

# LB Newham Core Strategy Submission

## Statement of Consultation

### (Engagement Evidence Base)

#### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 LDF Regulations<sup>1</sup> require a statement of consultation to set out the details of representations invited and made under formal provisions in line with the Statement of Community Involvement. This statement seeks to fulfil this obligation, whilst also demonstrating the wide range of other mechanisms by which community and other stakeholders' views and knowledge have been reflected in the development of the Core Strategy. This is in line with broader principles of community engagement, and the Council's duty to consult, an approach encouraged by PPS12.
- 1.2 As such this statement draws together in summary various reports of consultation already published<sup>2</sup>, and the background work undertaken by the team that has collated and recorded all sources of engagement and the messages delivered through them into a series of topic and thematic engagement logs. This system has ensured that each policy and its reasoned justification can be directly related back to what people have told us.

#### **2. Formal Regulation 25 Consultation**

##### **What?**

- 2.1 Regulation 25 consultation requires the local planning authority to invite stakeholders to make representations as to the scope and content of a DPD. This is typically referred to as the formal 'Issues and Options' consultation. In Newham, this involved the publication of an [Issues and Options Report](#) (February 2008) and associated exhibition material which was presented at venues across the borough to stimulate discussion.
- 2.2 This document encouraged responses under a number of themes:
- Building homes that are affordable to you and future generations
  - How we move around Newham
  - Quality of design and enjoyment of surroundings
  - Care of our environment
  - Community Facilities
  - Jobs
  - Health and well-being
  - Open space and public space
  - Education and training facilities
  - Town centres that offer a wide range of facilities
  - Safety and security

---

<sup>1</sup> Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as amended 2008

<sup>2</sup> See [www.newham.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.newham.gov.uk/planningpolicy)

It also proposed 3 spatial options for consideration – prioritising employment, mixed use or housing. The Sustainability Appraisal scoping report was also consulted on at this stage.

## Who?

2.3 As the Core Strategy [Issues and Options Consultation Report](#) (May 2010) details, in addition to the Specific ('Statutory') consultation bodies specified by the Regulations, a wide range of other individuals and groups on the LDF database ('General Consultation bodies' or other stakeholders) were contacted with details of the consultation and invited to make representations. The consultation was also advertised in the Newham Recorder, online, and at exhibition venues to invite participation from individuals.

## How?

2.4 Representations were invited in writing: via email, letter or through the Council's consultation portal, with a questionnaire being used to encourage structured responses at events.

### **3. Other consultation input prior to publication of the draft Core Strategy**

3.1 Following the Issues and Options consultation, it was recognised that there were a number of gaps to be addressed to ensure that we progressed a Core Strategy with widespread support. The limitations of conventional approaches to consultation on planning documents were also increasingly evident, particularly in terms of limited residents' interest, the danger of consultation fatigue and duplication of effort.

3.2 In response, it was decided that a more holistic approach should be taken, drawing together what people were telling us in a variety of ways, (i.e. not just through formal Core Strategy consultations) to form an engagement evidence base common to the whole of the LDF, as with the technical evidence base. In doing so, formal consultations on other LDF documents were also clearly of relevance, as were member enquiries, corporate surveys and other work done routinely by the corporate research and engagement teams. Residents would also be targeted on their own terms, with more engaging activity-based work.

3.3 Beyond this a series of discrete stages were conceived of to take forward through focused targeted engagement with stakeholders. These were: agreeing a common vision; agreeing an evidence base (ensuring the evidence base reflects local knowledge, needs etc, and is subject to 'peer review'); [Choices for the Core Strategy](#) (consultation on policy directions and options with opportunity to suggest alternatives).

What/why ? (activity set)	Date(s)	Who?	Comments
Regulatory consultation on other LDF documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Control Policy Manual (DCPM) Issues and Options</li> <li>- Forest Gate SPD - draft</li> <li>- Stratford and Lower Lea Valley AAP (SLVAAP) Issues and Options</li> </ul> Including exhibitions, focus groups, workshops, questionnaires, written representations	Dec 2008 Summer 2009 Autumn 2009	Local residents and all general and specific consultation bodies invited to participate	Extensive consultations on parts of the borough/more detailed issues but where strategic matters can still be identified.
Agreeing a common vision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Workshops</li> </ul>	Sept 2009- January 2010	Officers from across the Council, members, youth council, local strategic stakeholders (public, private, voluntary and community)	Average 18 attendees across 9 workshops

What/why ? (activity set)	Date(s)	Who?	Comments
<p>Agreeing an evidence base</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Resident/business surveys feeding into Employment Land, Housing, Town Centre and Retail studies</li> <li>- Stakeholder workshops (housing)</li> <li>- Combined stakeholder workshop - critiquing the evidence base</li> <li>- Joint Economic Development Strategy/LDF stakeholder workshop – evidence base implications</li> <li>- Supplementary meetings with specialist groups/key stakeholders as necessary (including neighbouring authorities)</li> </ul>	September 2009- Sept 2010	Local residents and businesses (surveys) Expert and other local strategic (public, private and voluntary/community sector) stakeholders	<p>Survey sample size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Housing 1800 (200 per community forum area)</li> <li>- Business c.300 (retail) c. 200 other.</li> <li>- Retail customers 1000</li> </ul> <p>Stakeholder workshop: around 25 participants</p> <p>Combined stakeholder events: 45-75 people at 2 events</p>
<p>Core Strategy Choices document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meetings with members</li> <li>- Stakeholder Workshops</li> <li>- Inter- authority liaison meeting</li> <li>- Written representations</li> </ul> <p>See also ongoing community engagement (LDF)</p>	November – December 2010	Expert and other local strategic (public, private and voluntary/community sector) stakeholders	Approx 70 written responses and attendance of c.50 people at stakeholder event.
<p>Ongoing community engagement (LDF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mayor's Show interactive activity re issues and spatial preferences</li> <li>- Photography competition – favourite places</li> <li>- Postcards re neighbourhoods, work, travel to work and Core Strategy proposals</li> </ul>	July 2009 May 2010 Summer 2010 (and ongoing)	Local residents. Limited equalities monitoring demonstrated a reasonable cross section being achieved.	<p>57 postcards filled in 2009, c. 60 entries to photography competition; c.380 postcards filled in 2010</p> <p>People also invited by extensive poster campaign in local libraries and via local community groups and centres to send us postcards during the Choices consultation.</p>
<p>Ongoing community engagement to ensure corporate strategies reflect local needs and views (Corporate)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Corporate surveys (Liveability, Annual Residents' etc)</li> <li>- SCS/LDF/Corporate equalities strategy focus groups</li> <li>- Emails and letters from local residents and businesses (via members etc)</li> </ul>	Annual surveys, Focus groups 2010.	Representative cross section of residents, and top up targeted work (with disabled people, carers, older people, young adults, LBGT people, people with families, deaf people, housed Irish travellers, housed Roma, children in care, the Youth Council and BAME groups)	<p>Representatively stratified where organised, with sample sizes of 1000+</p> <p>Annual surveys provide for useful monitoring material and ensure regular updates.</p> <p>Some issues (e.g. takeaways/high streets) feature prominently in member enquiries, whilst others receive none.</p>
<p>Ongoing liaison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meetings with colleagues across the Council with knowledge and interests that need to be reflected in the LDF</li> <li>- Meetings with neighbouring/overlapping authorities/bodies</li> <li>- Meetings with consultants preparing other relevant documents (e.g. masterplans)</li> <li>- Meetings with members through Council governance mechanisms (lead councillor meetings, cabinet, O&amp;S, local service review boards).</li> </ul>	Ongoing	Colleagues in Housing, Major Sites, Property, Business Development, Development Control, Leisure, Education, Customer Access, Public Protection, Health Partnerships, Corporate Policy and Research; LB Waltham Forest, LB Redbridge; LB Barking and Dagenham; LB Tower Hamlets; LB Greenwich; LB Hackney; ODA; GLA; OPLC; LTGDC	Through task and finish/corporate steering group and smaller area/issue specific meetings.

#### **4. Summary of main issues raised through consultation (prior to publication of draft Core Strategy) and how they have been taken into account**

4.1 The following tables summarise the main issues raised by consultation by spatial area and theme, and identify how they have been taken forward into the Core Strategy as appropriate, or otherwise addressed.

## Stratford and West Ham

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation (SLLVAAP, DCPM); Visioning; Agreeing an evidence base; Choices consultation; ongoing liaison with neighbouring authorities.	<b>Stratford as a Metropolitan Centre</b>	Various - esp. development interests, statutory consultees (GLA, ODA, Met Police, LTGDC, LB Waltham Forest) and other public agencies (HCA); also residents; VCS/Interest Groups	<b>Stratford</b> needs to develop a <b>complementary role</b> to Stratford City; independent shops, market(s), better public realm and pedestrian access and a more developed (consolidated, stronger) cultural quarter including HE/education uses are desirable - this will probably require active intervention (or else fringe location); has most potential for <b>offices</b> due to its accessibility, also <b>tall buildings</b> (but sensitivity of some heritage assets - conservation areas); <b>boundary</b> of town centre needs to be expanded to include Stratford City in order to benefit from investment potential; not just a floor-space consideration to make it function as a Metropolitan centre - need to specify what's needed - physical barriers , public realm; need to maintain <b>community facilities including local food role</b> - need for a new food superstore; <b>connections to other boroughs</b> is important for the movement of workers e.g. from Waltham Forest to Stratford.	Yes, see Policies S2 - Stratford & West Ham, SP1, INF1, INF2 (connections) SP4 (re tall buildings), SP5 (heritage) Tall Buildings, INF5 - town centre hierarchy, INF8 - Community Facilities, J1 – The New Economy, and relevant strategic site designations. Town Centre Boundary to be reviewed in subsequent DPD, as explained in INF5 reasoned justification, however broader economic potential recognised through designation of Stratford Metropolitan as an employment hub.	In line with broader spatial vision, responding to major opportunity for it to become a higher level centre in line with Town Centre and Retail Study, whilst setting out a spatial vision to address these matters to fulfil its potential. Scope for office development and tall buildings confirmed by Employment Land Review and Character Study together with masterplanning work. Boundary to be reviewed at a later stage to enable priority to be given to development in existing town centre to let it 'catch up'. Policy direction broadly supported in Choices consultation.
Regulatory consultation (Issues and Options – CS, SLLVAAP) Choices consultation; Ongoing member engagement.	<b>West Ham Regeneration Potential</b>	Residents, development interests, statutory consultees and other public agencies; interest groups	<b>More of a centre needed in West Ham</b> (supermarket, launderette, chemist, other community facilities) - but should not compete with other centres locally (Canning Town, Stratford). Likely that local centre scale or below is all that is justified. <b>Abbey Mills</b> - opposing views for and against a mosque, and for and against a major sports facility. Support for any faith facility to	Yes, to some extent - see Policies S2 - Stratford & West Ham, SP1 place-making, (individual place identities, connectivity); INF5 (new local centre) INF8 (new/existing	In line with broader spatial vision of place-making and regeneration potential throughout the Arc, broadly supported by Choices consultation. Retail and Character Study supports a new local centre in this

