general area as an office location had been established through the commitment at Canary Wharf. The eventual use of this site was not so clear, however, especially in the early 1990s when the office market on the Isle of Dogs collapsed. Owners of the site were hedging their bets in submitting a speculative application for either hotel or office use, with a total floor area of around 20,000 sq m. This was approved in 1993 prior to JLE authorisation but despite the flexibility of the permission, no buyers were found between 1993 and 1997 reflecting the state of the local markets, and the permission was renewed unaltered in 1997.

A further application was made in 1998 proposing a 50:50 combination of office and residential uses in buildings ranging between 7 and 11

storeys. The shift of interest towards residential development (including a proposed 25% of affordable units) reflected the continued lack of confidence in the local property market, and for office development in particular. This was not helped by the explosion of an IRA bomb on the site to the east of Arrowhead Quay.

By the turn of the decade things were looking rather different. Not only was there resurgence in the office market, but also the opening of the JLE at Canary Wharf and the DLR extension to Lewisham had dramatically increased the inbound accessibility of the locality.

A new planning application (by Ballymore Properties) in February 2000, reverted to primarily office use, and with almost three times more gross floorspace than provided in the earlier permissions. Following various amendments and negotiations throughout 2000 a mixed use scheme emerged with 60,000sqm of floor space comprising office, leisure and retail uses and public open space and dockside walkway. Approval was given shortly after the Council's approval of the Millennium Quarter Masterplan (September 2000) and thus became one of the first firm development prospects within the new framework. Approval for the final scheme was given in May 2001 and construction was under way by March 2002.

The proposed scheme will incorporate an office building described as "a landmark gateway to the Millennium Quarter" and consisting of two towers of 17 and 25 storeys. Restaurants, retail and a health club will be contained in the main building, while a "landscaped plaza" will contain a freestanding retail pavilion. A third of the development site is designated for public use with the waterfront plaza.

Lower parking provision had been accepted by the LDDC in relation to the earlier applications in view of the good public transport accessibility. The DLR extension and the JLE at Canary Wharf further reinforced this approach, and correspondence indicates that it was Tower Hamlets Council as the incoming planning authority that led the way in ensuring that the scheme took full advantage of its highly accessible position. This is indicated by the design of the building, with its main entrance orientated towards the pedestrian access from Canary Wharf station rather than the road access from Marsh Wall.

With only 55 parking spaces, the scheme reflects government guidance in PPG13 and the stringent parking standards adopted for accessible locations in London. Precedents for height and density had been set by

other new developments immediately to the north (adjacent to the JLE station) and the applicants used good public transport access to the site to further justify the much-increased scale of the development compared to earlier proposals.

The Transport Assessment submitted with the scheme highlights the site's proximity to Canary Wharf stations and estimated that almost half of staff working at the development would use the JLE for commuting to and from work. The application proposed a 'Green Travel Plan', to be prepared in conjunction with LB Tower Hamlets, with the aim of maximising use of non-car modes of travel. It was forecast that this would help to ensure that 85% of people using the proposed offices would use public transport by 2003.

The overall conclusion from this case study is that while fluctuations and uncertainties in the property market held back development of the site for 10 years or more, in the end the step change in public transport accessibility with the JLE helped to fuel the resurgence of office demand and to produce a much more intensive use of the site. The proximity of other major office buildings both completed and under construction, and the commissioning of the Millennium Quarter masterplan must also have been influential in bringing forward the final scheme.

CF2 Canary Riverside Docks

This case study includes three substantial sites arranged around Westferry Circus at the western end of the Canary Wharf complex. The land is owned by Canary Wharf Group Plc. Distance to the JLE station is 400-750 metres (5-10 minutes walk).

The north west plot (Phase I) is complete and includes 325 luxury apartments, a 5-Star hotel, health club, bars and restaurants. There are four buildings within this phase – Eaton House, Belgrave Court, Berkeley Tower and Hanover House. The 139 room Four Seasons hotel is adjacent to the 3,700 sq m (40,000 sq ft) Holmes Place Health Club. There is also underground parking and landscaped gardens.

