



# Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 28-30 January and  
5 February 2009

Site visit made on 6 February 2009

by **Roland Punshon** BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

Decision date:  
20 March 2009

---

## Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/A/08/2085786

### Essex Wharf, Lea Bridge Road, London E5 9RL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by A Cole Esq. against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
- The application Ref 2007/2341, dated 18 December 2007, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2008.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing building and redevelopment of site for Class C3 residential use for 167 units, associated car parking, cycle parking, refuse storage areas, hard and soft landscaping and improved vehicle and pedestrian access from Lea Bridge Road.

---

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Procedural matters

2. Since the close of the Inquiry I have been provided with a signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking given by the appellant pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Amongst other things, the Unilateral Undertaking would commit the appellant to making financial contributions towards various matters including environmental improvements and transport and highways improvements. I deal with these matters as part of my consideration of the third and fourth main issues which I set out below. The Council has informed me that it considers the form of the Unilateral Undertaking to be acceptable.

## Main issues

3. I consider that the main issues in this case are:
    - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area by reason of any lack of visual permeability, lack of variety and articulation in the elevations and roofscape, visual impact on the river frontage, choice of materials and general massing;
    - Whether the proposal makes best available provision for outlook, light and sunlight in the interests of the living conditions of future residents;
    - Whether the proposal incorporates adequate measures to mitigate any adverse effects of high density development on the local transport network
-

that would otherwise arise and to reduce dependence on the private car;  
and,

- Whether the proposal incorporates adequate measures to mitigate any adverse effects of high density development on the amenity value of adjoining land and especially the Lee Valley Regional Park.

### **The development plan and other documents**

4. The development plan for the area including the appeal site includes the Waltham Forest Unitary Development Plan First Review adopted in March 2006 and the London Plan 2008. I have been referred to a large number of plan policies by the main parties and third parties and I will take these into account.
5. My attention has also been drawn to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) *Note 1: Residential Development Design Standards* and the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) *Planning Obligations* adopted in late 2008. I will give these documents appropriate weight in my decision.
6. In addition I have been referred to the Lee Valley Regional Park Plan prepared by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority which is a statutory consultee.

### **Reasons**

#### *Principles of development.*

7. At the time of the Inquiry the appeal site was disused. It had most recently been used for self-storage purposes and, for these purposes, had been occupied by stored metal storage containers. Previously it appears to have been used as a scrap metal yard and, before that, as a small estate of workshops. Whilst Policy INB3 of the Unitary Development Plan seeks to retain land in employment use, it makes clear that this does not apply where the land is not considered suitable for continued employment use on environmental, amenity or transport grounds. The policy also makes clear that, in these circumstances, use of the site for residential or commercial use will be preferred. Other plan policies seek to maximise housing provision in suitable locations. The site comprises previously-developed land at an important location – it is within the Lee Valley Regional Park, it is highly visible from Lea Bridge Road and Millfields Recreation Ground and it is at a prominent 'gateway' into the borough. In my view it is unlikely that an alternative employment use would deliver the quality of development which is demanded by this site. I am satisfied therefore that residential development is acceptable in principle.
8. In coming to this conclusion I have taken into account the provisions of the London Plan dealing with the Blue Ribbon Network (BRN) and, in particular, Policy 4C.6. This policy requires that land alongside the BRN should be prioritised in favour of those uses which specifically require a waterside location. However, in this case, there is no evidence to show that, if planning permission was to be refused on these grounds, the site would be brought into use of such purposes. No evidence has been put before me to demonstrate that there is an unmet demand for sites for uses which require a waterside location or that any such demand could not be adequately met elsewhere. The site is not an identified safeguarded wharf but I note the views put forward by a third party that it could be needed for riverside purposes in the future and should,

therefore, be protected from other development. However, there is no clear evidence to show that this would be the case. The proposal would leave open the option of access to the riverside by way of the proposed access road if this was needed in the future. In these circumstances, I am not persuaded that planning permission should be refused on these grounds.

9. Policy PSC4 of the Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan specify recommended densities of development for different locations. In areas of high accessibility the Unitary Development Plan seeks residential densities of between 200 and 450 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) but in all other areas it seeks densities of 200-250 hr/ha. The text accompanying the policy makes clear these standards should be employed flexibly and only as a guide and should not be employed as a main factor in judging whether a proposal is satisfactory. In the appeal case the proposal would have a density of over 800 hr/ha. Despite the site being in a location where statistical analysis shows that accessibility levels are relatively poor, the Council is satisfied that this density of development is acceptable in principle provided that the quality of development is high and other plan policies are satisfied. Having regard to the terms of the policy and its accompanying text, I agree with this assessment.

