

Local Development Framework  
London Borough of Newham



**Regulation 30(1)(e) Statement  
Representations received on the Core  
Strategy Proposed Submission**

Core Strategy Submission

March 2011

For further information please refer to the Council's website: [www.newham.gov.uk](http://www.newham.gov.uk)  
Alternatively, contact Spatial Planning and Regeneration Policy on 0208 430 2639  
or email [ldf@newham.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@newham.gov.uk).

## SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS ON PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT

### Sections A & B and S1 - Spatial Strategy

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
169	Brett Group	Private Developer	A1	Introduction	N/A	Procedural reference re London Plan	No	
84	London City Airport	Local Business	A2	3.1 & 3.2	Unsound - Effective	<p>1. Paragraph 3.1 - Last sentence - We believe it would be more accurate to refer to London City Airport's domestic and international air links in the same way that 'soon to be international rail links' are referred to.</p> <p>2. Paragraph 3.2 - The word 'areas' is missing in the following sentence towards the bottom of the page....'Today all areas other than East Beckton are a blend of old and new, and continue to provide a focus for local communities and neighbourhoods which have evolved alongside them, as well as being very important for providing..'</p>	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
205	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest Group (Heritage)	A2	Section 3 Spatial Portrait	Unspecified	Noted that the Mills sit within the 'Arc of Opportunity' and this is supported by the Trust. Suggest adding: 'Three Mills is located in the Stratford and West Ham Community Forum Area and is the largest surviving tidal mill in the world. It has been the site of grain milling since at least the 11th Century and probably earlier so forms an important part of the historical development of the area.'	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
373	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	A2			The phrase 'soon to be an international rail links' attributed to Stratford International gives the impression that there is an international operator with a plan to use this station which is currently not the case. This should be reworded to avoid misunderstanding.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
89	London City Airport	Local Business	A3	4.6		The last sentence reads: 'Importantly however, the Borough has a developing tourism and leisure offer, incorporating the ExCeL exhibition centre, and the public sector provides important business opportunities'. To be sound, the presence of London City Airport in addition to the ExCeL exhibition centre, should be stated. This is because the airport facilitates inward tourism into East London with approximately one third of all passengers travelling through the airport stating that their reason for travel is for leisure.	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
206	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest Group (Heritage)	A3	4.6		Para 4.6 refers to 'developing tourism and leisure offer' and the Trust supports this particularly in terms of the opportunities available at Three Mills.	Unstated	
207	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest Group	A4		N/A	Comment on listed buildings in North Woolwich	Unstated	
104	Bouygues Development	Private Developer	A4	Context. Table on page 14: Safer Newham		Supported	No	
90	London City Airport	Local Business	A4	Context	N/A	Should include reference to Economic Development Strategy	No	This point is covered in section Policy J1
170	Brett Group	Private Developer	A4	Context	N/A	Procedural reference re London Plan	No	
207	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest Group	A4	Context	N/A	Comment on the House Mill and North Woolwich Old Station	No	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
43	ODA	Statutory consultee	AP4	Appendix 4		Welcomed and supported	No	
281	Quintain Estates and Development	Private Developer	B1	Key Diagram	Not Justified	Strategic Site S08 (Thames Wharf) should form a part of the regenerated Canning Town	Yes	
426	Lucy Rogers	Other	B1	Vision	Unspecified	Strategy favours multinational corporations and developer interests over the needs of local residents	Unstated	
11	ODA	Statutory consultee	B1	Vision and Key Diagram		Vision is welcomed. And previous concerns have been met	N	
128	LTGDC	Statutory consultee	B1	Vision and Key Diagram		Generally supportive of document as a whole	Yes	
330	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	B1	Vision		Supports policies for the arc of opportunity, job creation, housing provision, decentralised energy networks, family housing and the shift of industrial activity from west to east	Unstated	
395	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development Interest (Private)	B1	Vision		Support maximising the development potential of the Arc and creating a better choice of homes, shops, services and facilities.	Unstated	
439	University of East London	Other	B1	Vision		Supports the overall strategy	Unstated	
146	British Waterways	Statutory Body	B1		N/A	Change water features to water spaces	No	
376	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	B1	Vision	N/A	Add reference to a new road based tunnel at Silvertown and a crossing at Gallions Reach	No	
44	Mr Daniel Pope	Individual	B1	Key Diagram	Not legally compliant, Unsound - Effective	The key diagram should show the Barking to Royal Docks bus corridor and the DLR extension to Dagenham Dock so that it is consistent with the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's adopted Core Strategy key diagram.	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
48	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	Statutory Consultee	B1		Unsound - Effective	Suggests reflecting the various routes described (see full submission) on the Key Diagram, and denoting the U2 (Thames Tideway Tunnels) and U3 (Decentralised Energy Network) designations in different colours to avoid confusion.	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
105	Bouygues Development	Development Interest (Private)	B1	section B, paragraph 6.7.		We agree that Canning Town will become an important centre within Newham. However, we think that the paragraph should be amended to clearly outline where the extension of the town centre will be. We suggest the following wording: 'Canning Town will be another important centre, having diversified and expanded in terms of increased retail, improved public realm and re-orientating the town centre to the south. This will enable Canning Town to take more of a borough-wide role and become a re-valued part of surrounding neighbourhoods in Newham and Tower Hamlets'.	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
145	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee	B1	4.6	N/A	Suggest new wording for paragraph 4.6 (see representation for details).	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