Phase 2 on the north east side of Westferry Circus consists of three buildings that have been completed and are fully occupied:

- 1 Westferry Circus: 230700 sq ft of office and retail, designed by SOM. The tenants are Texaco, Credit Suisse.
- 7 Westferry Circus: 175000 sq ft of office and retail, designed by SOM. Tenants are Edward Jones, EDS, EMEA.
- 11 Westferry Circus: 142200 sq ft designed by Koetter, Kim and Assoc & Perkins and Will. Tenants are Readers Digest Assoc, Edward Jones.

Phase 3 lies south of Westferry Circus and has yet to be developed. In March 2002 the case study part of the site was still in use for car parking. Restaurants and a pedestrian podium that opened in 2000 occupy the land in between Phases 1 and 3 (West Ferry 1).

The site has always formed part of the LDDC comprehensive redevelopment plans for the central Docklands area and is a key component of the overall Canary Wharf plans. Although the site lay within the LDDC development area, the majority fell outside the original Enterprise Zone and its development has come later than many of the neighbouring sites that immediately adjoin the West India Dock.

The case study sites were the subject of a number of applications throughout the 1990s. The majority of these, however, were detailed applications based on an outline permission granted by the LDDC to Olympia & York Canary Wharf Ltd in 1992, prior to JLE authorization.

The principle of the scale and type of development was therefore established as part of pre-JLE plans, dating back to 1987, and the JLE cannot therefore be said to have played a role in this.

The JLE does enter the picture in relation to the design of development and in particular the amount of parking provision. The LDDC was relaxed about the amount of parking included in the original outline consents and paid little attention to the changed circumstances brought about by the JLE in terms of higher public transport accessibility. This was despite objections by LB Tower Hamlets.

The transfer of planning power from LDDC to the Borough seems to have prompted a rethink as shown by an application in March 1997 to LB Tower Hamlets for the redevelopment of site WF9, on the north east side of Westferry Circus. The application sought 22,333sqm of office floorspace with 112 car parking spaces. Permission was granted in September 1997, but after extensive negotiations the number of car parking spaces was reduced to 20.

Informing this change towards lower levels of parking provision were studies commissioned by Canary Wharf Ltd. The Traffic Impact Assessment estimated that the car mode share before the JLE opened would be 25-30% falling to 18% after opening. The applicants followed the logic that more parking would be required to serve new development, but that this could be reduced once the JLE was open. In 1992 an application for a temporary car park had therefore been granted for five years by the LDDC, which accepted these findings. The permission was extended in 1997 for a further two years to 1999.

It can therefore be concluded that the JLE had a significant impact on parking provision at Canary Wharf, and that it was the Borough rather than the LDDC that actively responded to the new accessibility levels brought by the JLE. The LDDC's acceptance of high parking levels even as late as 1995 is perhaps more a reflection of the precedents already established on the site rather than the developer's reliance on these levels of provision to ensure project viability.

The other issue concerns the timing of the development. Although outline consent had been given in 1987, and renewed and revised at intervals during the 1990s, take up on site did not occur until the late 1990s, and by March 2002, the southern site (Phase 3) had still to be developed. The JLE can also be seen to have influenced the timing of this development, although it was not the driving force behind it.

Economic circumstances and the collapse of the development company were important contributors to the delays in development activity.

CF3 West India Quay, Hertsmere House

The site is about 400-600 metres from the JLE station, but is more conveniently served by the DLR at West India Quay. The walking route between the JLE and the site is reasonably direct, but far from clear to the visitor.

The eastern part of the site – adjoining West India Quay station – will be West India Quay Tower, a 32 storey residential tower. By March 2002 this was being developed by Multiplex Developments and MWB Architects.

The remainder of the site is a converted warehouse that includes A1, A3, C3 and a museum. This originally LDDC approved scheme is reaching its final phase. The conversion is entitled Port East, West India Quay. The museum, which will open in 2002, is on five floors in the western half of the Grade I listed Georgian warehouse. It will include 12 galleries, function suites, restaurant and shops. It is being developed with funding support from Heritage Lottery, DTLR/LDDC, Corporation of London and the Port of London Authority. The eastern half of the main warehouse is more mixed with residential on top of bars, restaurants, health club, cinema and parking. The westernmost part of the site is now a JD Wetherspoons public house.