*First main issue - Design*

10. The River Lea runs approximately north to south in a broad, flat flood plain and, in the vicinity of the appeal site, the watercourse is close to its western side. The site is contained in a meander of the river which projects towards the west and is immediately north of the Lea Bridge which carries the A104 over the river. It is not disputed by any of the parties at the Inquiry that the appeal site is important in many ways. The site is prominently located at a main gateway into the borough and is very prominent from Millfields Recreation Ground and surrounding properties on the western side of the river. It is located at an entrance from the main road system into the Lee Valley Regional Park. The character of land on either side of the river at this point is markedly different. To the west the land levels fall to the river and the character of the area is distinctly urban with dense, mainly residential, development surrounding the formal open space of the Recreation Ground with its regimented lines of mature trees. To the east of the river the 'marshland' environment is much flatter and is in a semi-natural state forming Metropolitan Open Space (MOS) with areas important to nature conservation. The Ice Centre with its large surface level car park is immediately to the east of the site. However, that structure is so distinctly different to the development on the western side of the river in terms of its design, colour and character that the contrast between the 2 landscapes is maintained.
11. The site lies on the boundary of these contrasting landscapes. Despite the presence of the Ice Centre building, from the western side of the river the difference in character is clearly discernible. From footpaths and cycleways in the Regional Park the contrast is even more striking with the line of development following the western river bank being clearly visible. The design of any development on the appeal site needs to be sympathetic to this unusual context whilst also having regard to national guidance and advice on design and the efficient use of land.

12. In developing the design of the appeal proposal the appellant has taken the maximum height of new residential development on the western side of the river as a cue for overall vertical scale. The Council has no objection to 7 storey buildings as a matter of principle and I agree that a building with a degree of vertical stature would be appropriate in this 'gateway' location alongside the river bridge. However, even to the west of the river the existing development is not consistently 7 storeys in height and there are considerable variations in the number of storeys both within these new developments and within other, older developments nearby. Whilst the recessing of the top floor of the proposed buildings would reduce their apparent vertical scale from close range, from more distant views this device, together with the employment of bay widths which reflect terraced housing, would do little to mask the true bulk of the buildings. Despite its design differences, the proposal's general scale would reflect the more urban elements of development on the west side of the river and it would substantially complete the enclosure of Millfields Recreation Ground on all 4 sides. In my view, from the Recreation Ground and from Lea Bridge Road, the existing contrast between the urban area and the 'marshland' landscape would be largely masked by the proposal and, because of its similarities in terms of scale and modern design, the proposal would be seen as an extension of the development to the west of the river rather than as an interface which reinforces the distinctive character of the 2 landscapes. From the 'marshlands' to the east, a development of this scale would be seen as a clear intrusion on to the eastern side of the river. Clearly the appellant is seeking to make the most efficient and effective use of the site in line with national guidance in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3: *Housing*. However, that guidance makes clear that design which is inappropriate in its context or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted. In this particular case I consider that the design would be harmful to the existing context.
13. A considerable amount of evidence was presented to the Inquiry regarding the concept of 'visual permeability'. This was an objective of the appellant's architect in designing the appeal proposal. However, there appeared to be some misunderstanding of the meaning of the term. The Council and others had taken the term to mean the ability to see through the development to the landscape which lies behind. However, the appellant argued that it was a wider concept describing the perception that a person could pass through the development and around the buildings. He argued that, whilst it may comprise part of that wider concept, the ability to see through the development was not an objective in itself. In my opinion any successful development of this site should maintain a perception of the contrast between the urban and the 'marshland' landscapes. I consider that it is essential that users of Lea Bridge Road, Millfields Recreation Ground and the surrounding development should be able to perceive the different landscape character of the 'marshlands' behind the appeal proposal and vice versa. Any development of the appeal site is likely to have an impact on this perception. However, whilst I accept that there is no policy or guidance which requires that development of the site should achieve this type of visual permeability, I find it difficult to see how it could be successfully achieved without a degree of inter-visibility between the 2 areas. The proposed layout of buildings would allow some views from the vicinity of Lea Bridge Road through gaps between the blocks towards the open land at the rear. However, these views would be relatively narrow and would only be