378	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	B1	Key Diagram	Unspecified	In light of the fact that there is currently no formal safeguarding for the DLR extension to Dagenham Docks, TfL requires that the route for this possible transport scheme is shown on the diagram but with a comment that it is not currently with committed funding	Unstated	
396	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development Interest (Private)	B1	Newham 2027 (page 18)		We note and support the spatial strategy to maximise the development potential of the Arc of Opportunity and in particular to create access to 'better choice of homes, shops, services and facilities that reflect our population's diversity and a world class Olympic Legacy. '	Unstated	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
442	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Statutory Consultee	B1	Key Diagram		The Key Diagram should also show the relationship between the Regional Park, Olympic Park and Lea River Park, three major areas of open space located within the Arc of Opportunity, the area where the majority of new development within Newham will take place. Adding these designations to the Key Diagram would support and illustrate Policy INF6 and Policy S1 Spatial Strategy where reference is made to "better connecting residents to the Olympic Park and Lee Valley Regional Park".	Unstated	
208	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest Group	B6	Vision	N/A	Comment on the House Mill and North Woolwich Old Station	No	
287	One Housing Group	Private Developer	B6	Vision	N/A	Revise Vision to ensure development takes account of site characteristics and the overall character of the area.	No	This point is covered in Policies S1-S6
154	British Waterways	Statutory Body	B6	Vision	N/A	Add reference to maximising use of waterways throughout borough	No	This point is covered in Policy INF 7
92	London City Airport	Local Business	S1	Bullet 4	Unsound - justified	New housing should be able to sit comfortably alongside existing employment uses	No	
139	English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	S1		Unsound - Justified, Effective, Consistent with National Policy	Strengthen reference to heritage	No	
380	London Gypsy and Traveller Unit	Other	S1		Unspecified	Strategy should make provision for site for gypsies/travellers within Olympic Park	Yes	
12	ODA	Statutory Consultee	S1			Support proposed development criteria	No	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
103	Workspace Group	Local Business	S1			Agrees that new housing development is accompanied by jobs growth and infrastructure and supports strategy for arc of opportunity.	Unstated	
211	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest Group	S1			Supports S1 in principle	Unstated	
259	Friends of the Earth - Newham	Interest Group	S1			Welcomes positive elements of policy S1	Unstated	
106	Bouygues Development	Private Developer	S1	Bullet 5	N/A	Propose amendment relating to dwelling mix and financial viability	No	
155	British Waterways	Statutory Body	S1	Bullet 3	N/A	Add reference to freight in rest of borough	No	This point is covered within Policy INF7.
156	British Waterways	Statutory Body	S1	Bullet 6	N/A	Add reference to blue infrastructure	No	This point is covered within S1 Bullet 7
170	Brett Group	Private Developer	S1		N/A	Procedural reference re London Plan	No	
259	Friends of the Earth - Newham	Interest Group	S1	Bullet 7	N/A	Support cycle superhighways	Unstated	
440	University of East London	Interest Group	S1		N/A	More emphasis needed on links between regeneration and higher education	Unstated	
192	Rooff Ltd	Development Interest (Private)	S1	Item 5	Unsound - Justified, Effective, Consistent with National Policy	The policy to "prioritise new family housing over smaller residential units" is too general. The policy needs to be more sensitive to the context of development sites in order to be justified and effective. On large regeneration sites a range of housing typologies and densities will be required. The wording of this part of S1 should be redrafted to indicate that the Council will promote a range of housing typologies including family homes.	Yes	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
289	One Housing Group	Development Interest (private - semi-public)	S1	Spatial Strategy	Unsound - Effective, Consistent with National Policy	Strongly object to bullet point 5 of Policy S1 which states: "Prioritise quality new family housing over small residential units to rebalance the borough's housing stock." (See complete representation for reasons). Strongly objects to the statement in paragraph 3 of the reasoned justification to Policy S1 that: "...this must take place in a comprehensive rather than piecemeal manner in order to ensure that new housing areas are not gated communities, isolated from the rest of the borough and that new employment uses can sit comfortably alongside residential uses." (see complete representation for reasons). One Housing Group considers that bullet point 5 of S1 should be rewritten to state: "Provide a range of residential accommodation, including family housing, to reflect both housing need and the specific characteristics of individual sites and the wider area ". One Housing Group considers that paragraph 3 of the reasoned justification to SP1 which refers to the need for a comprehensive approach to development should be deleted.	No	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
295	Genesis Housing Group	Development Interest (private - semi-public)	S1		Unsound - Effective	The vision to focus "most growth" across the "Arc of Opportunity" is strongly supported. The implication to utilise landscape and water features as part of these innovative mixed use developments is also acknowledged. In order for Policy S1 to be "effective" (in terms of deliverability), the following wording is suggested as a new point 2 after "Development proposals which address the following criteria will be supported: "Maximisation of development at new communities within the Arc of Opportunity at locations in close proximity to key services which can utilise unique features such as riverfronts in order to create a new, positive and distinctive identity."	No	
313	Port of London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S1		Unsound - Consistent with National Policy	The policy, and more particularly criterion 3, is unsound as it is not in general conformity with the London Plan. In order to make this sound, the PLA considers that the promotion of water freight transport on the Blue Ribbon Network more generally within the Borough should be included.	No	
401	LB Tower Hamlets	Statutory Consultee	Section A	Links between SCS and CS		In Section A where links between SCS and CS are explained, under the Housing Newham theme it may be useful to include the provision of supportive physical and social infrastructure within the spatial expression in Core Strategy.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID.
143	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee		Section A - SCS Theme: Cleaner, Greener Newham	N/A	This paragraph should be amended to "An improved network of open spaces and waterways and a focus on quality corridors will also help to achieve this aim..."	No	See minor amendment proposed under this ID