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
		(faith, local campaign/interest)	provide for multi-faith uses. Problems with large numbers of visitors in this location - good public transport access, but issues of site access. A need to identify the <b>relationship between West Ham and Stratford</b> , potential to Masterplan West Ham. <b>Concern that West Ham will miss out</b> on regeneration as a result of Stratford and Canning Town regeneration investment, more focus needed on West Ham.	community facilities), and relevant strategic site designations. Abbey Mills envisaged for mixed residential and employment uses.	area. Are strategic site opportunities to be fulfilled on a significant scale, if not as big as Stratford's. West Ham now to re-locate to Olympic Park. Site constraints limit scope for large scale community/leisure uses, and residential is likely to be needed to address these in viability terms.
Regulatory consultation (CS, SLLVAAP Issues and Options); Agreeing an evidence base; Choices consultation.	<b>Local Centres</b>	Residents, development interests, statutory consultees and other public agencies; interest groups (faith, local campaign/interest)	Mixed views as to whether a <b>new local centre is needed on High St 2012</b> given access to Stratford town centre - new local centre provision should be planned strategically with residential growth. Potential for leisure uses on Olympic Park site - well connected, as well as town centre. Support for recognition of local shopping at <b>Maryland as a local centre</b> . There is perhaps scope for a <b>local centre at West Ham</b> e.g. on opposite side of tracks (Parcelforce site) to existing shops, given development potential.	Yes, see Policies S2 - Stratford & West Ham, INF5 - Town Centre Hierarchy and Network and relevant strategic site designations. Stratford High Street not currently identified specifically as a location for a local centre given proximity to Stratford and Bromley by Bow, but scope to justify a small one there.	In line with wider spatial strategy and vision supported in Choices consultation, and evidence base. Making best use of accessible locations and promoting local accessibility, whilst carefully managing retail network and hierarchy impacts.
Regulatory consultation (Issues and Options CS and SLLVAAP); Visioning; Agreeing an Evidence Base; ongoing community engagement (LDF and corporate) ; ongoing member liaison; Choices consultation; ongoing liaison with neighbouring authorities meetings.	<b>Olympic Legacy</b>	All	The use of <b>waterways and heritage assets - activating</b> , creation of high quality <b>open space</b> ; <b>college</b> ambitions; <b>tourism and leisure</b> potential <b>and sporting/physical activity legacy</b> , plus desirable location for <b>families</b> ; need to <b>spread the benefits</b> of the legacy; <b>gypsy traveller site</b> ; appropriate <b>mix of uses</b> on sites, new uses for <b>employment land</b> , accessibility levels and appropriate <b>housing typologies</b> e.g. family housing, high density, tall buildings – opportunities for <b>exemplars</b> etc. Need to create <b>new place/communities</b> . Need for <b>integration/connections</b> – in/out to wider area and its facilities/population, but also to consider <b>wider impact, including support for small</b>	Yes, see policies SP2 - Stratford & West Ham including associated strategic sites, SP1 (place-making) and other SP policies promoting high quality design; J1 and J2 re new economy and employment land release; S1 and INF policies re infrastructure needs and strategic investment; H1 & 2 re housing mix and quality; H3 allows for specialist	In line with wider strategic spatial strategy and vision supported in Choices consultation – of key strategic significance given scale of change and degree of investment and impetus. The strategic policy implications of the Olympic legacy are broad, and must be addressed through a broad range of policy topics. More detailed matters not appropriate for the CS to be dealt with through

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
			<p><b>businesses.</b> Phasing of development must be linked with <b>infrastructure delivery. Rick Roberts Way</b> – of lesser strategic importance/relevance to plans for the area.</p>	<p>housing needs (e.g. gypsy traveller sites) to be met as required. College uses allowed for as part of land use mixes on certain sites. Rick Roberts Way to be dealt with in Site Allocations DPD.</p>	<p>subsequent DPDs (e.g. site allocations for specific community uses).</p>
<p>Regulatory consultation (CS, SLLVAAP); Choices consultation.</p>	<p><b>Sugar House/Pudding Mill/Three Mills</b></p>	<p>Residents, development interests, local businesses, statutory consultees and other public agencies, interest groups.</p>	<p>Significance of <b>heritage assets and waterways</b> - need to integrate not just use as a setting; role of <b>enabling development</b> in enhancement; sensitivity to tall buildings. Need to protect existing employers but allow for new uses at appropriate locations that are compatible with surrounding uses and proposed new <b>mix</b> on-site. The area is an example where residential development, creative industries and other industry are able to <b>coexist</b> reasonably well. Need to think about how things work <b>outside the boundaries</b> of Newham, e.g. Pudding Mill Lane is linked with Stratford, but Sugarhouse Lane is better linked with Bromley by Bow. <b>New local centre</b> may be justified fronting the High St. <b>Marshgate Lane and Bow Back Island</b>, Stratford should not be protected as industrial land. Easterly shift of industry will allow them to be re-provided in modern purpose built premises.</p>	<p>Yes, see policies S1 – (mixed use spatial strategy); S2 - Stratford &amp; West Ham, SP policies particularly SP1 (re place-making, connections), SP3 (quality design for mixed use areas); SP5 (heritage and other place-making assets; INF5 (town centre network – scope for new local centres); J1 and J2 re new economy/ employment land release.</p>	<p>In line with strategic spatial vision which recognises the clear links between these areas and the delivery of the Olympic Legacy; this includes consolidating the shift from mono traditional employment use in this area. See above re new local centre. Policy direction supported in Choices document.</p>
<p>Regulatory consultation (CS, SLLVAAP Issues and Options); Agreeing an evidence base; Choices consultation; ongoing community engagement (LDF)</p>	<p><b>Connections</b></p>	<p>Residents, public agencies; statutory consultees; development interests; local businesses; interest groups (waterways).</p>	<p>Need to be <b>improved between West Ham and Stratford</b>; role of <b>Crossrail and DLR</b> extension; need for new <b>river crossings, pedestrian routes</b>; concern re safety on the Greenway. <b>Potential of the waterways</b> to be used as connections rather than identified as barriers. The <b>road network</b> needs improvement around West Ham, there are areas difficult to access, e.g. Parcelforce site. A new <b>western entrance to Stratford station</b> is needed to make Carpenters work. <b>Key linkages</b> should be identified.</p>	<p>Yes, see policies S2 - Stratford &amp; West Ham, SP1 re connectivity; INF1 - Strategic Transport, INF2 - Sustainable transport, INF7 - Blue Ribbon Network. INF9 - infrastructure delivery, which provide strategic spatial framework for more detailed DPDs and</p>	<p>In line with strategic spatial vision to help realise potential of the area; more detailed matters to be dealt with through subsequent DPDs and SPDs. Policy direction supported in Choices document.</p>

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
				guidance to be developed within.	
Regulatory consultation (CS, SLLVAAP Issues and Options); Visioning; Agreeing an Evidence base; Choices consultation; ongoing community engagement (LDF).	Open Space	Residents, Interest Groups (heritage, waterways); statutory consultees; other public agencies.	<b>Olympic Park</b> - as a major asset, new MOL; <b>Lea River Park</b> - potential to develop southwards connecting with LVRP; <b>Three Mills</b> - difficulties presented by operational use/health and safety/private ownership, but enhancement plans; Open spaces should be <b>protected and enhanced new ones created</b> together with community uses. Potential of <b>waterways</b> as open spaces	Yes, see policies S2 - Stratford & West Ham, SP2 - Healthy Neighbourhoods, SP5 - Heritage and other Assets, INF6/7 – Green/blue Infrastructure, INF9 (delivery) and relevant strategic site designations. Details to be worked through in subsequent DPDs/SPDs.	In line with strategic spatial vision and evidence base identification of shortage of open space/opportunities to create more. Policy direction supported in Choices.

## Royal Docks

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options(CS, DCPM); Visioning; Agreeing an Evidence Base; Choices	<b>Economic opportunities</b>	Officers; interest groups (theatre, environment); Statutory consultees (Natural England, LVRPA); development interests (semi-public/private), public agencies (economic development); members; local businesses	<b>Leisure uses</b> given good public transport accessibility and waterspace; <b>tourism, offices</b> (decentralised government offices?) and <b>service industries</b> due to Airport, ExCeL. <b>Green Industry</b> - heat network use, and further infrastructure potential - public sector landholdings could help support. Pros and cons of <b>airport</b> expansion - cross boundary impacts too. Potential for further <b>HE development and spinoffs</b> . Employment use alone will not necessarily advance economic development. Need for <b>complementary uses</b> - including things for workers to do after work/conferences - evening economy. <b>Creative and cultural industries</b> . <b>Retail</b> provision at Silvertown Quays must not compete with Canning Town - but should support tourist/leisure anchor (clarity re scale needed). Improved <b>strategic transport</b>	See Policy S3 including strategic sites, which seeks to maintain a significant amount of employment land in the Royals, including at the southern fringe of CTCH and Beckton (policies S4 and S5), building on these opportunities (J1 identifies relevant employment hubs). INF5 identifies that a new local centre is the appropriate scale of retail development for the Docks. INF1 identifies strategic transport	In line with borough-wide Economic Development Strategy, Retail Study and Employment Land Review, helping to advance the spatial vision. Policy direction supported in Choices subject to balance below.

			<b>connections</b> will help local economy, though existing connections are already supporting growth.	connections which will benefit it and approach to airport.	
Regulatory consultation (CS Issues and Options); Agreeing an Evidence Base; Choices	<b>Industrial Land v. Residential Potential</b>	Development interests; residents; local businesses; statutory consultees (GLA)	Concern re <b>balance of jobs and homes</b> (residents); developers identify various sites ( <b>Thameside West/East</b> etc) they would like to see released with appropriate re-location of employment uses, and question efficiency of industrial land uses/appropriateness of them occupying prime riverside sites; scale and existing and dormant <b>DLR connections</b> (Peruvian Wharf) give potential to create viable new communities and meet borough-wide housing target, creating investment momentum. How does industry sit with broader push to visitor economy? <b>Residential-led mixed use</b> can also cross-subsidise affordable workspace. Mixed use can make good use of surplus land on employment sites and manage transition between residential and employment. Residential potential may be limited by <b>airport</b> . A suitable <b>stock of employment land</b> needs to be kept for strategic reasons. Critical mass will be important.	See Policy S3 including strategic sites, which seeks to maintain a significant amount of employment land in the Royals in blocks of substantial sizes, whilst allowing for release in places allowing for new communities of a viable scale to be created. Design policies SP1 and SP3 deal with mixed use configurations. Policy J2 deals with any further sites that may be proposed for release, ensuring a strategic check on the process.	In line with mixed use vision for the borough, supported from Issues and Options stage onwards. Industrial land release based on technical evidence base (Employment Land Review) in line with PPS4 requirements, whilst maintaining strategic stock in line with London Plan and in response to Choices consultation (S23 Thameside West dropped and release sites reconfigured). Policy direction supported in Choices.
Choices consultation; ongoing community engagement (LDF)	<b>Wharves</b>	Statutory consultees; local business; development interests.	The <b>safeguarded wharves</b> are subject to a ministerial direction which needs to be acknowledged in spatial designations; developers point to potential for <b>consolidation/swaps</b> . Potential for <b>marina use/wharve use</b> may be being obstructed by landlords.	Yes - Policy INF 1 acknowledges a strategic London wide need for safeguarded wharves, but supports the principle of consolidation at Thameside West or relocation within the borough. Spatial Strategy (Policy S1) states that there will be a shift from traditional industrial activity from the Lower Lea Valley and Royal Docks to Beckton.	In line with mixed use vision for the borough, supported from Issues and Options stage onwards, and joint Royal Docks vision, together with higher level policy. Supported by joint work on Thameside West wharf consolidation with GLA, PLA, LTGDC and others. Borough wide study to consider demand for wharf facilities, this will feed into GLA study, to report in late 2011.
Regulatory consultation (CS Issues and Options); Visioning; Choices consultation.	<b>Design principles</b>	Officers; members; development interests; public agencies; local	Suitability of various sites for <b>tall buildings</b> including riverside proposed (whilst acknowledging airport constraints) - though others disagreed; concern <b>riverside views/access</b> should not be blocked; suggestion that low	Yes- see S3 (Royal Docks vision based policy avoidance of piecemeal development) and associated strategic sites,	In line with strategic spatial vision and associated evidence base (notably Character Study). Policy direction supported in

		charitable trust.	density family housing not suitable in much of area; importance of improved <b>access to open space</b> ; desirability of improved <b>coherence/integration</b> - importance of comprehensive not piecemeal development.	(including indicative housing typologies) and SP policies, particularly SP1 (place-making, coherence) and SP4 (strategic approach to tall building; does not allow for them in every location, but presents criteria that they must meet, and identifies the requirement for further work to refine locational and formational suitability). Policy INF6 addresses deficiencies in open space. Further details to be fleshed out in SPD for area.	Choices document.
Regulatory consultation - Issues and Options (Core Strategy); ongoing community engagement (LDF); ongoing member liaison.	<b>Sustainable Communities</b>	Local residents; Interest group (environment, disability); Statutory consultees (NHS Newham) other public agencies (Mental Health Trust); development interests; officers	Concern re <b>stability</b> , and lack of housing/population <b>mix</b> - more families desired. Not enough affordable housing. <b>Airport impacts</b> - especially noise. Also unpleasant <b>odours</b> from industry. Improvements to <b>green space</b> (and access to it); desired, <b>transport</b> (lack of buses) and <b>shop</b> provision. Learn from Beckton - strengths/weaknesses.	Yes, see policies S3 - Royal Docks, H1 & 2 (re housing mix) ; INF1 & 2 (re transport improvements) INF6 - Green Infrastructure, SP policies notably SP2 and 3 (re environmental impacts, successful mixed use and accessibility) ; INF5 (re new local centres and other retail access). Further details to be supported by SPD for area.	In line with broader strategic spatial vision and higher-level policy; policy direction supported in Choices document. The development of strategic sites and new planned communities and facilities will help achieve the spatial vision for the area.