available from a limited number of locations. The proposed glazed sections of the structures and the 'sky garden' in Block B would permit additional views through the buildings but would be insufficient in my opinion to make the proposal acceptable in this regard. Their consistent height would prevent any perception of space behind the blocks by preventing views over the buildings and I am satisfied that, from large parts of Millfields Recreation Ground and Lea Bridge Road and the Regional Park, the proposed buildings would present an overlapping barrier to the appreciation of the relationship to the landscape which lies beyond. Whilst the development would, from most angles, be discernible as 3 blocks, I do not consider that the degree of separation employed would be sufficient to permit ready appreciation of the spaces behind. I accept that important views from the riverside walks towards the open spaces to the north would be maintained. However, this would not, in my opinion, be sufficient to ensure that appreciation of the relationship was retained.

14. The proposed buildings would be set back from the river bank behind communal and private garden areas. This arrangement would have advantages in terms of security and in the provision of on-site facilities for residents. However, despite this, the 7 storey structures, without significant variation or articulation in their height, roofscapes or main elevations would, in my opinion, tend to tower over the river and would dominate the riverside walks on the opposite bank. I agree with the views expressed at the Inquiry by the appellant's representatives that a single, continuous 7 storey development following the river bank could prevent the establishment of a proper relationship between the landscapes on either side of the river. However, I do not consider that the proposed layout pays sufficient regard to the pronounced meander of the river and would appear somewhat at odds with this distinctly curved river frontage. A development comprising a number of smaller blocks with a varying number of storeys may be more successful in reflecting the riverside location whilst also allowing appreciation of space behind the buildings by way of views over and between the structures.
15. The design of the riverside frontage of the building makes considerable use of oak louvred screens. These are designed to reflect wharveside architecture, to provide a sympathetic backdrop to trees on the Recreation Ground and to reduce the vertical emphasis of the building. In general terms I consider that this treatment is acceptable although acceptance that such a device is needed to reduce the vertical emphasis of the building indicates to me that the essential scale of development employed may be flawed. Without the screening I consider that the building would appear plain and undistinguished. The Council argues that the treatment is somewhat 'fussy and overworked'. While there may be some merit in this argument, I do not consider that the result is so unacceptable that planning permission should be refused on these grounds alone. The end walls of the buildings would be formed from plain stonework panels although the oak louvred screens would 'wrap-around' the corners. As a contrast to the busier detailing of the riverside frontage, I consider that the materials proposed are acceptable. Much plainer detailing has been employed on the elevations of the buildings facing towards the 'marshlands' and Ice Centre. Again I consider that this approach is acceptable as it would reduce the stridency of the structures when viewed across the flat landscape.

16. In these circumstances I conclude on the first main issue that, whilst the external materials are generally acceptable, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area by reason of lack of visual permeability, lack of variety and articulation in the elevations and roofscape, visual impact on the river frontage and general massing. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies SP1, SP2, SP13, BHE1, BHE2 and HSG4 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 4B.1 of The London Plan.

*Second main issue - Living conditions of future residents*

17. Being located between the river and Millfields Recreation Ground to the west and the more natural environment of the 'marshlands' to the north and east, the site presents the opportunity to take advantages of both of these features in terms of outlook for local residents. However, the proposed arrangement of the blocks would result in a significant number of single aspect units having an outlook towards the north east and directly towards the Ice Centre and its car park. A different orientation of the buildings could have allowed outlook more directly towards the 'marshlands' or across the car park towards the 'marshlands. I accept that this alternative outlook would be more directly towards the north but, with a more careful positioning of those units with only a single aspect, I am satisfied that a layout which made more of the opportunities presented by the site could have resulted.

18. No evidence was put to the Inquiry to show that the amount of natural light reaching any of the proposed apartments would be below normally accepted standards. However, where the apartment involved would be single aspect, efforts should be made to ensure that that aspect is orientated to receive the maximum amount of light. I am not persuaded that this design does that.

19. The Council argues that the shape of some of the proposed rooms exacerbates the limitations on outlook and light imposed by the orientation of the buildings. I agree that some of the proposed rooms are relatively deep compared to their width and are unusual shapes. However, no evidence has been put before me to show that the rooms are in any way deficient in terms of overall size and, in the final analysis, it would be open to future occupiers to judge whether or not the rooms were acceptable before moving into the development.