## Stratford & West Ham

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
144	Theatres Trust	Interest Group	S2	General	Unspecified	Consider that cultural uses are not protected adequately and therefore could be lost to higher value uses	No	Adequately covered by S2 & INF8.
175	British Waterways	statutory consultee	S2		N/A	Pleased that this section recognises Stratford Waterfront has having the potential to for vibrant high quality and sustainable development that will support high quality parkland. Suggest that "water features" be amended to read "water spaces" so that these do not simple describe attractive settings but also valuable assets in delivering opportunities for leisure, recreation, tourism, education, biodiversity, transport and sustainability.	No	
443	Lower Lea Valley Regional Park Authority	statutory consultee	S2	Appendix 1 , S01, S07	Unspecified	Spatial Policy S2 should support the Regional Park and acknowledge the contribution that the Park's open green spaces, waterways, heritage assets and sporting facilities make to the distinctive character of Newham. Wording amendment to Policy S2, and strategic sites S01 and S07 suggested. The Regional Park should be identified in Appendix 1 Strategic Site Schedule and Designations as part of the Spatial Designation N1 'Olympic Legacy' and as an 'Existing Enhanced Open Space' (OS). Link between the Park and the draft replacement London Plan referenced.	Unstated	See minor amendments under ID 443.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
62	Newham 6th Form College	Development Interest (Public)	S2	S2	Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy	Core Strategy fails to provide the necessary policy framework to enable NewVIc to relocate to Stratford. It has not had regard to the evidence submitted by NewVIc on the Stratford Masterplan and which indicated the need for the College to relocate to Stratford town centre or its environs. Evidential studies prepared by the Borough support the need for investment in education. The Core Strategy is not justified having regard to the alternative locations promoted for new FE development. None of the alternative locations meets the requirements of NewVIc. The Strategy fails the 'effective' test in that it does not provide the appropriate policy framework to facilitate the delivery of a new FE campus.. The Core Strategy is not flexible enough to deal with the changing circumstances of the Borough up to and beyond the delivery of the Olympics, is not consistent with national policy on education referred to in PPS1 and PPS4.	Yes	See minor amendment to ID62
451	University of East London	Development Interest (Public)	S2	S2	Unspecified	Stratford Island University Centre (SIUC) We support the inclusion of the SIUC site within the Stratford Metropolitan element of the Arc of Opportunity which focuses on the Olympic Legacy and the fundamental objective of integrating Stratford to the rest of the Stratford Metropolitan Area. The actual wording should include reference to higher education provision in the Borough as part of the urban regeneration process.	Not stated	See minor amendment to ID451