## Canning Town and Custom House

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation (SLLVAAP I & O); Choices; ongoing community engagement (LDF); agreeing an evidence base	<b>Town Centre</b>	Various - residents, development interests; statutory consultees	Canning Town needs significant regeneration; <b>market</b> important plus more food and drink uses and wider <b>variety</b> of shops (independents and multiples; <b>new foodstore</b> supported with careful consideration of sizing and content so as to be complementary not predatory; <b>leisure</b> potential; new centre should consider <b>needs of local people</b> (affordability) not just incomers, though new, more mixed population will support this vision; <b>town centre boundary</b> needs to be modified to take into account masterplan/growth proposals. Provides and important <b>focus to the area</b> (or will do), with good access - so more uses should be located here. Various <b>community infrastructure deficiencies</b> noted. Reasonable <b>business confidence</b> in the town centre, despite ongoing changes.	Yes – see Policy S4 (overall spatial policy for CTCH, and town centre vision); INF5 – (re town centre growth and boundary); INF8 re co-location of community infrastructure in town centres; SP6 (re town centres as places, including access to them); also SPD, which will be reviewed as necessary to bring it in line with CS, providing further guidance on detail.	In line with broader strategic spatial vision and retail strategy, supported by evidence base (Town Centre and Retail Study). Policy direction supported in Choices consultation.
Regulatory Consultation (CS Issues and Options ); Choices	<b>Freemasons /ExCeL/Custom House</b>	Development interests, local businesses, members; public agencies; statutory consultees.	<b>Custom House</b> needs to develop an <b>evening, business and hotel offer to support ExCeL</b> , and spread its benefits. This may include secondary service industries associated with conferences and exhibitions. A major opportunity/need with the expansion of ExCeL. Opportunity to <b>intensify residential and commercial</b> uses given <b>Cross Rail</b> access.	Yes – see Policy S4, (overall vision-based spatial policy for area) plus INF5 (re local centre growth and development); J1 (employment hub around ExCeL); further details to be taken forward in subsequent DPD and SPD (including revisions as necessary to bring in line with CS).	In line with broader strategic spatial vision and strategy, supported by evidence base (Town Centre and Retail Study). Policy direction supported in Choices consultation, which supported both residential and commercial development being promoted in this location..

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation (CS Issues and Options); ongoing member and officer liaison; ongoing community engagement (LDF); Choices consultation.	<b>Open space and environmental quality.</b>	Statutory consultees; members; officers; residents	<b>Lea River Park and Bow Creek Ecology Park</b> - should be supported - role in connecting communities, community cohesion, biodiversity, education etc. <b>Twelvetrees Gasholders</b> - potential for open space once de-commissioned as part of LRP. <b>Limmo</b> - also a potential open space location given development constraints, including contamination and Crossrail infrastructure, though some residential may be necessary to make this viable. Desire for <b>more/better open space and general improvements to environmental quality</b> , including tackling of <b>overhead power lines</b> (though National Grid suggests undergrounding unlikely to be viable). Some sites (around Silvertown Way and Manor Road) significantly affected by <b>transport infrastructure/traffic impacts</b> , and potential traffic impacts of Silvertown Crossing,	Yes – see overarching Core Strategy policy S4 which refers to general environmental improvements and constraints, especially mitigation of infrastructure impacts subject to national protocols; also refers to Bow Creek, LRP - which proposals for Twelvetrees and Limmo site are part of, and enabling role of residential on Limmo site. See also policies on green infrastructure (Policy INF6), the Blue Ribbon Network (INF7) and biodiversity (SC4). All to be taken forward in subsequent DPDs and SPD (including revisions as necessary to bring in line with CS) .	In line with broader strategic spatial vision, evidence base (green infrastructure and biodiversity studies) recommendations and higher level policy. Policy direction supported in Choices consultation, with some amendments to address concerns re Silvertown Way/Crossing impacts, and need for Limmo open space to be enabled by residential, rather than being viable as a sole use.
Issues and Options (CS); Choices; ongoing member engagement; ongoing LDF and corporate community engagement	<b>Balance of jobs and homes</b>	Development interests, local businesses, members	Various sites in vicinity of station proposed for <b>release/retention</b> based on <b>accessibility, housing need/capacity v. ongoing employment/waste</b> use, (esp. around <b>Bidder St</b> ) and continued <b>need for jobs</b> in area. Allowing adjacent sites to become mixed use can put pressures on existing ‘bad neighbours’ even though these are important waste/employment sites. Also further south, <b>Thames Wharf</b> in conjunction with the <b>Carlsberg Tetley</b> site, which offers some flexibility re the wharf, and has important connections with the Royal Docks as well as CT development area.	Yes – see overarching Core Strategy policies S1, SP1 and S4, with criteria for further release set out in policy J2, and employment hubs in J1. These policies will be taken forward in subsequent DPDs and the SPD (including revision of existing Canning Town and Custom House SPD).	In line with broader strategic spatial vision supported from Issues and Options stage onwards; consistent with evidence base (housing capacity and employment land studies) recommendations and higher level policy; policy direction broadly supported in Choices consultation – though this did result in strategic site S12 being dropped as identified as partly strategically important employment land, and rest of site no longer of strategic scale, and addition of S08 (related to

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
					strategic release of employment land).

## Beckton

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation (CS Issues and Options); Visioning; Agreeing an evidence base; ongoing community engagement (corporate); Choices consultation.	<b>Beckton as an opportunity area</b>	Development interests; members; statutory consultees; local businesses; local residents.	Should be acknowledged as a primary opportunity area; <b>SIL v. residential development v. operational land uses</b> (utilities). <b>Constraints:</b> sewage smell -though mitigation work underway; airport noise/expansion (on <b>Albert Basin</b> ); contaminated land, flood risk and subsidence. <b>DLR extension</b> may be predicated on residential use; opportunity also of <b>Barking-Royals Bus Corridor and new river crossings</b> . Riverside location is an opportunity. <b>Mixed use development</b> brings opportunities to provide for pleasant riverside open space (as part of Cross River Park proposals) and residential environment. A new mixed community could add to the viability of Gallions Reach Shopping Park, and improve coherence and integration in the area. A key <b>gateway area with links to wider cross-boundary development potential and Royals</b> . Extension of employment land use in this area <b>allows for consolidation elsewhere</b> , recognising significant cluster of modern employment space – though members concerned re low quality industrial estates and retail park.	Yes - policies S5 Beckton and J1: provide for the continuing trend of industry in the borough shifting eastwards, whilst allowing for large scale residential to edges of this with appropriate separation, and potential transition of some SIL overtime (subject to appropriate review). SP2 , SP3 and SC3 address environmental constraints; INF1 and INF3 for strategic infrastructure in area. J1 designates the wider area (including retail parks) as part of an employment hub.	In line with broader strategic spatial vision and strategy, which seeks to move the borough's industrial offer to constrained land in the east, limiting residential development in the area, supported by Employment Land Review. Wider employment hub supported by Economic Development Strategy evidence base, and brings opportunity to focus change to improve jobs density. Policy direction broadly supported in Choices, which resulted in Albert Basin sites being combined as part of a wider development area.

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation (CS Issues and Options); agreeing an evidence base; Choices	<b>SIL and Wharves</b>	Statutory consultees; development interests; local residents; interest groups.	GLA support <b>designation as SIL</b> , though rationale should be clear; advise London Industrial Park should probably be a separate SIL to other East Beckton sites - as is strategically significant in its own right, and wouldn't want to make it vulnerable by it being a small exposed part of a larger designation. Questionable evidence base re opportunity for <b>relocation of river freight facilities</b> to this location. Viability questions, and biodiversity protection. <b>Deliverability of waste site</b> proposals within plan period also questionable (development interest) however wharf usage here has been considered by another development interest who assumes an authoritative position on its validity. Some support from residents re needing to provide <b>more jobs</b> in the area, and concern re over-development of residential, given constraints.	Yes – a compromise struck between residential and employment, as above, (See policy S5, J1). Wharf relocation remains subject to further work - see policy INF1 and S3, which maintain a flexible approach. Waste site in INF3 to be tested at Joint Waste DPD EIP.	In line with broader strategic spatial strategy, supported by technical evidence base (waste, employment land) and broadly, by Choices consultation.
Regulatory consultation (CS Issues and Options); agreeing an evidence base; Choices	<b>Retail – East Beckton and Gallions Reach</b>	Statutory consultees; local residents; development interests; local business	Need for <b>local retail to support Albert Basin</b> given distance from other shopping; Concern that ASDA wishes to expand at expense of other local businesses in East Beckton; <b>East Beckton's role</b> in retail hierarchy may need to be reviewed – is it really performing a district centre role given its lack of evening uses etc? ; support for <b>better mix of development at Gallions</b> – though future partly related to balance of residential/employment in wider area, and re-configuration of other retail parks in the area; <b>reduction in car parking</b> at GR would reduce network pressures - though public transport and connectivity improvements are also needed. Some register concern re the <b>potential impact on other town centres</b> if there were growth. A clear approach and circumstances in which change would be acceptable should be set out. Also relative position in hierarchy vis a vis East Beckton. Owners point out it <b>needs to renew itself</b> as with any centre, and that investment and employment need to be supported by greater	Yes – see policy S5, INF5 and SP6, which set out retail and town centre strategy in the area, identifying Gallions Reach as having potential to become a major centre, with change towards it becoming so subject to various conditions, including accessibility improvements, and planning as part of wider change in the area.	In line with broader strategic spatial strategy and support for policy direction in Choices consultation and in Town Centre and Retail and Character Studies.

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
			policy certainty. Has capacity and attracts a different market to other centres locally including cross boundary. Has already evolved to some extent from initial out of centre character with investment in public transport etc.		
Ongoing member liaison; ongoing community engagement (LDF, corporate); agreeing an evidence base.	<b>Accessibility/ connectivity</b>	Residents; local business; statutory consultees; development interests	Poor - need for <b>better distribution of shops, open space; transport improvements and improvements to local connectivity</b> . More <b>coherence</b> to development e.g. university, residential areas, retail areas. Should refer to <b>DLR extension to Dagenham Dock, and new river crossings plus Bus Corridor</b> (though may not sit well with employment designation). Relevance of <b>cross-boundary connections</b>	Yes – see S5, SP1, INF1 re strategic principles of connectivity and key infrastructure projects (funded and unfunded). Also SP2 and INF5, INF6 and 8 re accessibility of community infrastructure and open space.	In line with broader spatial vision and supported by technical studies (food mapping, infrastructure, character). Policy direction supported in Choices consultation.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options (CS, DCPM); visioning; ongoing corporate & LDF community engagement; Agreeing the evidence base; Choices; ongoing member liaison.	<b>Open Space/MOL</b>	Statutory consultees (Thames Water); Members, Residents; VCS; development interests	Beckton Rectangle and Beckton Sewage Treatment Works should be omitted from <b>Open Space/MOL protection</b> - required for operational land use, no longer in sports pitch use. Concerns about promoting access to the Roding through the Thames Water site - health and safety issues etc. Other stakeholders suggest that <b>riverside access</b> should be provided for, but acknowledge operational use of other land. Concern re <b>safety in Beckton park</b> .	Yes – see S5, (new open space at Beckton Riverside, public access to river/docks and connections to Beckton Park); INF6/7 and SP3 (green/blue infrastructure, access and enhancement) which enable this, together with SC4 re biodiversity.	In line with broader spatial vision and infrastructure strategy, supported by community infrastructure study (open space assessment). Broad support for this policy direction in Choices document.