The type and scale of development on this site is in general accordance with a 1991 masterplan prepared by a subsidiary of Olympia and York, the Canary Wharf developers. The concept was to develop the sites as a mixed use area to complement the office and commercial activity occurring at Canary Wharf. The original LDDC permission in 1991 established the mixed use, high density character of the site, though some elements changed through subsequent permissions.

There is no evidence that either the planning or timing of the development of this site was related to the JLE programme.

CF4 Heron Quay Docks

The case study site covers elements of the Heron Quay development that is being created on this former quay. The site is adjacent to the JLE station at Canary Wharf, but the other side of West India Dock, so that pedestrian walking distances are greater than appear from the map. The site has its own DLR station.

By March 2002 five office towers were under construction, and this represented what may be regarded as “third generation regeneration”. Following closure of the docks, the first regeneration schemes emphasised residential uses and single story offices. A 1991 Enterprise Zone application marked a change to higher density and greater emphasis on office use. In 1997 a further consent (as now being built) provided for still higher density, and almost exclusive office use.

This transition can be linked to the development of transport infrastructure, first the DLR, and its upgrading around 1990, and then the JLE.

The evidence is particularly strong in relation to the JLE. The 1991 application sought a flexible permission which allowed the proportion of each use to fluctuate according to whether or not the JLE station was built. A special “Jubilee Density Agreement” permitted 28%-100% commercial office development and 0-70% residential development on the site if the station was constructed but reverted back to the original 1989 EZ consent if the station construction never went ahead. A flexible parking standard was also agreed, and the LDDC accepted parking levels could be lower than its standard in view of the high public transport accessibility offered by the JLE and the DLR.

There are clear links between the construction of the JLE and the form and use of development proposed. The timing does not appear to have been directly related to the JLE, but use of part of the site for JLE construction works prevented take up of the development permissions until the JLE was completed.

CF5 Hutchings Wharf Docks

The site lies 800 metres crow-fly distance from the JLE station, but the actual walking distance is considerably greater. The DLR does not provide convenient linkage to the JLE station. As a consequence this site is not particularly well served by rail services on the Isle of Dogs, but there is a bus connecting to Canary Wharf which runs past the site.

Because of its location, it is not expected that the JLE would have had much impact on its development.

The site is occupied by a residential scheme that was completed by 2000. It consists of a 54 flat gated community in three buildings that rise toward the waterfront. The waterside block is ten storeys high. Each building has its own open space and car parking. The development is sited behind a dilapidated row of shops. However, Hutchings Wharf Riverside Development have bought the centre shop and have put the freehold up for sale. It appears likely that this part of the site will be developed in the near future.

Although the proximity of the JLE station was cited as one of the reasons for permitting development at a density above (then) UDP standards, parking provision was also above UDP standards, suggesting a rather selective view was taken as to the importance of the JLE. The general pattern of use in the area, and the increasing acceptance of higher densities means that the JLE had only a limited impact on development activity. More direct influences are likely to have been the creation of the bridge link from South Quay to Heron Quay and access to the DLR .

CF6 Pierhead Lock Docks

The site is 800 metres from the JLE station as the crow flies, but currently the route on foot is almost double this distance. Possible future development of Wood Wharf, which lies between, would allow more direct access.

The Barratt development consists of nearly 100 flats that were completed in November 1999. The highest block is 13-storeys. Both Riverside Court and Crescent Tower won the National Home Builder Design award for 2000 and 2001 respectively.

The case provides little evidence of any direct JLE impact and there was no apparent consideration of public transport issues in the determination of the planning applications.

CF7 Wood Wharf

This large former Port of London Authority, now British Waterways (BWB), site lies immediately to the east of Canary Wharf JLE station. It currently has wider water use and dockside development.

A major mixed use development scheme is to be initiated in the period 2004-6. Partner organisations include BWB, London Development Agency, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, and Thames Gateway London (TGLP).

The Wood Wharf redevelopment was granted planning permission in April 2001.

The site currently includes a residential block in the north east of the site. The large warehouse – Lutsmer House - remains in the centre of the development. In the north west of the site is Fulton House a distribution office and to the south of that is the Docklands Telecom Centre. All the units, bar the main warehouse, appear active and relatively new/good condition.

Redevelopment is likely to include major improvements to pedestrian access between Canary Wharf JLE station and sites to the East (see Pierhead Lock Docks case study above).