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
157	British Waterways	Statutory consultee	S2	S2 Criterion 1	Unspecified	As above, we would recommend the addition of reference to green <b>/blue</b> spaces. Waterways should not be seen as barriers or boundaries but places where communities can gather together (including those in adjacent LB Tower Hamlets) for active leisure and events, etc in supporting sustainable communities.	No	See minor amendment to ID157
49	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	Statutory consultee	S2	8.1 Map 5	Justified	Suggests that Abbey Mills S10 is renamed to avoid confusion with the operational Abbey Mills Pumping Station site (usually referred to as Abbey Mills), on the opposite bank of the Channelsea Creek. The site is an operational sewage pumping station and therefore has significant security and safety requirements that can only be ensured by preventing public access to the site. We would therefore request that the reference to this site in the above text and on the accompanying figure should not include publically accessible open space function within the existing extent of its fenced perimeter. Should the Borough insist on the site being retained as Open Space; Thames Water request that the policy should be expanded to include direct reference to potential future development requirements at this strategically important site.	No	See Minor Amendment to ID49
85	LTGDC	Statutory consultee	S2	Appendix 1 - S02	N/A	Support the designation	No	
87	LTGDC	Statutory consultee	S2	Appendix 1 - S04 & S05.	N/A	Support the designation	No	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
122	LTGDC	Statutory consultee	S2	Appendix 1 SO9 Pudding Mill Lane	N/A	Previous comments about extent of the site available for development have not been incorporated. Support de-designation from SIL, but consider development should be employment led mixed use, with residential coming forward only in those areas where amenity issues are not significant.	No	
334	CEPF Chariot SARL	Development Interest (Private)	S2	Appendix 1 - S05 Stratford Central	Justified Effective	Consistent with comments on policy S2, Designation N2 should acknowledge the additional potential for student housing and a foodstore. It should also confirm that the demolition of Morgan House is essential to facilitate development.	yes	
158	National Grid Property Holdings	Development Interest (Private)	S2	Appendix 1 -S06 Carpenters District	Effective	Site at Rick Roberts Way should have a typology that allows for higher density.	Yes	
435	Newham Concern	Interest Group (community)	S2	Appendix 1 -S10 - Abbey Mills - Appendix 1: Schedule of Strategic Sites -	Justified Effective	The wording of the schedule should reflect the need for a genuine mix of uses; section should delete the reference to the owners of the site wishing to develop a new mosque, school and housing	No	Reference to the owners aspirations should be deleted. See ID435 under Minor Amendments
41	ODA	Statutory consultee	S2	Appendix 1	N/A	Support strategic site designations within ODA administrative area and a comprehensive approach to development	No	
82	LTGDC	Statutory consultee	S2	Appendix 1 S01	N/A	Support the designation	No	
7	Newham College of Further Education	Development Interest (Public)	S2	Appendix 1 -Possible new site. Appendix 1: Schedule of Strategic Sites	Legal Compliance, Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy	Believe their existing site at Welfare Road should be identified as a Strategic Site for residential development within Appendix 1.	Yes	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
121	LTGDC	Statutory consultee	S2	Appendix 1-S07 Sugar House Lane and Three Mills	N/A	The table of strategic sites should refer to the land use and design brief for this area, not just to the Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan.	No	
315	Her Majesty's Court Service	Other Pubic Agency	S2	General	Justified Effective	To ensure all new development takes into account surrounding uses, particularly those of a sensitive nature, such as court services, when addressing issues of overlooking, access, circulation and land use.	No	Sensitivity adequately considered under SP3 Quality Urban Design within Places
338	Greater London Authority	statutory consultee	S2	General	Unspecified	The level of residential development assumed for Stratford and West Ham is below the levels proposed in the emerging Olympic Legacy SPG.	Unstated	
383	London Gypsy and Traveller Unit	Interest Group	S2	General	Unspecified	Want recognition of MOLs commitment to relocate former Clays Lane Gypsies to the Olympic Park.	Unstated	Adequate provision is made for general accommodation needs under H3.
176	British Waterways	Statutory consultee	S2	Map 5	N/A	Should show waterways much more clearly.	No	See minor amendment under this ID.
177	British Waterways	Statutory consultee	S2	Para 8.11	N/A	River Lea should not be looked at as a boundary but as an opportunity to bring people together through water/waterside activities.	No	
243	St John's Church Stratford	Interest Group (faith)	S2		Unspecified	The description of Carpenters Estate as "social housing in a number of low and high rise blocks" is inaccurate. The Estate contains around 150 traditional terraced houses, each with a garden. These properties should be retained.	Unstated	See Minor Amendment under ID94
183	British Waterways	Statutory consultee	S2	S02 Stratford Waterfront and S03 Olympic Quarter	Consistent with National Policy	Seeks integrating development with the waterway and maximising the active use of the water space.	No	Policy INF7 adequately caters for development located adjacent to waterways

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
4	Newham College of Further Education	Development Interest (Public)	S2	S03 Olympic Quarter & S06 Carpenters District	Legal Compliance, Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy	Wishes S03 and S06 to include specific provision for further education campus for Newham College of Further Education. Believe their existing site at Welfare Road should be a strategic site.	Yes	Minor amendment reference to HE/FE expansion in Stratford ID62 of Minor Amendments
291	East Thames Housing Group	Development Interest (Public/Semi Public)	S2	S04 Chobham Village	Legal Compliance, Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy	Change housing typology to average medium density/medium family housing typology across the site.	Yes	
327	CEPF Chariot SARL	Development Interest (Private)	S2	S05 Stratford Central	Justified	Rework policy to describe a vision for a site or area set out how the Council will support the approach and then set out a series of tests against which developments should be judged. Supporting text should be not be prescriptive about the scale of a foodstore and acknowledge the possibility for student housing.	Yes	
332	CEPF Chariot SARL	Development Interest (Private)	S2	S05 Stratford Central	Justified Effective	Policy to cover renewal and significant expansion of retail floorspace, including a new foodstore with student accommodation and public realm and permeability improvements. Development that integrates with the Olympic Park and Stratford City	Yes	
188	British Waterways	Statutory consultee	S2	S05,S07 and S09	Unspecified	Development between Waterworks River and City Mill River integrate with these waterways including opportunities for freight, leisure and recreation, health and well-being, education, tourism, biodiversity and education	No	Policy INF7 caters for development located adjacent to waterways