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options (CS); Visioning; Agreeing an Evidence Base; ongoing internal liaison; Choices	<b>Green Street - especially town centre</b>	Officers; local businesses/business groups; development interests; statutory consultees; local residents.	<p><b>International links, retailer commitment and distinctive offer</b> should be acknowledged, though current lack of developed evening offer; need for clear position on Green Street town centre going forward, also Katherine Road; divergent views on extent to which <b>boundaries and town centre parking and business type</b> should be constrained; potential to develop the <b>supply chain</b> locally, and other business support measures including affordable business space are desired; support for <b>public realm improvement</b> and retention/<b>regeneration of Queens Market</b> and other town centre sites as new draws whilst maintaining the market offer and function as a site for social interaction; support for <b>town centre intensification</b>; some <b>support/promotion of West Ham stadium</b> site as a strategic site, for a foodstore, (development interest) or other intensification given high PTAL. Perceived need for <b>new transport, parks and community infrastructure</b> (notably schools) by local residents due to congestion etc.</p>	Yes partly - see S6, (Urban Newham), J1, INF5 and SP6 & 7 (re the evolution of the town centre and other local retail/business); other SP policies notably SP5, (assets - including cultural/infrastructural such as the market) INF6 and 8 (re other community infrastructure); however a focussed town centre and local shopping parades are aimed for consolidating ribbon development and prioritising in centre locations for retail development, and the West Ham site is not identified as a strategic site, only as a place for exemplar development that responds to the local context. Market is a strategic site, but expected to be re-provided as part of any redevelopment.	In line with broader spatial vision, retail strategy supported by the Town Centre and Retail Study and Food Mapping Study and consistent with higher-level policy including the sequential test, Infrastructure Study and a character-based approach to urban design. Market improvements likely to be dependent on cross-subsidy from wider development. Support for broad policy direction in Choices consultation.

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Agreeing an evidence base; Ongoing community engagement (LDF); Choices; draft SPD; ongoing member liaison.	<b>Forest Gate - especially town centre.</b>	1 developer; local residents and members; statutory consultee (EH)	Town centre needs its <b>own identity</b> not just an over flow for Stratford - is an <b>important centre for food shopping, convenient</b> to where people live with a character they appreciate, whilst find <b>threatened</b> in some respects (takeaways, budget retail and betting shops) with a desire for better quality evening/leisure offer, easier parking, continued provision of community meeting space and space for the local artistic community, and a higher quality environment; some business concern re high rents; 1 developer identifies short to medium timescale <b>regeneration opportunities</b> comparable in significance to larger sites elsewhere, including a tall building near the station given <b>Crossrail</b> ; local residents concerned with <b>maintaining and enhancing character</b> , (addressing decline) providing <b>new housing</b> given that it's somewhere they want to live, and town centre development <b>enabling regeneration/improvements</b> - but cautious re building heights (good design a must).	Yes - see S6 (especially town centre vision) and SP policies, especially SP2 & 6 (notably controls on takeaways) SP4, (tall buildings - strategic approach and design quality - should be an exception and appropriately scaled in Urban Newham), SP3 & SP5, (heritage and character, quality mixed use) plus INF5 (town centre development) and INF8 (community infrastructure protection/deficits)	In line with broader spatial vision, Infrastructure Study, and character based approach to urban design, addressing strengths and weaknesses, together with borough-wide retail strategy supported by Town Centre and Retail Study. Support for policy direction in Choices consultation and higher level policy.
Ongoing community engagement (LDF); Agreeing the Evidence Base; Choices; ongoing member liaison; ongoing neighbouring authority liaison.	<b>Manor Park - overview</b>	Interest group; local residents and members; local business group;	Lack of <b>open space</b> in the centre of the area though <b>City of London cemetery</b> important natural greenspace, a cultural resource with visitor economy plus education and health benefits; need for improvement to <b>public realm/heritage assets</b> in High Street North and Romford Road; need for <b>new schools, play facilities and childcare</b> ; concern re <b>takeaways</b> in area and <b>lack of focus/centre</b> to the community. Significance of <b>Crossrail</b> inc. tunnelling academy opening, and <b>links to Ilford</b> .	Yes see S6, SP policies especially SP1 and 5, (place-making assets, including heritage and cultural), SP2 and SP6 (v. takeaways). INF5 (local centre evolution and protection and enhancement of local access to food); INF6 (open space deficits) and INF8 (community infrastructure deficits)	In line with broader spatial vision, Infrastructure Study, and character based approach to urban design, addressing strengths and weaknesses, together with borough-wide retail strategy supported by Town Centre and Retail and Food Mapping Study. Support for policy direction in Choices consultation and higher level policy.

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
<p>Choices; ongoing community engagement (LDF); Agreeing the evidence base; Ongoing member liaison.</p>	<p><b>Plaistow - overview</b></p>	<p>Development interest; residents; statutory consultee (EH)</p>	<p>Support for <b>new local centre near the station</b> and associated residential development to help rejuvenate the community; problem of but also value of ribbon shopping along Barking Road re access; desire for <b>better quality shops, less takeaways and betting shops</b> which are displacing shops, more <b>open space and transport improvements</b>; support for <b>heritage asset enhancement, connectivity</b> improvements. Anxiety about mixed uses – would prefer to see uses defined in specific areas.</p>	<p>Yes see S6, SP policies especially SP2 (re takeaways) SP3, (character based approach to urban design, quality mixed use development) SP5 (valuing heritage and place-making assets); and SP7/INF5 (re consolidating retail development and new local centre), INF6 (open space deficiencies) and INF8 (community infrastructure)</p>	<p>In line with broader spatial vision, Infrastructure Study, and character based approach to urban design, addressing strengths and weaknesses, together with borough-wide retail strategy supported by Town Centre and Retail and Food Mapping Study. Support for policy direction in Choices consultation and higher level policy.</p>
<p>Ongoing community engagement (LDF); agreeing the evidence Base; Choices; ongoing member liaison</p>	<p><b>East Ham - especially town centre</b></p>	<p>Statutory consultee (EH); local residents, businesses and consumers;</p>	<p>East Ham - support for <b>more shops and businesses in the town centre and houses</b> (esp. family/better quality) nearby to benefit it and vice versa; important for <b>independent and ethnic food and non-food retail</b> and valued for its convenience and range of shops and services, though concern re dominance of <b>hot food takeaways, pound &amp; betting shops</b>, and lack of an evening offer. Concern of <b>vulnerability of town centre</b> to Stratford City, problems of <b>crime/security and parking</b> (local businesses) - importance of good town centre management, though reasonable confidence amongst businesses themselves. Important <b>heritage assets</b> - should be recognised and enhanced, with appropriate re-use. Potential of <b>College Site and Market Hall</b> for redevelopment/intensification, though some concern re viability of residential over market (devlt interest). Perceived need for <b>more community facilities</b> - for older/younger people, a mosque, health facilities and schools. Also <b>more green space</b> (in centre of area - though Central Park to south is highly valued) and <b>transport improvements</b>.</p>	<p>Yes - see S2 (healthy neighbourhoods including controls on takeaways) S6, (especially town centre vision and strategic sites - market and town hall complex extending to college); SP policies especially SP5, (heritage and other assets - enhancing) SP2 (healthy neighbourhoods including controls on takeaways) SP6, (successful town and local centres) SP7, INF5, (town centre development) INF6, (open space deficiencies and improvement) INF8 (community infrastructure deficits).</p>	<p>In line with broader spatial vision, Infrastructure Study, and character based approach to urban design, addressing strengths and weaknesses, together with borough-wide retail strategy supported by Town Centre and Retail and Food Mapping Study. Support for policy direction in Choices consultation and higher level policy.</p>

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options (CS); Agreeing the evidence base; Choices; ongoing community engagement (LDF); ongoing member liaison.	<b>Urban Newham cf. the Arc</b>	ALL	<b>Urban Newham</b> - there are areas within the mid, north and east of the Borough which would benefit from the Core Strategy recognising the need for rejuvenated communities, spreading the benefits from the Arc (concern that existing residents will not benefit from future plans). Many common problems re <b>population churn, crime and anti social behaviour</b> etc, and <b>key drivers of change</b> as town centres, and transport and other infrastructure improvements (Crossrail) together with cumulative impacts of small scale change (HMOs/flat conversions, takeaways etc).	Yes - see S1, SP1 re integration and coherence, and spreading the benefits from the Arc; also S6 with a detailed focus on Urban Newham's issues and potential, focusing on particular sites including town centre rejuvenation, improved development quality and urban design, and a focus on intensifying development around Crossrail. Most thematic policies reflect themes felt across urban Newham, especially SP2, SP3, SP7 and INF2, 5, 6 and 8.	Support for policy direction in Choices document, in line with broader spatial and corporate vision. Recognising that most of Urban Newham is already built so the opportunities are different to those found in the Arc, but that cumulative impacts of decisions have significant implications. These small scale changes plus key drivers must be harnessed to make the most difference.

## Successful Places

Engagement drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, SLVAAP, FGSPD); visioning; agreeing an evidence base; ongoing community engagement (corporate/LDF); choices	<b>Assets</b>	All	Include <b>heritage</b> (some landmark buildings), <b>public transport hubs/access</b> beyond the borough, <b>cultural and community</b> facilities (e.g. markets), <b>open spaces</b> , (inc Greenway, parks, cemeteries, LVRP); <b>waterways, diversity and cohesion, youthful population</b> . Should be <b>making better use of</b> , put more centre stage (waterfront) and improving, increasing access etc. Many have asset values in multiple dimensions (as different types of infrastructure, visitor	Yes - see especially policies SP1 (place-making) and SP5 (heritage and other place-making assets – protection and enhancement) and relevant spatial policies. To be followed up in SPDs as necessary.	In line with broader spatial vision re place-making and distinctiveness and sustainable communities; supported by Character Study and Economic Development Strategy, plus in line with higher-level policy. Policy direction supported in Choices document.

Engagement drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
			attractions etc). Also potential of <b>Olympic Site and other landmark development sites</b> as key assets.		
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (FGSPD, SLLVAAP); visioning; agreeing an evidence base; ongoing community engagement (corporate and LDF); choices	<b>Place-making</b>	All	<b>Need for place-making across the borough</b> , ensuring different parts have <b>distinct offers</b> - don't compete with each other, but that old and new <b>integrated</b> , and are flexible over time. Generally the borough as a whole and local neighbourhoods are not commonly/easily characterised by residents, though <b>valued aspects</b> include overall diversity, open spaces/parks, older buildings and contemporary striking architecture – and some don't want to see much change. Need to <b>change reputation</b> of the area, discourage movement to 'a better borough' and <b>encourage stability and a sense of community, whilst maintaining character/identity</b> . Partly about <b>maintenance/upgrading</b> of existing environments/assets, also <b>masterplanning</b> to achieve multiple objectives (e.g. connectivity without severance, mixed uses without viability problems).	Yes - see policies SP1, (place-making, integration) SP5 (place-making assets); to be followed up with SPDs as necessary.	In line with concerns to create successful communities and a sustainable new economy, relating to overall vision. Concept supported in Choices consultation, with some disagreement as to what place-based visions should be.
Regulatory Consultation -Issues and options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM); visioning; agreeing an evidence base; Choices	<b>Improve connectivity</b>	All	Need to consider <b>cross-borough connectivity</b> and the <b>integration of particular areas</b> (e.g. Olympic Park and Stratford City) with the rest of the borough, addressing <b>severance</b> and <b>fragmentation</b> along rivers, railways, etc. whilst recognising that these are also important connections. <b>East West and North South links</b> are an issue. Intra-borough connectivity is very poor when compared to external connectivity.	Yes - see especially policy SP1, (re connectivity, integration) plus SP3, 7 (design in relation to movement). Also INF1 and INF2 re more strategic infrastructural interventions, and spatial policies and SPDs for particular local issues/opportunities.	A strategic issue to be considered in the re-allocation of land and planning of infrastructure plus public realm - creation of places. Supported by Character Study and Choices consultation.