The conclusion from this site is that that redevelopment of uses that remain viable is a clear indication of the development value generated by the arrival of the JLE. As with the Millennium Quarter already discussed, the higher degree of public transport accessibility, together with the critical mass presented by existing developments at Canary Wharf have led to a step change in the development aspirations for sites such as this close to the JLE station.

Canning Town station catchment

All the case study sites are in Newham except CT6 Brunswick Wharf, which falls within Tower hamlets

CT1 Barrier Point

This site lies about two kilometres from Canning Town JLE station, about a 25 minute walk along heavily trafficked with little frontage development. In short, walking to the station would not be considered an option, certainly not by the occupiers of housing on this site. The site is relevant only insofar as feeder services might be used to access the JLE.

This complicated case study site can be divided into four parts, following a review in March 2002.

- 3 The western parcel is an active storage/warehousing “park” known as Kirkbeck Business Complex. This park currently has spaces to let ranging from 10-95000 sq ft.
- 4 Bordering Kierbeck Business Park is a second distribution and warehousing complex at Crescent Wharf that again is active and occupied but similarly is in poor state of maintenance.
- 5 To the east of this park is the site of the former Minoco Wharf oil depot. The site is vacant and derelict at present and is being de-contaminated by WSP Remediation. The site is 5.98ha and is owned by Shell. It falls within the 1997 Adopted Newham UDP and 1999 Deposit Draft planning frameworks. This guidance shows it as a principal employment site, which encourages the retention and expansion of industrial, warehouse and other B1 uses but resisting residential or retail. It has Protected Freight Wharf designation and potential location for provision of a riverbus service. The development proposal set up by Shell through Drivers Jonas sees the opportunity to set up a high quality employment or mixed use development that benefits from river frontage. The frontage of the side is subject to a CPO to facilitate the construction of the City Airport/Silvertown DLR link. Drivers Jonas are marketing the site to sell it as freehold.
- 6 A new DLR station will be located nearby at Pontoon Dock which forms part of the eastern most element of the case study site. The eastern element of the site is taken up by the landmark residential development by Barratts – Barrier Park. This

includes 'The Tower' in the south eastern corner – just outside the case study boundary. This 16500 sq ft development has penthouses and restaurants included. Just to the east of the tower is an area of open space designated for residents and known as Thames Barrier Park. The front of the site is London Development Agency land being marketed by Tradewinds to form the Pontoon Dock station for the new DLR extension.

Factors other than the JLE are seen as more influential on this site. These include the riverside and Thames Barrier views, which have made housing marketable despite the remote location, the adjacent open space, and the easy access to the main road network. The new DLR station on the airport spur will also provide better public transport access.

CT2 Limmo site

This site is the most accessible to the JLE of all the Canning Town case study sites. Other things being equal, if the JLE was to spur development in this part of east London, then one would need to look for evidence of this. Prior to 2000 there is evidence that the proximity of the Dome (one stop on the JLE) was regarded as a factor likely to have a positive impact on the development of the site. This has not proved to be the case.

The conclusion from this case study is therefore that it provides evidence of the gap between development and regeneration aspirations of the borough, and the willingness of developers to invest. The site would be one to watch in the longer term.

The update in March 2002 highlighted the following aspects of the site.

- The 5.1 ha site is owned by the former British Railways Property Board and others – now Spacia. It was used as a contractors compound for the JLE. It is within the Canning Town SRB and has Intermediate Assisted Area Status. It is part of the Major Opportunity Zone – with Thames Wharf – and high quality mixed use would be permitted (i.e. desired) with B1, B2 and leisure uses.
- The site is seen as the western gateway to the area, though it is not entirely clear what this means. The revised UDP promotes a mixed use high quality development of B1 (business), B2 (general industrial) and leisure. The site will be available for development in the medium term – 2/3 years.
- B2 and B8 uses were proposed with an estimated final floorspace of 20,000 sq m. This was due to start in 2001 and end in 2002 but no such activity has occurred. (Source DETR Thames Gateway Review)
- In 1999 LBTH sent a memo relating to the site's use as a park and ride facility for the Dome – planning permission was granted under conditions – but this apparently was not followed through, perhaps because demand for access to the Dome turned out to be half of the forecast.
- In March 2002 the land was vacant scrub with a vent shaft for the JLE on site. It may be in use as an educational eco-centre, but there is no evidence of this on site.