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
153	National Grid Property Holdings	Development Interest (Private)	S2	S06 Carpenters District	Unspecified	NGPs site at Rick Roberts Way is at a strategic location within Stratford Metropolitan Area and the Arc of Opportunity and given that the site is available in the short term should be included in S06.	Yes	Covered under criterion 9 of Policy S2
242	Carol Richards	Resident	S2	S06 Carpenters District	Unspecified	SO6 Carpenters Estate Reasonable alternatives have not been considered to the statement at SO6 therefore the proposals cannot be deemed to be the most appropriate strategy.	Unstated	Protection of family homes recognised in Policy H4.
302	Genesis Housing Group	Development Interest (Public/Semi Public)	S2	S07 Sugar House Lane	Legal Compliance, Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy	Indicative housing typology is overly restrictive and the S07. A revised is suggested to give more flexibility to maximise development.	Yes	
399	Land Prop Inter IKEA	Development Interest (Private)	S2	S07 Sugar House Lane	Not stated	Support S07, and southern parallel but should not refer to SMM as it has no status.		
397	Land Prop Inter IKEA	Development Interest (Private)	S2	S07 Sugar House Lane	Unspecified	Support the identification of Sugar House Lane as a Strategic Site (SO7) Suggest rewording in favour of residential led development. Creative and cultural employment uses has no status, is not justified and is too prescriptive.	Unstated	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
212	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest group (Area Conservation)	S2	S07 Sugar House Lane	Unspecified	Para 5 Supported. After '....sensitive integration of heritage assets within new areas of development to enhance the built environment' add 'and define the character of new neighbourhoods'. Para 6 Tall buildings should be excluded from the Sugar House Lane and Three Mills area to safeguard. Listed Buildings, buildings/structures of Historical/Townscape value, historic street patterns and waterfront settings but see comments on Core Policy SP4. Reasoned Justification at p26 should make reference to the existence of the Grade I Listed House Mill which in November 2010 received the green light for a £2.65m grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund to restore the four water wheels to working order and generate hydro-electricity.	Unstated	
213	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest group (Area Conservation)	S2	S07 Sugar House Lane	Unspecified	Mixed uses set out for site SO7 are supported in principle as being broadly consistent with the Trust's objectives.	No	Noted
374	East Thames Housing Group	Development Interest (Public/Semi Public)	S2	S07 -Sugar House Lane	Legal Compliance, Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy	Consider policy is too detailed and does not maximise potential. Mixed use to include residential, creative and cultural employment uses, community uses	yes	
195	Roof Ltd	Development Interest (Private)	S2	S09 Pudding Mill Lane	Legal Compliance, Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy	Consider that the site should be for medium density medium family housing and linking the definition of density with the London Plan Matrix	Yes	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
202	Roof Ltd	Development Interest (Private)	S2	S09 Pudding Mill Lane	Legal Compliance, Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy	Change the housing typology text to medium density/medium family. More detail and clarification of phasing is needed.	Yes	Phasing explained at start of Appendix 1 table.
447	Lancaster Plc	Development Interest (Private)	S2	S09 Pudding Mill Lane	Consistent with National Policy	Own 68-70 High Street on which they promote mixed use. Support the proposed de-designation as SIL and development for residential and business mixed use and support retail and community uses with improved connections. Object to housing typology as wish to maximise development. Support de-designation and mixed use but not lower density housing typology. Recognition of London Plan Matrix.	Yes	
392	Newham Concern	Interest Group	S2	S10 Abbey Milles	Unspecified	Support policy but would wish to see great emphasis on residential and medium to high density.		
388	Abbey Mills Trustees	Interest Group	S2	S10 Abbey Mills	Unspecified	Mistakenly note that we are proposing community use on the site but suggest it should be extended to include faith use.		We do not support main community or faith use on the site. It indicates employment led mixed use.