20. In overall terms, I take the view that the proposal does not make the most of the opportunities which are presented by the site to achieve the best living conditions for future residents. However, I do not consider that, if this was the only deficiency of the proposal, that it would be sufficient, by itself, to warrant the refusal of permission. Nonetheless, it is, in my opinion, symptomatic of the failure of the design to fully respect its context.

21. In these circumstances I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal does not make best available provision for outlook in the interests of the living conditions of future residents. Whilst I do not consider that this, in itself, would provide a reason for refusal it reinforces my conclusion on the first main issue that the design is unacceptable.

*Third main issue - Effects on the local transport network*

22. The Council assesses the relative accessibility of sites to the public transport network by a statistical analysis of walk access times and service availability. It

was not disputed that these measures, referred to as Public Transport Accessibility Levels or PTALs, are widely used by local planning authorities in London. At the Inquiry I was informed that, whilst the Council would seek the most efficient use of land and the highest appropriate density of development, in some cases the policies of both the Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan limit densities on those sites which have a low PTAL rating. Essentially higher densities are permitted in more accessible locations. In the appeal case, where very high density is proposed in a location which has a relatively low PTAL rating, the Council is seeking contributions towards measures which would improve accessibility by more sustainable modes of travel. In principle I consider that this approach is reasonable provided that it is operated in a pragmatic manner within the terms of national and local guidance.

23. As part of my consideration of the appeal and site visit I carried out my own assessment of the accessibility of the site. I accept the findings of the Council on accessibility to trains and buses and have noted the distances which would be involved in accessing these services. I also noted that the site is at a focus of cycle and walking routes and that a wide range of local facilities are close at hand. However, the density of development proposed is well outside the range set by policy for a site with this PTAL rating and I am satisfied that, for this reason, improvements should be made which would improve accessibility by more sustainable modes. In these circumstances I am satisfied that the appellant should make a contribution towards improving general accessibility.
24. The Council's *Planning Obligations* SPD sets out standard contributions which will be sought in respect of transport accessibility improvements. The standard contribution for the appeal proposal would be £76,400. At the Inquiry the Council confirmed that, in accordance with national guidance, these standard rates are not applied as a 'blanket' policy to all developments. It also pointed out that the SPD permitted the requirement of additional contributions in exceptional cases. The Council argues that the proposal is such a case and sets out a list of 8 specific improvements towards which it considers the appellant should pay contributions. Excluding the 'car club provision', which the Council accepted could be provided directly by the appellant, the total contribution sought by the Council for transport accessibility improvements is £181,300.
25. The Council's case for considering that the proposal should be treated as an exceptional case is based on the site's low PTAL score, the high density proposed, the poor accessibility of the site and the impact of parking provision on the viability of the 'car club' proposals. Dealing first with the PTAL score, information submitted to the Inquiry indicates that, in large areas of the district PTAL ratings of 'very poor', 'poor' and 'moderate' are common. Ratings of 'good' and above are confined to a few small areas. The Council's SPD was presumably drawn up with this knowledge. In these circumstances it is difficult to see why a poor PTAL score should be treated as being exceptional when such scores are the norm. Turning to the issue of density, it is undeniable that the proposed density is very high. However, a high density brings with it increased contributions as the standard contributions are levied on the basis of a charge made against each dwelling. A greater number of dwellings will therefore require greater contributions when the standard charges are applied. I am not persuaded, therefore, that high density should automatically qualify a

proposal as an exceptional case. Regarding accessibility, the Council's case is based on there being only one site access. However, given the limited size of the site, local facilities and services would be readily accessible to all occupants of the proposed development. I do not consider that the claimed lack of accessibility is sufficient reason to consider that the site should be treated as exceptional. As I have already mentioned, the appellant has opted to take responsibility for the 'car club'. I am not persuaded that the level of car parking provision proposed which falls well short of one space per dwelling would be sufficient to render such a scheme unviable. Having considered these matters I can see few grounds for considering that the proposal should be treated as an exceptional case. In these circumstances the appellant should, at most, pay a contribution based on the standard charges in the SPD.