CT3 6 Oak Crescent

This small residential site lies about 300 metres north of Canning Town JLE station, and has been development with seven private residential units.

There is no indication from available material, the planning history or timing of development that the JLE had an impact on the development of this site. Indeed the negotiations regarding the site, the latest of which occurred after JLE authorisation, worked in the opposite direction from what might be expected in terms of public transport oriented development. The number of dwellings on site was reduced so that the Boroughs (then) minimum parking standards could be met.

The site was fully developed and occupied at the time of the baseline study.

CT4 Silvertown Way - Peto Street

The site is an active Holiday Inn Express – an 88-bed hotel over four floors with a restaurant. The transport motel in the south portion of the site remains. It is in a decrepit state, however, and presents a further development opportunity on the site.

The proximity of Canning Town station to the site (250 metres) was used by the applicants as the justification for the uses sought in this location. A succession of applications for motel or hotel uses on this site indicate a shift from lower to higher quality accommodation aimed at the business user. Whilst it is not apparent from available evidence that this change was related to the JLE, the interest in the site by Holiday Inn Express as a hotel suggest an increase in demand, and this may be related to the JLE. However, it should be noted that the timing of the scheme related also to the Excel exhibition centre nearby; another potential boost for business hotel demand.

The final application did not include redevelopment of the hostel on the site, as hoped for by the Borough at the time. Parking was reduced in view of public transport access to the site.

The overall conclusion is that while the evidence of JLE impact is weak, the development is in keeping with Borough planning policy for the area, and consistent with the principles of public transport oriented development.

CT5 Bidder Street & Stephenson Street

This is a large site about 200-700 metres north of the JLE station at Canning Town, although it is separated by a major road and flyover.

It is not really a single site, and consideration can be divided into parts. The following was the situation at March 2002:

- 1 The part enclosed by Bidder Street remains as active light industrial use/storage/ warehousing with some variations on the theme including a scrap yard and Turkish Baths.
- 2 The land in the far south eastern corner (nearest the station) is being used as a road construction depot for the improvements to the road above.
- 3 On the opposite side of Wharf Side Road is the area designated as Crown Wharf. This is currently still occupied by warehousing, however there are significant aspirations for the site. This site was previously a saw mill and timber yard that has been vacant for sometime. The Newham UDP designates it as a principal industrial area with the following policies having relevance:
 - Policy EMP4 – local planning authority will sanction the retention/expansion of industrial and warehouse uses
 - Policy EMP5 – proposals for new B1 development should be designed flexibly to accommodate servicing/parking for whole range of uses within class B1
 - EMP6 – adverse industrial development not permitted
 - OS3 – development must be consistent with Lea Valley Regional Park Plan
- 4 There is however, the possibility of the site being re-zoned for residential or leisure with some ancillary retail. The site is offered as freehold subject to a number of short-term leasehold interests. The freehold is owned by Monnberry Ltd. Much of the site has been used in association with the A13 Trunk road widening works since July 2000.

The site is within the Canning Town SRB and Euro Funding Objective 2 areas. The council is seeking a high quality flagship development that reflects the site's location. The following uses are deemed acceptable – B1, B2, B8, business, community or leisure facilities with links to adjoining sites with footpath/cycle routes provided along Lea.

The site should be available for development in the medium term of 2-3 years.

Further elements of the case study site include an active and environmentally unattractive scrap yard to the north of the Crown Wharf site and the remainder is under construction as Electra Park.

The Electra Park development of 220000 sq ft floorspace comprising units from 10000 sq ft upward will be a development of industrial warehousing. An entrance has been created from the north eastern corner of Bidder Street which will form a boulevard with two large units on either side. A total of ten warehousing and light industrial units are to be built on the 13.5ha site. Electra Park has been developed by Harbour Land which is the property arm of Schroder banking group. Some of the units will be taken by contractors servicing the nearby ExCeL exhibition. At the river end of the site will be a raised square that will adjoin a walkway that follows the line of the Thames.