413	Jeffers	Resident	S2	Strategic Site S06 - Carpenters District	Unspecified	The reference to 'communities' needs to specify and protect leaseholders and freeholders interest in the Carpenters District.	Unstated	
430	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development Interest (Private)	S2	Strategic Site Schedule - S07 - Sugarhouse Lane	Not stated	Consider the following wording more appropriate for the site description for S07: 'Mixed use residential-led development to include complementary employment uses, community uses, supporting services and local amenity space in the form of a new successful neighbourhood.' In addition, a more flexible approach to the housing typology would be more appropriate for this site.	Unstated	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
403	London Borough of Tower Hamlets	Statutory consultee	S2	Strategic Sites S03, S07, and S09	Not stated	Would like to emphasise that adequate supportive physical and social infrastructure must be provided to sustain the population growth within the area, considering direct impact on neighbouring areas.	Unstated	
102	Workspace Group	Development Interest (Private)	S2		Blank	Supports Policy S2 for housing delivery, and also the site designation S09 - Pudding Mill Lane for mixed use development.	Unstated	
353	Stratford Renaissance Partnership	Interest Group	S2		N/A	Supports the removal of the gyratory and would support policies which retain and develop the cultural and evening offer of the area. Would also like to see more focus on how all of Stratford's component parts are integrated into one whole	No	
381	Travel for London	Statutory consultee	S2		N/A	It should be noted that TfL is currently considering plans of double-tracking the DLR services from Stratford to Bow Church stations.	no	
449	OPLC	Statutory consultee	S2		N/A	OPLC has commented positively on Olympic Legacy strategic sites with the following reservations 1.S01 Chobham Village comparatively lower densities for families may be ok but family oriented development does not need to be low density 2. S06 Carpenters (higher density may be appropriate on part of this site) 3. S07 SHLViability questions on the studios may suggest that residential element may be included 4. S09 PML may not be the only location for health facilities and primary school higher density may be appropriate nearer the station	no	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
298	East Thames Group	Development Interest (Public)	S2	Appendix 1 S05 Stratford Central	N/A	The policy text is supportive of retail, employment and medium/high density low family housing. This is consistent with our recent proposals for 57 Broadway. ETG supports the land use principles set out for the Stratford Central area.	No	
240	Carol Richards	Resident	S2	Appendix 1 S06 Carpenters District	Unspecified	The Carpenters Estate description ignores the fact that there are highly desirable family homes in the area. The Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan, as a document, was not itself the subject of any consultation exercise.	Unstated	See minor amendment under ID94
340	CEPF Chariot SARL	Development Interest (Private)	S2	Appendix 1 S05 Stratford Central	Justified Effective	The policy should be revised to be more a direct means by which development proposals can be considered against. Specific reference should be made to the importance of regeneration Stratford Centre for a flexible range and scale of development.	yes	
13	ODA	Statutory consultee	S2, and MapS	Maps 4 and 5	Unspecified	Reference to retaining and developing the sport and recreational infrastructure inherited from the 2012 Games would be welcomed. Seek to accommodate changes to the Olympic Park strategic sites shapes once the final form of OPLC's broad development proposals become clear. Include a definition/description within the document text or map key of the "Stratford Masterplan North South Parallels" shown on the map. Exclude Games time warm up track from the Olympic Park area. Differentiating on the map areas outside LBN boundaries. Amend the policy to include criteria which the new and existing elements of Stratford Town Centre need to achieve to become one town centre and achieve designation as a Metropolitan Centre. Identify additional physical linkages that need to be achieved. Retention of the relatively modern, employment use cluster at Rick	No	See Minor Amendment to ID13