26. Circular 05/2005: *Planning Obligations* states that planning obligations are intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms and sets out tests which need to be satisfied. It goes on to state that it will in general be reasonable to seek a planning obligation if what is sought is necessary in order to bring a development in line with the objectives of sustainable development as articulated through national guidance and local planning policies.
27. I accept that national guidance and local policies seek generally to enhance accessibility by more sustainable modes of transport. However, I note that the Transport Assessment submitted with the original application identified no specific deficiencies in accessibility and, at that time, none were identified by the Council. I have considered the 7 specific improvements (excluding the 'car club' provision) which the Council now requires to improve accessibility. The 7 improvements would each provide a benefit to residents of the proposal to a greater or lesser degree and, as a package, would improve accessibility thereby contributing to the general policy aims of improved accessibility and overall sustainability. However, in my opinion, none of the measures, by themselves, meet the test of being necessary to make the development acceptable. In most cases the works appear to remedy perceived deficiencies in the existing accessibility network. Whilst I accept that the appellant should contribute towards general improvements in accessibility, these contributions should be commensurate with the amount of benefit which would accrue to residents of the proposed apartments and to the impact that the development would have on the network. No evidence was produced to demonstrate that failure to provide any of the specified improvements would make the proposal unacceptable by imposing any intolerable burdens on the transport network.
28. A considerable amount of Inquiry time was spent examining the requirement to contribute towards making the Kings Head footbridge accessible by disabled residents. In my view the benefits which would accrue to disabled residents of the proposal and residents seeking access to cycling routes would be limited as I agree with the appellant that access to the west bank of the river by way of Lea Bridge Road is likely to be just as convenient. In my opinion the improvement works are not made necessary by the proposal and the requirement to contribute £100,000 towards them is disproportionate to the benefits to accessibility which would accrue to future residents.
29. Similarly I do not consider that there are any grounds for arguing that street lighting improvements are made necessary by the proposal. I visited the site

during the hours of darkness and I consider that the existing lighting is quite safe. No evidence was put before me to show that this level of lighting would be made inadequate by reason of the increased pedestrian movements which would arise from the proposal.

30. I conclude on the third main issue that the appellant should contribute towards a package of measures to improve the accessibility of the proposal. However, I do not consider that there are grounds for treating the proposal as an exceptional case or that the specific measures required by the Council meet the test of necessity set by Circular 05/2005. In my view a contribution in line with the standard charges set by the Council's SPD would be appropriate and the Council could divide this between the measures which it requires as it sees fit. In these circumstances and having regard to the provisions of the Unilateral Undertaking, I conclude that the proposal would incorporate adequate measures to mitigate any adverse effects of high density development on the local transport network that would otherwise arise and would reduce dependence on the private car and, in this respect, would comply with Policies SP18, TSP4, TSP5 and TSP9 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Council's *Planning Obligations* SPD and Policy 4B.5 of The London Plan.

*Fourth main issue - Effects on the amenity value of adjoining land*

31. In the officer's Report on the planning application the view was expressed that the provision being made for amenity open space within the site was 'reasonable' and 'acceptable' in terms of level and quality. At the Inquiry the Council argued that, whilst the level and quality of on-site provision was adequate, the proposal would put pressure on the open space of the Regional Park. The Council's *Planning Obligations* SPD states that a standard charge will be levied on new residential development to secure enhancements of local open space where on-site provision is inadequate. Given the Council's expressed view on the matter, I can see no clear reason for applying the standard charge in this case. Inevitably, residents of the proposal would make use of the Regional Park. However, given the amount of open space provision on the appeal site, the proximity to Millfields Recreation Ground and the extent of the adjacent Regional Park, I am not persuaded that this level of increased use would be sufficient to cause harm to the Regional Park particularly as I heard evidence which indicated that the Park Authority was seeking to increase use and awareness of the facility which the Park provides. I note the advice in PPG17: *Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation* concerning the use of planning obligations in respect of open space provision. However, in this case I can see no local deficiencies in quantity or quality which would require the appellant to make contributions towards provision or enhancement.
32. I accept that the proposed development would mask an important entrance to the Regional Park from parts of Lea Bridge Road, Millfields Recreation Ground and the river towpath. It would, therefore, be appropriate for the appellant to make an appropriate contribution towards the cost of improving the entrance and its associated signage in line with the requirements of Policies ENV13 and ENV16 of the Unitary Development Plan. Without these improvements the entrance to the park would become even more visually insignificant than it is already.