The lack of large scale development on the Bidder St/Stephenson St site and the lack of evidence of any major commercial development in the immediate vicinity of Canning town station suggest that the JLE has had little impact on the development market. Development interest so far has been primarily for industrial or warehouse use which is regarded as largely unrelated to accessibility offered by the JLE

To address this, Newham have committed themselves to improving the site and its linkages with the new stations. Consequently, the JLE has been a major part of a series of public sector initiatives to raise the profile of the area.

CT6 Brunswick Wharf

This site is around 800 metres as the crow flies from the JLE station. But, and it is a very large but, access to it on foot is all but impossible due to the presence of the river Lea. Access to the JLE is practical via the DLR, however, one stop away.

The former Brunswick Wharf now known as Virginia Quay was approved by LDDC in December 1997. By March 2002 Phases 1 & 2 were complete with 3 & 4 under construction. The scheme consists of 620 flats and 3 storey town houses. Flats are in blocks of up to 14 floors and include a restaurant and a site for a new school. The Barratts scheme was started in Spring 1998 and is due for completion in 2002.

Development aspirations for the site changed between the late 1980s and early 1990s. An earlier route for the JLE was to pass through this area with a station providing direct access to London Bridge and Waterloo as well as Canary Wharf. The aspiration was for the site to be an extension of the Canary Wharf business location. The announcement of the final JLE route in 1991, however, took it on a more southerly course to serve the north Greenwich peninsular, thus leaving the Brunswick site without access to the JLE. This is likely to have impacted negatively on the viability of the site as an office location. However, this also came at a time when the office market had begun to rapidly decline and speculative office development in the Canary Wharf area as a whole had almost ceased. It is therefore difficult to gauge the relative impact of each turn of events.

The conclusion is that the decisions about the JLE appear to have influenced the course of events on this site. The lower level of public transport accessibility finally agreed is probably adequate for the (final) residential use of the site, but would have been insufficient to support it as an office location. Whatever the influences, this was the outcome.

CT7 Victoria Docks

This large site at the south western corner of the Royal Victoria Dock is about 1200 to 1800 metres from the JLE station, and partly opposite the Barrier Point case study site already discussed. As with that site, walking to the JLE station is not an attractive option, but are buses through the site itself which link to the station.

By March 2002 the site was fully developed with housing and few ancillary facilities.

The history of applications and development on this site reflects the state of the property market during the 1980's and 1990's, in particular with a shift from commercial to residential-led development. There is little evidence that the construction of the JLE had any impact on the decision or timing of development on the site. The scheme that was finally implemented had many similar elements to the original 1988 proposal before the JLE route was confirmed.

The overall conclusion is of no JLE impact other than its presence as an additional marketing factor for the new dwellings.

WH1 – Rick Roberts Way

This site lies 1100-1400 metres walking distance from West Ham station, involving a tortuous route with an extremely unpleasant and unsafe environment. There is a pedestrian only route which cuts the distance to 800 metres but being through derelict land, poorly maintained and not being overlooked, this is not perceived as sufficiently safe to be a realistic option.

Consequently, until such time as a new direct and properly designed link is available to link the site to the JLE at West Ham, it is not realistic to expect that the JLE had any impact on development. The development that has occurred is mostly business use and clearly relates to the road network rather than to public transport services.

At March 2002 the site had been transformed with the building of Rick Roberts Way from north to south across the site joining the old Union Street and Abbey Lane as it curves to run along Channelsea River.

Within the site there have been three large units constructed. Two (in the north and centre of the site) belong to Kesslers International and include delivery facilities and extensive car parking up to the tube depot/river edge in the east. These high quality units include offices to service their main industrial function.

The third unit is occupied by a BMW showroom and repair centre in the southern part of the site located between the river and the gas depot.

The western part of the site (bounded by the new Rick Roberts Way) had yet to be developed but there was evidence of site preparation under way (soil decontamination).

A number of factors may have combined to influence the development including support and funding by the Stratford Development Partnership and English Partnerships in site and access preparation. The development by Kesslers was linked to operational requirements rather than the JLE.

The overall conclusion is that the JLE had no influence on the type, scale, or timing of development on this site.

WH2 – Bromley by Bow Gas Works

This large site lies between 500 and 1500 metres from West Ham JLE station. However Bromley-by-Bow District station is closer (about 4 minutes walk), giving direct access to the City as well as the West End.