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
						Roberts Way is supported. This should be defined from the Olympics Southern Transport Mall which will be the subject of separate legacy proposals from OPLC. Resisting piecemeal development is welcomed and supported.		
5	Newham College of Further Education	Development Interest (Public)	S3	Appendix 1 - S03 Olympic Quarter & S06 Carpenters District	Legal Compliance, Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy	Wishes S03 and S06 to include specific provision for further education campus for Newham College of Further Education	Yes	Minor amendment reference to of HE/FE expansion In Stratford ID62 of Minor Amendments. Policy INF8 also makes reference to further education expansion [subject to amendment ID9, 64, 66]
94	Shiva Williams	Resident		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S06 Carpenters District	No	The residents in the houses on the Carpenters Estate do not think the houses on the Estate should be demolished they are only 40 years old and in very good condition. We believe the houses should remain. Plans to demolish the Tower blocks and some of the houses already agreed should be carried out as soon as possible and high density homes should be built along the Warton Road area. Land on the redundant building on the other side of the Jupp Road bridge could be used to develop some of the ideas on phase 3 of the preferred Master Plan. A Ten story Block could replace Dennison Point and the remaining space could be used for Education. The shopping centre is close by and there is no need for more shops there.	No	See minor amendment under ID 94.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to Participate at EIP?	Minor Amendments/Comments
123	LTGDC	Statutory consultee		Appendix 1 - S10 Abbey Mills	N/A	S10: proposed designation for the site should be clearer. The policy should more clearly set out the area allocated for employment, residential and community uses. Map on page 82 of the strategy marks sites S10 and S11 as "Proposed release of Other Employment Land Designation" - this would seem contradictory to the text in the spatial designations table. Support a new local centre in the vicinity of West Ham station. Maps on page 22 and page 82 show different designations. This should be clarified.	No	
86	LTGDC	Statutory consultee		Appendix 1 S03 Olympic Quarter	N/A	Support the designation	No	
88	LTGDC	Statutory consultee		Appendix 1 S06 Carpenters District	N/A	Supports the Designation but wants a stronger reference to the benefits of a southern entrance to Stratford Station to Carpenters.	No	Details of entrance will be covered in the SPD