Engagement drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Visioning; choices	<b>Temporary/meanwhile uses</b>	Voluntary and community sector and public agencies	Temporary uses on development sites should be <b>encouraged</b> e.g. food growing	Yes - see especially policy SP1, SP3 which refer to activation and other roles of meanwhile uses.	A strategic issue, that the CS recognises as part of the means to deliver the longer term vision.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM FGSPD); agreeing an evidence base; draft SPD; Choices; ongoing community engagement (LDF)	<b>Open space quantity and quality</b>	Statutory consultees, public sector agencies; residents	<b>More open space</b> is needed, with a <b>balance</b> struck between development and open/green space, including <b>natural green space</b> - balconies are not sufficient. Open space can provide a useful <b>harmonising tool</b> between old and new development, allowing a neutral place for community mixing. Need for a <b>greener borough, but also attention to maintenance and security</b> , without privatisation. <b>Connectivity</b> of spaces an issue.	Yes - see SP3, SP2 and INF6/7 re designing in open space, and enhancing [access to] existing open space; and spatial policies and SPDs for particular local issues/opportunities .	A key part of place making and quality urban design considerations, reflected in the overall vision for the borough, and higher-level policy. Also a key component of healthy urban planning (see below).
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, DCPM); visioning; ongoing community engagement (LDF/corporate); agreeing an evidence base; Choices; ongoing internal liaison	<b>Healthy urban planning</b>	Residents inc young people; public agencies and statutory consultees; officer; development interests and some local businesses more cautious / suspicious.	Newham has some of the <b>worst health statistics</b> in London, and the <b>socio-economic environment is a key determinant</b> of this, including housing quality, ease of active lifestyles, prominence of takeaways, access to greenspace etc. Also need to consider <b>side effects of economic development</b> (noise, air quality) and contaminated land. Support for <b>restrictions on takeaways</b> alongside other measures - a balanced approach needed, recognising consumer choice and the role as part of local economic development. Support for the potential for <b>HIA</b> to support implementation - though some concern as to its efficacy/methodology.	Yes - see policy SP2, SP3	A key part of the convergence agenda (SRF) and equalities-aware planning, and sustainable development - and hence creating successful communities in line with overall corporate priorities. Support for this policy direction in Choices consultation and higher level policy.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, DCPM, SLLVAAP); visioning; ongoing community engagement (LDF); agreeing an evidence	<b>Mixing uses - meeting social, environmental and economic needs in neighbourhoods</b>	Development interests, residents; public agencies, statutory consultees, voluntary and	Mixing uses is a way to <b>promote more flexible sustainable communities</b> , (meeting social, economic and environmental needs) bringing back into use redundant land, and avoiding creating sterilised, impermeable areas or areas that are dead outside of working hours - natural surveillance, especially in town centres; <b>deficiencies currently seen in some areas</b> (e.g.	Yes - see SP3,SP6 and spatial policies; to be followed up with further guidance as necessary.	Consistent with higher level policy - a strategic issue. Design policies need framing carefully to manage impacts as acknowledged in Choices document consultation.

Engagement drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
base; Choices		community groups, interest groups (faith, business)	town centres, Royals - lacking retail/leisure offer for residents). However, some concern about some <b>negative externalities</b> (noise, pollution) and viability, including impact on existing centres and ground floor voids.		
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM, FG SPD); visioning; agreeing an evidence base; ongoing corporate and LDF community engagement; ongoing internal and member liaison.	<b>Design quality</b>	All	Design standards (of both buildings - domestic and commercial, public realm/streets and the relationship between them) <b>need to be improved</b> , making proper reference to local character and heritage, <b>designing out crime, and designing in inclusivity, sociability, flexibility safety, health and sustainability</b> including walkability; poor quality areas may need to be re-developed (though this is sensitive amongst residents); key sites could become showcases. Key is to clearly define good design, including durability of materials, input from users, (doesn't have to be iconic) and enforce it consistently with <b>a long term view</b> , also to provide for maintenance. Building for Life, London Residential Design Guide and East Thames High Density tool kit as useful guides. <b>Viability</b> may be an issue according to developers - implementation must be attuned to local development realities. Mustn't be overly prescriptive, but encourage <b>innovation. Benefits</b> for economic performance, population stability and quality of life.	Yes - see SP1-7 and spatial policies, to be followed up with further guidance as necessary.	In line with broader spatial vision and higher level policy; character study systematically informs, with engagement evidence helping to create a locally relevant design policy. Policy direction supported in Choices document consultation, as does evidence as to the value of good design.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM); Draft SPD (Forest Gate); Choices;	<b>Density</b>	Development interests; statutory consultees; residents; members	<b>Higher density mixed use hubs</b> suitable in key centres at e.g. Stratford, Green St, Canning Town, Custom House provide foci to places and make use of accessibility; local <b>concern</b> not to pile people too high, and to link to existing <b>character and sensitivity</b> of assets (also English Heritage); developers pushing for higher densities to make schemes <b>viable</b> ; see also 'tall buildings' below; some local people understand increasing densities can be <b>'enabling'</b> of other objectives.	Yes - reflected in indicative typologies for strategic sites, tall buildings spatial strategy SP4 and town centre visions and policy SP6; to be followed up with further guidance through masterplans and SPDs as necessary.	In line with higher-level policy; broad strategy supported in Choices document consultation.

Engagement drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Agreeing an Evidence base; Draft FG SPD; Choices; ongoing internal liaison	<b>Tall buildings</b>	Development interests; statutory consultees	<b>Robust policy and strategic approach to tall buildings needed</b> - hold out for design quality via masterplanning, strategic disposal of landholdings etc; should define areas of sensitivity to, (heritage assets, water environments, character) and areas with capacity for and acknowledge variety of impacts including of existing ones - need for integration. <b>Often not suitable for families or affordable housing</b> due to service charges and intensity of use - buy to let best. 8-12 storeys is worst in terms of viability/expense: walk up or taller better. <b>Private amenity space, good design, microclimate and space standards crucial</b> to address people's aversion to flats; also location, management. Stratford as having most potential to absorb, subject to improvement of current ad hoc arrangement - tall and thin rather than large blocks, integration; also CT town centre; Royals needs a variety of heights - stepping down to reflect <b>airport restrictions and to maintain views</b> of the water, suitable for some landmark sites. Support for strategy proposed in the Choices document, though others argue approach needs to be either more flexible or tighter.	Yes - see SP4 (strategic approach to tall buildings); to be followed up with further work through masterplanning and SPDs.	In line with broader spatial vision, required by London Plan and underpinned by Character study. Support for broad policy direction in Choices consultation, with policy carefully drafted to address concerns raised then and previously, whilst retaining flexibility in line with benefits of tall buildings, subject to appropriate more detailed work.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM, FGSPD); Visioning; Draft SPD; Agreeing an evidence base; Choices	<b>Heritage</b>	English Heritage; some residents; development interests (want a more flexible approach)	Development should be <b>sensitive</b> to heritage and conservation design matters. <b>PPS5</b> should be followed, with appropriate language used in policy wording. <b>Concern</b> from some residents that valued buildings are being lost (Lower Lea Valley) or poorly maintained (Forest Gate). <b>Conservation area/Areas of Townscape value</b> designation is one possible tool, and encouragement of re-use, though care must be taken re <b>quality benchmarks</b> , and wider objectives for the area.	Yes - see SP5 and SP1 (heritage and place-making) plus spatial policies, to be followed up with further guidance re local issues/opportunities as necessary (e.g. conservation area appraisals and management plans, SPDs).	In line with PPS5 and concern with place-making (broader spatial vision). Policy drafting closely reflects PPS5 whilst bringing heritage assets together with other place-making assets given common issues locally. Support for this policy direction in Choices consultation.

Engagement drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM, FGSPD); visioning; ongoing community engagement (LDF/Corporate); Agreeing an evidence base; Choices consultation; ongoing internal/member liaison	<b>Town centre environment and management as places</b>	All	Concern to ensure that <b>mix of town centre uses</b> (including markets, cultural/leisure facilities, housing, offices, small business space, police shops, bars and restaurants) <b>contributes to town centre vitality and viability, without creating management problems</b> (e.g. re the night-time economy). Should deploy at strategic locations. <b>Mix of accommodation</b> (affordability) also an issue. <b>Flexibility</b> in composition should be encouraged - protection of retail not always viable. Meanwhile/temporary uses also important. <b>Town centre environments seen to be poor and declining</b> , especially Stratford and East Ham, plus Canning Town, Forest Gate; support for <b>greater restrictions on takeaways and place-making spatial visions</b> for town centres - Stratford needs to develop a complementary role to Stratford City. Family housing nearby supports town centres, as does office development. Need to <b>manage transition and disruption</b> where major work taking place. Change needs to be <b>balanced against sensitivity</b> to change. <b>Parking</b> also needed (businesses/development interests argue).	Yes - see SP6, SP3, (design and town centres as places, including meanwhile uses, requirement of change to respond to character) H1 (family housing) and INF5, (town centre hierarchy evolution), INF2 (parking) and spatial policies, (town centre visions) to be followed up with SPDs.	In line with broader spatial vision and policy direction supported in Choices consultation and by higher-level policy. Town Centre and Retail Study makes similar observations; partly a matter of managing town centres as part of the hierarchy/network, but also as places, including mix of uses and connections to hinterlands, hence two different areas of policy, and support via spatial policies.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options (CS, SLLVAAP, FGSPD); Ongoing corporate community engagement; Draft SPD; Agreeing an evidence base; Choices	<b>Streets, public realm quality</b>	Members, officers, residents, community groups, public agencies, statutory consultees, development interests.	<b>Ribbon development</b> needs consolidation, though can provide for local access to shops. <b>Street design, inc maintenance and quality of materials</b> should be improved (related to people's concerns about their local environment, crime, congestion etc) including integration/enhancement of heritage assets. Proposed classification for design purposes in Choices needed further development - principles could also be applied to <b>waterways</b> .	Yes - see SP7 and INF5, and spatial policies, to be followed up with further guidance as necessary.	In line with broader spatial vision, PPS4 and London Wide policy re town centres first, as well as broader public realm improvement works. Support for public realm improvements and improved street design in Choices consultation.