33. Amongst other things Unitary Development Plan Policy ENV22 seeks tree planting as part of developments. The Council's SPD sets out a standard formula for the number of trees required. Clearly some of the required trees could be planted as part of a landscaping scheme on open spaces within the site. The remainder could be planted within the Regional Park which would soften the visual appearance of the development and would offset any damage caused by increased usage arising from the proposal. While I accept that it would be appropriate for the appellant to make this contribution, I consider that it should be limited to that tree planting which cannot be satisfactorily accommodated on the site.
34. The Council has suggested a range of other environmental improvements for which appellant contributions are sought including improvements to the towpath and riverside, new footpaths, disabled access to Kings Head footbridge and treatment of the gas pipe alongside the bridge. Whilst I accept that residents of the proposal would benefit from these works, I do not consider that any of them meets the test of necessity set by Circular 05/2005.
35. I conclude on the fourth main issue that, whilst there are no grounds for seeking standard contributions for the enhancement of adjacent open spaces, the appellant should contribute to tree planting outside the appeal site and to works for improving the entrance to the Regional Park and its associated signage. In these circumstances and having regard to the provisions of the Unilateral Undertaking, I conclude that the proposal would incorporate adequate measures to mitigate any adverse effects of high density development on the amenity value of adjoining land and especially the Lee Valley Regional Park and would comply with Policies SP1, SP2, HSG4, BHE1 C) and BHE10 of the Unitary Development Plan.

#### *Conclusion*

36. I have concluded that, subject to the provisions of the Unilateral Undertaking to ensure financial contributions of the scale which I have set out, the proposal incorporates adequate measures to mitigate any adverse effects of high density development on the local transport network and on the amenity value of adjoining land. I have also concluded that the proposal does not make best available provision for outlook in the interests of the living conditions of future residents although this, in itself, would not provide a reason for refusal. However, I have concluded on the first main issue that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. For this reason I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Roland Punshon*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr E Robb	of Counsel
He called	
Mr R Preswell BSc (Hons), DipUD	Programme Manager Urban Design Team
Mr Parr BA (Hons), MSc, MIHT, MTPS	Senior Transport Planner
Mr J Price Hons degree, DipTP, MRTPI	Section Manager Development Control/Management Team

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr N Cameron	of Counsel
He called	
Mr P R Tuppeny BA Arch (Hons), DipArch, RIBA, ARB	TuppenyCarter Architects Ltd
Mr P Brookes BSc, BArch RIBA, ACI Arb	Paul Brookes Architects
Mr P Silcock BSc, MIHT	EAS Transport Planning Ltd
Mr K Rushe BA TP, DipTP, MRTPI	Dalton Warner Davis

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr Wilkinson	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
Ms K Andrews	New Lammas Lands Defence Committee
Mrs E Bayliss	Millfields Users Group
Mr R Gillham MA, BSc (Eng), C Eng	Waltham Forest Open Spaces and Nature Conservation Group
Mr D Brenner	The Regent's Network

### DOCUMENTS:

Document 1	Lists of persons attending the Inquiry
Document 2	Copies of letters informing interested persons of the Inquiry arrangements
Document 3	Officer's Report on the appeal application
Document 4	Costings for improvements to the Leyton Marsh Ice Centre entrance
Document 5	Copy of e-mail from Mr Rushe to Mr Price re environmental improvements contribution
Document 6	Statements by Mr Wilkinson
Document 7	Letter from Millfield Users' Group
Document 8	Lea Valley Heritage Trail leaflet
Document 9	Memo from Head of Planning and Development to Mr Price
Documents 10, 11 & 12	Supplementary submissions by Mr Parr – extract from Planning Obligations SPD, Transport Assessment and Walk Distances
Document 13	Draft Unilateral Undertaking

Document 14	Map of Sustrans routes
Document 15	Map of 'Green Crisp of Olympic Routes'
Document 16	Lea Valley Area Framework documents
Document 17	East London Green Grid Plan
Document 18	Statement by Mr Brenner
Document 19	Statement of Common Ground between the appellant and the Council
Document 20	East London Green Grid Framework SPG
Document 21	Statement, letter and plan by Mr Gillham
Document 22	Draft Unilateral Undertaking received 18 February 2009
Document 23	Completed Unilateral Undertaking received 6 March 2009

PLANS:

Plans A-R	The drawings submitted with the appeal application
-----------	--