For the review in March 2002 the site is split into several distinct elements that cover a range of uses and states of development.

- 1 The northern part of the site – north of Twelvetrees Crescent remained a Transco compound and gas works – the holders are grade II listed structures.
- 2 South of Twelvetrees Crescent there were some completed parcels and some that remained under construction or awaiting development. This area was to be turned into Prologis Park.
- 3 To the west of the southern spur of Twelvetrees Crescent is the large Dudleys warehouse/depot and distribution centre with associated servicing and car parking – this relatively recent construction was built over the old London Gas Museum.
- 4 The area south of Twelvetrees Crescent that is not within the Dudleys depot is being constructed as Prologis Park by Fitzpatrick. Two units have been constructed and a further two or three being built. Those being built include Unit B which is 140800 sq ft of industrial warehousing that will be available Summer 2002. That already built includes Unit C which is a 14000 sq ft industrial warehouse with 30% office space.
- 5 North and east of the southern spur of Twelvetrees Crescent is an area of land with a variety of uses centred on the Memorial Gardens. Part of the site is a depot, part is vacant and part is a construction site. The old gas works company building also lies vacant adjacent to the gardens. Bromley by Bow gas works and Memorial gardens are designated (in the UDP) as sites of nature conservation importance where development will be resisted.

The development of the site for employment purposes reflects UDP policies and there is no evidence that this was influenced by the proximity of the site to the JLE station. In developing a comprehensive

strategy for the site the Local authority did not include the JLE as a factor that needed to be addressed. Contributions are likely to be required towards local public transport links to enable reduced reliance on the car for staff on the site, but this again is not specifically a JLE impact.

WH3 – Channelsea Business Park

This site is close to West Ham station but with somewhat awkward access between the two. Although the main site entrance is from Canning Road, there is also an unofficial entrance via Crowe Road that runs along the railway line above West Ham Station. As with all the West Ham case study sites, considerable remodelling of the local road network will be required to allow new development effectively to address the West Ham interchange.

The March 2002 position was as follows:

The Channelsea site also represents a complicated land parcel with a variety of existing uses and proposals in the pipeline.

- 1 The north eastern part of the site is the active Abbey Trading Point which is a series of light industrial, storage, distribution and warehouse outlets some of which are in the process of being refurbished. One unit is for sale but there are no signs of development activity in this part of the site.
- 2 On the western side of Canning Road is a vacant building on a semi-derelict site but there are no obvious development opportunities.
- 3 The site is split by the east-west Greenways bridleway that then overlooks the larger southern portion.
- 4 In the western half of the site are the only significant buildings, based around Channel Sea House, which despite having offices to let is active. Adjoining this office block are a small number of light industrial units.
- 5 On the eastern half of the site is a major electricity pylon, which will hinder development of that part of the site. To the south of the pylon are a series of one-storey buildings that are actively being used but the use is unknown. The remainder of the land is vacant scrub.

An application was lodged towards the end of 2001 for a change of use of the existing small office buildings (plus a new extension) to a place of worship. This followed a 1999 outline application for the Redevelopment of the site for mixed-use development comprising

B1/B2, D1, A1/A3, C3, C1 use. The application was submitted by a local Muslim Trust who intend to use a large part of the development for religious and cultural purposes. The development includes a mosque with potential capacity for 2,500 people, with an additional medical centre (25,000sqm), education study centre (6,000sqm), B1 and B2 office use (16,000sqm) and guesthouse / hotel with adjoining open space.

The council's aspirations for the area are to capitalise on proximity to the JLE and ensure comprehensive high quality schemes development. Negotiations were continuing into 2002 to secure the best possible scheme.

Overall, the JLE has had an impact on the planning of the area, but development interest has not immediately been in tune with the Council's aspirations as set out in local framework plans (see policy section of the report).

WH4 – Manor Road: Pretoria Goods Yard

This site lies 500 metres south of West Ham station. It has a completed residential scheme.

There is little evidence of any JLE impact on this site. The development took place in the early years of the JLE's development with permissions being granted before the commitment had been made to the construction of the route. It is likely that for this reason and the incremental manner in which the site was developed there was little consideration given to its proximity to the proposed station from either the applicants or the Council.