## JOBS

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation – (CS, SLLVAAP Issues and Options); visioning; Agreeing an evidence base; ongoing corporate and LDF community engagement; Choices; ongoing internal and member liaison.	<b>Homes v. Jobs</b>	All	A <b>need for jobs and affordable homes for local people, and jobs for new communities</b> - mixed use development allows for both. Potential for people to work from home, options for live/work. Link between <b>sustainable employment and population churn</b> . Aspirational houses needed to provide for workers in Canary Wharf. Better housing, environment and leisure offer to attract skilled workforce to live in borough. <b>Mixed use not suitable on all sites</b> , employment mix and surrounding uses must be compatible with homes, or risk losing them. <b>Good connectivity</b> critical, people want their work-home commute faster.	Yes - see Policies S1, SP1, SP3, SP5, SP6, J1, J2, J3, H1, H2, and INF1 which seek to create liveable mixed use communities and address other economic drivers. In addition, the Spatial Policies identify key sites, and appropriate mix of jobs and homes; to be followed up with SPDs as necessary.	In line with broader spatial vision derived from corporate policy to create a place where people choose to live, work and stay, policy direction supported from Issues and Options stage. Supported by the London Plan, and consistent with national policy guidance.
Regulatory consultation (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM Issues and Options); Visioning; Agreeing an Evidence Base; Ongoing corporate and LDF community engagement; ongoing member liaison; Choices	<b>Economic Development Opportunities and Job Creation</b>	All	Need for <b>more jobs and employment opportunities</b> . Provide for growth in <b>town centres</b> , other <b>accessible locations</b> (mixed use) and <b>through improving links with and support for hubs of successful existing business</b> (e.g. Green St, Canary Wharf, LCA, ExCeL, Ebbsfleet) or new development areas (Albert Basin, Stratford City); need to attend to <b>ongoing needs of established industries</b> (may not sit comfortably with new residential development); <b>need to diversify - green industry/biotech, heritage tourism, HE spinoffs, and social enterprise</b> - unlocking job potential of <b>Crossrail and Olympics</b> (being put on the map, image, unlocking potential), <b>people passing through, extent of developable land, plus of universities and overseas students</b> , and <b>young, multi-lingual adaptable and enterprising population, SMEs</b> . Need to transform <b>image/reputation of area</b> - stigmatises. <b>Meanwhile uses</b> may help. Focus should be on <b>job quality as well as quantity</b>	Yes – see Policies: J1, J2, J3, SP6, INF1, INF5 and spatial policies, which seek to promote economic drivers, realise opportunities, and release/protect employment land as necessary, identifying various growth hubs. SP3 aims to create workable mixed use areas, and all SP policies to help transform the image of the area.	In line with broader spatial vision and strategy supported by Economic Development Strategy and Employment Land Review. Reflects broader thinking about employment-generating uses in PPS4 and London Plan, which recognise new economic geographies, whilst ensuring key strategic industrial land is able to continue to provide the regionally important industrial uses.

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation - Issues and Options (CS, SLVAAP); visioning; agreeing an evidence base; ongoing corporate community engagement; Choices.	<b>SMEs and their needs</b>	Local businesses; development interests; members; public sector agencies; statutory consultees.	Concern that jobs being left out of equation- especially smaller businesses e.g. MOT garages. Supply of <b>managed, flexible and affordable business space</b> needed, including live/work units as part of mixed use developments. Need to foster an <b>enterprise culture</b> to encourage small business start ups. Lack of <b>'move-on' space</b> as businesses grow is an issue. <b>Supply chain opportunities</b> , including procurement related to construction and other development. Support opportunities for creative and green industries.	Yes -policies J1 & J2 plus INF9 and SP3 promote more and better quality affordable and flexible local workspaces to support growth sectors and expanding local businesses. J3 aims to help to foster entrepreneurial activity.	In line with broader spatial vision and strategy supported by Economic Development Strategy and Employment Land Review. Policy direction supported in Choices document, and by higher-level policy.
Regulatory consultation - Issues and Options (CS, SLVAAP, DCPM); visioning; ongoing LDF community engagement; ongoing internal liaison; Agreeing an Evidence Base	<b>Employment Land Review/Potential</b>	Development interests; statutory consultees; officers; residents.	<b>Much employment land is underused;</b> residential values can <b>help pay for de-contamination</b> etc. <b>Mixed use</b> especially suitable in accessible locations. However, <b>SIL plays a London-wide role</b> so its release needs careful justification. Some support for <b>retention/release in different places</b> . Need a clear steer on appropriate uses on employment land. <b>Resistance to release of employment land adjoining existing noisy uses, including airport.</b> Differing opinions on the requirement for <b>safeguarded wharves</b> and the implications of a consolidated wharf to enable release of employment land for other uses. <b>Quality of local industrial estates need to be addressed</b> including issues such as security, access and storage space.	Yes, see policies J1 and J2, which strike a balance between employment land release and retention. SP3 will assist in improving the quality of business space and manage the creation of successful mixed use areas, building on a wider concept of employment generating development, with relevant hubs identified in J1.	Yes – in line with broader strategic spatial vision underpinned by Employment Land Review and housing capacity work. The borough also has significant levels of regionally important industrial land, and significant regeneration impetus which places pressure on this land. Policy aims to manage this stock appropriately over the plan period in agreement with stakeholders

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation (CS, DCPM Issues and Options); visioning; ongoing corporate community engagement; Agreeing the evidence base; Choices consultation.	<b>Skills and Access to Jobs</b>	All, in particular residents and young people.	Importance of <b>training opportunities and upskilling</b> to meet the needs of new industries (facilities seen to be lacking and concern jobs going to people from outside the area); <b>jobs in easy reach of residential areas</b> - addressing barriers/connectivity issues both within the borough and with the rest of London (residents less sure about employment uses being right next to homes). Support provision of additional <b>tertiary education facilities</b> particularly in Stratford, improvement to schools and vocational training (potential use of S106 to achieve the latter). <b>Sufficient well-located childcare</b> : current barrier to work. Address <b>health barriers</b> to employment also.	Yes - see Policies J1 - J3, INF1, INF2, SP3 and SP2. Policies J1, J2 and J3, INF9 plus SP2 aim to diversify the local economy and tackle barriers to work, alongside policies promoting strategic transport improvements and mixed use areas.	Yes – in line with broader vision underpinned by Economic Development Strategy/Local Economic Assessment and wider corporate policy and convergence agendas. Implementation beyond the spatial component of land provision and supporting policies will depend on the evolution of S106 and broader Council intervention work.

## HOMES

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation - Issues and Options (CS, DCPM); Agreeing the Evidence Base; Choices	<b>Housing Delivery</b>	Statutory consultees; development interests	Need for <b>conformity with the London Plan housing targets</b> . Need for <b>phasing</b> and housing mix etc demands to be <b>realistic</b> , and take into account site specific issues, notably contamination, infrastructure requirements as well as the changing funding landscape. <b>Need for clear evidence base</b> re needs, delivery, viability and infrastructure.	Yes -see H1 and spatial policies: London Plan housing target carried forward as a minimum housing target, based on a robust evidence base. Strategic sites schedule lays out known site constraints and estimated delivery timescales, and appropriate housing typologies. IDP lays out known infrastructure plans and requirements.	A test of soundness and legal compliance with the London Plan. Housing trajectory and capacity work in addition to SHLAA has shown deliverability is possible over the plan period factoring in various constraints. Housing delivery and phasing assumptions determined through consultation with delivery partners. The housing delivery suggested in Choices document and followed through into the core strategy is backed by a robust evidence base.

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
<p>Issues and Options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM); Visioning; Agreeing an Evidence Base; ongoing member liaison; ongoing corporate and LDF community engagement.</p>	<p><b>Family housing</b></p>	<p>All (though developers more cautious)</p>	<p><b>Much needed across all tenures</b> due to young population, extended families (overcrowding a key issue) and nature of existing housing stock and recent completions (including losses, particularly illegal conversions). <b>Mixed views as to whether this necessarily conflicts with high density requirements.</b> Key link to need to make Newham a place where people choose to stay - reduce churn, as major losses are to places [perceived to] cater better for family needs (e.g. Redbridge): a clear political priority, particularly of <b>3 beds rather than larger homes</b> (this is in social rent tenure only). <b>Some concern that 39% exceeds what is viable, that family housing not suitable in every location,</b> and that may affect delivery against London Plan targets, though others report market is shifting away from 1-2 bed flats also. Olympic Park benchmark is 40% average, but variation between 10 and 80% by site, enabling cross-subsidy.</p>	<p>Yes - see policies H1 and H4. Policy H1 specifically identifies a family housing target of 39%, subject to case by case analysis, including viability considerations and location factors. Policy H4 addresses the loss of family sized houses or flats through resisting their conversion into smaller units and encouraging the deconversion of flats back into family houses.</p>	<p>This is fundamental to delivery of the vision of stable mixed and balanced communities. The SHMA evidence base document, and enforcement records provide the evidence that back up these identified issues, with policy providing necessary flexibility re viability. This is also a key corporate priority in line with the SCS vision, and the aims of the emerging Housing Strategy. Conversions policy will be a strong disincentive for unlawful conversions, and will provide a strong policy tool to address known unlawful conversions.</p>
<p>Regulatory consultation - Issues and Options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM); visioning; ongoing corporate community engagement; ongoing member liaison; Visioning; Agreeing an Evidence Base; Choices</p>	<p><b>Housing mix and choice</b></p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Need to <b>improve mix and choice</b> - away from high levels of social rent, private rent and HMOs - allowing for <b>aspirational housing trajectories</b>, (including shared equity, for single people as well as families) and mixed communities, with a choice of housing formats, and in doing so providing flexibility in delivery, finance etc. whilst building on interest in area generated by Olympics etc. Some concern however that new housing planned for 'outsiders' rather than local needs - people being priced out. But also a key reason for people moving on is the desire for better family housing. <b>Flexible, Lifetime Homes</b> desirable according to some - though others argue proportion of specific needs housing may be better. Importance of <b>'pepper potting'</b> and clear concern from members and residents that without a strong stance will create 'ghettos'. <b>Site particulars</b> including location make some types of housing more suitable than others however.</p>	<p>Yes - See policies H1, H2, and H4. Policy H1 aims to improve mix and choice through the identification of a family housing target, and following through the London Plan Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing requirements, working with H2 and H4 to re-balance the borough's housing stock, mainstreaming flexibility but also providing for specialist housing need.</p>	<p>The evidence base and stakeholder feedback identifies housing mix and choice as a significant issue for the borough and its future, reflected across the Council's functions via the priorities set by the SCS. Delivering a sustainable housing mix and choice is one of the key requirements of PPS3 (tenure, size, affordability etc) and London Plan.</p>

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Issues and Options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM); SPD draft; ongoing corporate/LDF community engagement; Visioning; Agreeing an evidence base; ongoing member liaison; Choices	<b>Housing quality</b>	All	<b>Needs to improve</b> , in line with general design and environmental quality which is of more concern to many residents than housing availability per se, esp. if going to have more flats (to make these acceptable - common aspiration is for detached houses) and to redevelop areas of existing housing (e.g. Carpenters). <b>Particular importance of space standards</b> , (storage, amenity, general size), <b>flexibility, natural lighting and noise-proofing</b> ; should be aware of viability implications however. Importance of not putting housing up against <b>incompatible land uses</b> (SIL, sewage plant). <b>Design and density should be related to character of the area</b> . Housing quality a key reason people move out of the area. Potential business opportunity in improving environmental performance etc. Scale of development presents opportunity for step-wise change. <b>Retrofitting</b> should also be encouraged (e.g. of energy efficiency). <b>Management</b> also needed (lettings, child densities etc). Should not be planning for target numbers alone - need for inspirational housing.	Yes - see policies H1, H4, SC1, SC2, and SP3 re standards and design criteria, plus protection of larger homes. Policies SC1 and 2 address environmental/thermal performance, alongside wider quality design policies.	Housing quality is fundamental to the vision of creating stable, mixed and balanced communities, with support in Choices consultation for this policy direction, and from the evidence base. London Plan, PPS3, and corporate policies all require housing quality issues to be addressed as part of this agenda.
Regulatory consultation - Issues and Options (C/S, SLLVAAP); Visioning; Agreeing an evidence base; ongoing community engagement (LDF, corporate) Choices	<b>Sustainable mixed use communities</b>	Statutory consultees; other public agencies; local residents; business interests; officers; development interests; members	Need to ensure residential areas are <b>liveable and have good access to local facilities</b> , (inc open space, jobs, public transport) that develop alongside new housing and are accessible and welcoming to all local people, promoting community cohesion. <b>Homes need to be balanced with jobs, and infrastructure delivery/quality</b> - part of the package to encourage people to stay. <b>Good facilities, especially open space can make higher densities acceptable</b> , which in turn can make best use of good accessibility, vacant employment land etc, helping to pay for de-contamination, affordable business space etc.	Yes - See policies H1, SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4 re design of successful mixed use areas, balancing homes, jobs and infrastructure; also spatial and Infrastructure policies. To be followed up with further policies and guidance as necessary.	Building sustainable communities is at the heart of LBN corporate policy and is part of the broader spatial vision projected by the Core Strategy and supported in the Choices consultation. This is consistent with PPS1, PPS3, and the London Plan.

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM); SPD draft; ongoing corporate/LDF community engagement; ongoing member engagement and internal liaison; Choices	<b>Affordable housing</b>	All, especially young people.	<b>High levels of need for affordable housing, but also need to improve mix in places</b> - area based approach may be appropriate. Role of <b>intermediate housing</b> in this. May be site based <b>viability</b> issues. Perception by residents that <b>affordability getting worse</b> with new development, and continued support for new social rent, as well as alternatives including buy back, use of empty properties. 35% target supported at I&O stage, with either a 60:40 or 70:30 social rent: intermediate split depending on circumstance (e.g. density, existing stock). Developers stress <b>flexibility, viability and current funding constraints</b> - the need also to be flexible re delivery mechanisms.	Yes - see Policy H2 - (affordable housing negotiation subject to viability and site specific matters). Discontinuation of HCA funding for social rent tenure, and changes to rent levels through the proposed Intermediate Rent model will have implications for affordable housing provision that will be material considerations. Guidance from the CLG and GLA is awaited on this matter.	PPS3 evidence base requirements satisfied through SHLAA, SHMA and economic viability analysis, which policy has been based on, also satisfying London Plan requirements. These and consultation show that the availability of affordable housing in addition to building a sustainable housing mix are significant strategic issues in the borough. The approach taken, supported in the Choices Consultation, balances these two issues, subject to scheme viability to ensure housing development comes forward as desired.
Regulatory consultation - Issues and Options (CS, SLLVAAP); Agreeing an evidence base; Choices; ongoing corporate community engagement.	<b>Specialist housing needs</b>	Interest groups, local residents, statutory consultees.	Concern that <b>Lifetime Homes</b> not always enough - need to provide for <b>ageing population with Extra Care housing</b> , supported housing etc <b>Quality of housing</b> needs to be particularly good for those who are more house bound. <b>Student accommodation needed</b> , especially in Stratford. Also new <b>gypsy-traveller plots</b> with separate amenity blocks - is apparently suppressed demand, and present site seen to be inadequate in a number of ways. Re-location from the Olympic Park was on the understanding of a return post-Games, and shouldn't we refer to this in the CS?	Yes - see policy H3, to be followed up in subsequent DPDs. Policy H3 aims to ensure provision for specialist housing needs enabled/included where the need is clearly demonstrated and the need aligns with the spatial vision. The full range of needs are acknowledged via a reference to the JSNA which considered them in more detail.	The overriding concern of the Council is redressing the imbalanced housing supply, stabilising the existing community, and building stable mixed and balanced, sustainable communities. Other needs will be catered for in the context of this policy.

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Ongoing internal/member liaison; ongoing community engagement (corporate/LDF; Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options (SLLVAAP, DCPM, CS); Agreeing an evidence base; Choices	<b>HMOs, buy to let</b>	Statutory consultees; members; officers; development interests	<b>Problems of high levels of HMOs/private rent</b> (via buy to let of small new build flats) - affecting <b>neighbourhood quality</b> - especially antisocial behaviour, churn and hence community cohesion, as well as loss of larger houses to conversions. <b>Illegal conversions</b> are common - enforcement is an issue. Ineffectiveness of dated 'saturated street' approach. However some concern that shouldn't overlook these as a <b>source of housing for a particular tranche of the population. Buy to let cannot be directly tackled through planning, but can be influenced</b> by encouraging more intermediate housing instead, (helping people on the housing ladder, encouraging people to have a greater stake in an area) restrictions on conversions and requirements of larger homes with better space standards.	Yes - See policies H1, H3, H4. Policies H1 and H4 seek to redress the balance in the housing stock, and tackle buy to let indirectly. To be followed up with further guidance as necessary.	In line with broader strategic Council vision to create stable mixed and balanced communities, also aligned with the London Plan and PPS3. The SHMA and enforcement data shows the extent of conversions, including the significant amount of unlawful conversions which justifies a restrictive strategic policy. Support for this policy direction in the Choices consultation.

## SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation - Issues and Options (CS, DCPM, SLLVAAP); visioning; ongoing community engagement (LDF/corporate); Choices for the Core Strategy	<b>Care for the environment through development, Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM</b>	Residents (though not a high priority); statutory consultees, other public sector agencies, developers;	<b>Design measures</b> seen to be a key mechanism to address, ensuring development continues to be fit for the future, particularly in the face of climate change. Also <b>construction</b> . Some concern re impact on development <b>viability</b> by developers, who seek flexibility; statutory consultees/public agencies desire for Newham to <b>aim higher consistently and across the borough</b> , to avoid distinction between new and old areas, rich and poor. <b>Opportunity of scale</b> of new development to include latest technologies. Best practice design should be showcased. Opportunity to be locally specific (e.g. with Thames Gateway Heat Network)	Yes – see policies SC1-4 and SP3, to be taken forward in subsequent DPDs/SPDs as necessary – e.g. requirements for non-Major developments. See also policies on Energy and Infrastructure.	Consistent with higher level policy; issue is extent to which 'green development' is pursued, and emphasis from having a separate section of the Core Strategy cf. being incorporated.

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation (CS, DCPM Issues and Options); ongoing internal liaison; visioning; Choices for the Core Strategy	<b>Energy</b>	Public agencies, some development interests; officers	Policy should <b>support low and zero carbon development and on-site renewable energy generation</b> ; policy should be <b>flexible</b> (developers) – giving consideration to delivery constraints (including viability, historic settings); policy should provide local position on biomass should be developed; policy should be locally specific (including reference to <b>Thames Gateway Heat Network</b> ); policy should be consistent with regional and national policy on low and zero carbon development and on-site renewable energy generation (including London Plan policy and Building Regulations).	Yes- see Policies SC1 & SC2 and iNF4 to be taken forward in subsequent DPDs/SPDs including details re technologies.	Consistent with higher-level policy (PPS1 and London Plan) and proposed step-changes to Building Regulations, as well as local infrastructure potential. Linked to broader spatial vision and economic development strategy. Policy direction broadly supported in Choices consultation.
Regulatory Consultation – (Core Strategy SA Scoping Report; Core Strategy Issues and Options); Agreeing an Evidence Base; Choices for the Core Strategy; ongoing internal and neighbouring borough liaison;	<b>Flood risk</b>	Statutory consultees; other public agencies	Policy <b>should support the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</b> and the requirement to undertake <b>the Sequential Test</b> ; support for existing and future <b>infrastructure</b> promoted; support for <b>green infrastructure, sustainable drainage systems and sustainable design and construction</b> promoted; enhancements as a result of Olympic development / other regeneration should be highlighted; support for emerging evidence on <b>surface water flood risk</b> promoted; support for development to contribute to <b>flood risk mitigation and resilience</b> promoted.	Yes – see Policy SC3 to be taken forward in Development Management DPD and SPD with further policy / guidance flood resistant design as necessary. Risk based sequential test factored into site analysis and SA and associated spatial policies.	Requirement of national policy (PPS25) and statutory consultee (the Environment Agency) in line with local evidence re flood risk (SFRA).

Engagement Stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation – (CS, DCPM, SLLVAAP Issues and Options); ongoing community engagement (LDF); Agreeing an Evidence Base; Choices for the Core Strategy	<b>Biodiversity and integrating greenspace into development</b>	Public agencies; statutory consultees; residents; some development interests, variety of internal and external strategic stakeholders involved in emerging Newham Biodiversity Partnership (NBP)	Policy should support <b>Biodiversity Action Plan</b> ; policy should support <b>regional initiatives</b> on biodiversity (ie. London Habitat Opportunity Mapping); <b>living roofs and walls</b> should be promoted; improving the <b>public realm</b> through biodiversity enhancements a priority; <b>educational programmes</b> relating to biodiversity are a priority; <b>restoration of waterways</b> is priority; <b>maintenance and monitoring</b> of biodiversity sites important; biodiversity policy should act in conjunction with <b>green infrastructure policy</b> - potential of <b>green chains/blue ribbons</b> (esp waterway enhancement) and <b>green roofs, SUDs</b> .	Yes – see Policies SC4, SC3 and SC1 (also INF6/7) to be taken forward in Development Management DPD and SPD with further policy / guidance as necessary (e.g. re green roofs, flood resistant design).	Consistent with higher-level policy re flood risk, climate change and biodiversity, and emerging Newham Biodiversity Plan.

## INFRASTRUCTURE

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, SLLVAAP, DCPM); Choices.	<b>Strategic infrastructure (physical)</b>	Statutory consultees including neighbouring boroughs, PLA, GLA, LTGDC, Thames Water; other public agencies; members; development interests	Need to plan for more <b>sludge</b> treatment at Beckton, <b>the Lee and Thames Tunnels</b> ; support <b>for Crossrail routes, DLR extension, Barking to Royal Docks Bus Corridor; River crossings</b> . Need to acknowledge strategic potential of <b>heat network</b> re development in the Arc, reducing costs and improving sustainability. <b>Wharves</b> - are protected by law; some appear to be surplus to requirements but any plans for rationalisation need careful planning to ensure deliverability (East Beckton questionable in this regard) and maintain usage.	Yes - see policies INF1, INF3, INF4 and S3. Policy INF1 provides for major strategic funded and unfunded infrastructure. Policy INF3 reflects Joint Waste Development Plan Document including sewage sludge and tideway / Lee tunnels. Heat networks covered in INF4, wharves in INF1/S3	In line with broader spatial vision. Provision of major transport infrastructure that gives resilience to cross-river movement, improves local and east/cross-London connections, and supports sustainable economic development potential and residential development. London-wide need for sewage treatment, as well as supporting major local development. Support for policy

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
				with careful consolidation criteria.	direction in Choices consultation.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options (CS); Visioning; Choices;	<b>Airport</b>	Statutory consultees including neighbouring boroughs, police; public sector agency; business interest; interest group (environmental).	<b>Public Safety Zone implications; impact</b> on surrounding areas - people's quality of life/residential potential; economic benefits, complaints about increasing aircraft noise (e.g. Redbridge); <b>desires to expand</b> with economic benefits (LCA)	Yes – CAA's revised PSZ to be included on proposals map on adoption, and can be accessed now on LBN Website. Policy INF1 acknowledges desires for expansion of LCA but also constraints.	Contentious - arguments both ways; wider and localised environmental impacts of airport are significant and a restraint on the development of nearby new communities but airport also has economic development benefits. Flights are not yet at capacity of existing permission so further expansion not an immediate issue.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, DCPM, SLLVAAP); Visioning; Agreeing an Evidence Base; ongoing corporate & LDF community engagement; ongoing member and internal liaison.	<b>Ease of movement around Newham</b>	Residents; statutory consultees including GLA, NHS Newham; development interests; members; officers	<b>Capacity of roads</b> (inc. parking) and some public transport (congestion/over-crowding) seen to be worsening with further development/regeneration; problems of <b>severance and connectivity</b> in some areas; <b>walking and cycling improvement</b> , and public realm measures have widespread support; some perception that is latent transport demand - not evident due to lack of infrastructure.	Yes - Policy INF1 supports development of major infrastructure to support resilience of transport network; Policy INF2 and SP policies SP1, SP3, SP5, SP6, SP7 together with spatial policies reflect support for sustainable movement on foot and cycle, the need to address connectivity and make better use of transport assets, and require road capacity to be addressed.	In line with broader spatial vision, LIP and higher-level policy to reduce the need for cars, and to encourage active travel for health reasons. Support for policy direction in Choices consultation.

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and Options; Choices; JWDPD proposed submission.	<b>Waste treatment infrastructure</b>	Statutory consultees including GLA, Thames Water, Environment Agency, English Nature; development interests and local businesses including waste site operators.	Need to <b>safeguard / allocate waste treatment sites</b> to provide sufficient facilities for waste tonnage throughputs or identify equivalent provision elsewhere. Need for <b>environmental protection</b> . Need to consider further <b>alternative sites</b> for Joint Waste Schedule 2 allocated sites.	Yes – see Policy INF3, which is aligned with Joint Waste DPD, to be examined shortly.	In line with higher-level policy, the main objective is to protect capacity, so flexibility is given by allowing sites to be developed for alternative uses provided that equivalent sites are identified elsewhere that have similar characteristics in terms of capacity and meet transport objectives.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, SLLVAAP); agreeing the evidence base; ongoing community engagement (corporate and LDF); Choices	<b>Town centre network and hierarchy</b>	Statutory consultees and other public agencies; local residents; development interests; local businesses	<b>Is largely satisfactory and should be maintained</b> , recognising <b>local shopping roles</b> , and <b>specialist ethnic provision</b> in small and large centres; though may be need for some <b>new additions</b> to the network in West Ham and in areas of new housing development - though people are less convinced re the need for a new local centre on Stratford High St, given proximity to Stratford town centre; <b>Gallions Reach</b> also proposed for designation on these grounds, which may be reason to <b>review East Beckton's role/designation</b> ; also need for step change in <b>Canning Town</b> ; one development interest also claims there is a need for a large foodstore in <b>Green St</b> ; <b>Custom House</b> has potential for hotel and other linkages with ExCeL, as well as local centre offer; <b>Silvertown Quays</b> and Custom House mustn't compete with Canning Town (though development interests would like them to have a higher level role); public realm should be improved in TCs.	Yes - see INF5, SP7 and spatial policies which seek to focus retail development within the defined network, apart from large foodstore in Green St.	Fits with higher-level policy and retail strategy developed through Town Centre and Retail Study, with support for this in Choices consultation. Large foodstore in Green St does accord with this strategy and risks undermining convenience provision at Canning Town and East Ham, as well as in-centre provision. Gallions Reach is acknowledged from an employment perspective, and given scope for improvement. Broadly supported in Choices consultation.

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Agreeing an evidence base; Choices; ongoing internal liaison; ongoing community engagement (LDF/Corporate), Choices	<b>Out of centre development</b>	Development interests; members; officers; residents	<b>Protection of existing hierarchy</b> from out of town development supported and careful consideration of <b>mixed use impacts and ground floor vitality</b> . Clarity needed re position on <b>out of centre ribbon development</b> (e.g. Katherine Road) - pros and cons of (food access/convenience/business opportunities v. sprawl/competition); <b>shouldn't preclude all out of centre development; 300 sq m is a tough local RIA threshold</b> (5 consultees, primarily development interests) - should also be clarity that it is net sales floorspace	Clarity given by INF5, SP7 and spatial policies maintaining a strong stance that viable local shopping is generally best provided in clusters. Out of centre development is strongly discouraged, but not precluded where it can be well-located and fulfils an access role.	In line with broader spatial vision and retail strategy, responding to identified problems with legibility, viability, and extent of out of centre development etc. whilst balancing this against access needs.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, SLLVAAP); agreeing an evidence base; Choices	<b>Town centre growth and development</b>	Development interests; officers; statutory consultees	Town centre boundaries <b>need to allow for growth</b> ; primary and secondary frontages need to be based on evidence; need for clarity as to when Stratford will be regarded a <b>Metropolitan centre</b> , and associated infrastructure needs (e.g. gyratory); <b>community facilities should be promoted</b> in town and local centres subject to local assessment.	Yes - new boundary proposed for Canning Town to allow for major growth and change; others and frontages to be reviewed in subsequent DPDs; criteria re Stratford boundary review trigger and infrastructure requirements in S2 and INF5. See also INF5 and INF8 plus SP6 re community infrastructure uses in town and local centres.	In line with PPS4 and broader spatial vision and retail strategy developed through Town Centre and Retail Study, supported through Choices consultation. Boundaries other than Canning Town and Stratford are of lesser strategic significance.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options( SLLVAAP, CS); visioning; Choices consultation; ongoing LDF and corporate community engagement.	<b>Leisure, culture and entertainment facilities</b>	Developers; public agencies; residents; members; interest groups (theatre); local residents.	Larger leisure facilities should be in <b>accessible locations</b> - though can also have a <b>role in regeneration</b> areas (Thames and Dockside); <b>existing town centres weak</b> on this type of provision; cultural facilities need <b>protection/strategic development</b> ; part of the package needed to get people to want to stay. <b>Youth diversionary activities seen to be lacking</b> , with a link to anti-social behaviour, and lack of motivation/aspiration.	See policies INF5, INF8 & SP5, SP6 (re commercial/community leisure and culture), INF 6/7 & SP2 re sports facilities; INF2, (re access) and spatial policies. INF8 promotes multi-use, to increase availability of facilities locally. This is supported by INF9 (delivery) and	Aligned with broader regeneration objectives and town centre and transport policy, including higher-level policy. In line with PPS12 principles of a Core Strategy. Leisure and tourism identified as growth sector in Policy J1 which also sets out suitable locations.

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
				appendix 3 which provide a delivery plan for community infrastructure. Further and more specific details to be developed in SPDs. Use-specific site allocations to be dealt with in Site Allocations DPD.	
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options; Visioning; Agreeing an Evidence base; Choices; ongoing corporate and LDF community engagement/	<b>Open space - quality and quantity</b>	All	Need to <b>maximise potential of existing open space</b> (including LVRP) and major investment ( <b>Olympic Park</b> ) to ensure is well used - including attention to <b>safety</b> (Greenway, after dark); should also be focusing on <b>cumulative effect of smaller green infrastructure</b> investment and protection across the borough; development also needs to make adequate provision of <b>new open space</b> whether on or off site, or through re-provision. <b>Are existing deficits</b> in access to green space in parts of the borough. Should be explicitly supporting <b>Lee River Park</b> proposals, and other linkages to east. <b>Waterways and Docks</b> also have open space potential, plus <b>cemeteries</b> . Open space can be a meaningful use for otherwise constrained sites, but may need to be partially cross-subsidised, or have access limitations. More <b>allotments</b> needed.	See policies INF6 and 7, SP2, SP3 (designing for safety) SC4 and spatial policies, alongside policies which seek to improve connectivity/accessibility by foot/bike.	In line with PPS24 and higher-level policy, notably London Plan on green/blue infrastructure. Support for policy directions in Choices, subject to addition of blue ribbon policy.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (SLLVAAP, DCPM, CS); Agreeing an Evidence Base; Choices;	<b>MOL/open space in operational use</b>	Statutory consultees including Thames Water, LTGDC; officers	Issue that <b>Thames Water land</b> is partly protected as open space - this may need to be relaxed to ensure operational requirements (including health and safety) are met, but not at the costs of public access to River Roding. Potential of <b>gas holders</b> due to be de-commissioned at Bromley by Bow (Twelvetrees) . Open space enhancement potentially conflicts with private ownership of land at <b>Three Mills</b> .	Policy INF6 (green infrastructure) proposes de-designation of MOL on TW operational land in Beckton, whilst providing for a new riverside park, and new MOL within the Olympic Park. Other more detailed matters to be dealt with through subsequent DPDs and SPDs as necessary.	In line with higher-level policy (PPS1, London Plan); support for policy direction in Choices.

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, SLLVAPP, DCPM); Visioning; ongoing corporate and LDF community engagement; ongoing inter-authority liaison, Choices consultation.	<b>Strategic approach to community infrastructure provision needed</b>	Developers; public agencies; statutory consultees including neighbouring boroughs; local residents; interest groups (open space, waterways)	Community infrastructure provision should be on the basis of an <b>audit of need</b> (including diversity) and capacity, but also <b>accessibility and viability</b> - local facilities are important and should be protected except where not viable; losses may be acceptable when replacements are planned more strategically - this may include consideration of regeneration objectives; development should coincide with transport infrastructure investment - this may include making better use of existing infrastructure (e.g. canals); are various areas of <b>existing infrastructure deficit</b> (West Ham, Forest Gate, South of the Docks) which need to be addressed too; need to <b>consider cross-boundary facilities</b> (e.g. Bromley By Bow, Leytonstone) but also impact of ours (e.g. Gallions Reach); mixed views as to whether <b>localised or centralised</b> multi-use facilities best - may need to differentiate between types of facility; <b>clusters of facilities and multi-use</b> broadly supported.	Yes - via community infrastructure study, plus gap analysis in retail study reflected in INF policies particularly INF5 and 8 plus spatial policies, which seek to balance central and local provision by encouraging multi-use and clustered infrastructure provision in accessible locations in every community, acknowledging cross boundary linkages, whilst enabling a variety of providers to initiate provision. Policy INF9 and Appendix 3 set out a delivery plan for community infrastructure for years 1-15 of the Core Strategy.	Required by PPS12; part of a coherent spatial strategy and Council approach to community cohesion and asset management. Support for policy direction in Choices consultation.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options; visioning, Choices consultation; ongoing corporate and LDF community engagement.	<b>Quality of community infrastructure</b>	Development interests; public agencies; members; local residents and businesses.	<b>Needs to be improved</b> ; exemplary health and education buildings should be sought within reason; <b>poor quality attracts poor quality staff</b> and outcomes, plus <b>image</b> of the borough.	INF8 provides that community facilities should be inclusive and open to all regardless of ability. New facilities subject to general design related policies seeking a rising quality of development in the borough.	Aligned with broader spatial vision and regeneration objectives- support for policy direction in Choices consultation.

Engagement stage drawn upon	Sub-theme	Main stakeholder groups	Summary of key matters raised	Will it be taken forward/next steps?	Reason?
Regulatory consultation - Issues and options (CS, SLLVAAP); draft SPD (Forest Gate); visioning; Agreeing an Evidence base; Choices; ongoing corporate and LDF community engagement.	<b>Community meeting places and places of worship</b>	Local residents; interest groups (faith/campaign groups);	Community halls for <b>multiple group use important</b> , (concern re large, single group facilities e.g. large scale mosque, though some advocate the need for <b>single faith places of worship</b> , particularly for faith groups) but so are <b>other places for people to meet and socialise</b> - coffee shops, bars, markets etc.	Yes see INF5, SP5/6, INF8 and spatial policies, with a focus on multi-use/open access and needs based provision. Use-specific site allocations to be dealt with in Site Allocations DPD where appropriate/necessary.	Fits with broader/higher-level town centre and transport policy objectives, regeneration aspirations and council community cohesion policy; multi-use community facilities also make financial/land efficiency sense. In line with PPS12 principles of a Core Strategy.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, SLLVAAP); stakeholder meetings; agreeing an evidence base; Choices	<b>Education and training facilities</b>	Local businesses; local residents; members; Newham FE establishments	<b>Schools seen to be lacking in parts</b> of the borough. Concern also about <b>quality of schools</b> . Sites sought for new or <b>replacement facilities</b> , particularly for FE, and enablement via allocation of existing sites for residential.	Yes- partly Policy INF8 provides for community infrastructure to meet local needs alongside IDP, with spatial expression in spatial policies. Use-specific site allocations and smaller sites to be dealt with in Site Allocations DPD.	In line with broader spatial vision and strategy, and PPS12 principles of a Core Strategy.
Regulatory Consultation - Issues and options (CS, DCPM); Agreeing an Evidence Base; Choices consultation	<b>Viability of S106/other developer contributions</b>	Developers	Concern re increasing burdens on developers which may compromise <b>viability</b> , and impact of economic downturn.	See Policy INF9 and housing policies which address viability-driven flexibility. To be followed by CIL charging levy and associated viability work.	In line with PPS12 and CIL regulations. Housing Economic Viability Assessment included assessment of various 'burdens' on developers. Support for policy direction in Choices consultation.