## Royal Docks

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
285	Quintain Estates and Development	Development interest - Private	not stated but assume S3	S08 - Thames Wharf	Soundness - not justified or effective	Propose revised text to refer to a substantial residential element as well as new employment, leisure and hotel uses. This would ensure the policy was fully justified, being the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives and effective in that the residential development would aid the delivery of leisure and employment uses.	Yes	No change proposed

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
453	University of East London	Development Interest - Public-Semi Public	S3 - Royal Docks	Strategic Site S31	Unspecified	UEL supports the wider enterprise, green economy and improved "sense of place" aspirations of LBN for this area. However with the E10/S31 employment use proposals, we believe more that flexibility should be allowed for with regard to the expansion of the UEL Docklands Campus along the northern side of the Royal Albert Basin. Employment provision could sit comfortably with expanded higher education and ancillary activities (B1 incubator units etc) as required for UEL.	Unstated	
3	Notting Hill Housing	Development interest - Public/Semi Public	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not justified or effective	The approach of defining Albert Basin allocation S19 as a Strategic Site on the Key Diagram and other areas of the document but also referring to the allocation as an adjacent site is considered to be unsound.' The role of the adjacent sites is not defined to any extent. Moreover, the wording of this policy is strongly objected to, for reasons of inconsistency, ambiguity and unsoundness.	No	No change is proposed. Page 23 of the Core Strategy (reasoned justification to Policy S1) makes clear that the housing allocation figures for each spatial policy apply to sites within Community Forum boundaries. Sites in and around Royal Docks fall within Royal Docks, Beckton and Canning Town and Custom House Community Forum Areas. Site S19 is included within Policy S5 Beckton for the purposes of housing, which states that 1,600 dwellings are to come forward on the site over the plan period. No change proposed.
194	Ballymore Properties	Development Interest - Private	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not justified or effective	An additional strategic site (No S32) should be added to the plan (see rep 191 above)	Yes	No change is proposed. Core Strategy proposes retention of Thameside East as a Strategic Industrial Location. This is supported by the borough employment land review and discussions with other key stakeholders e.g. GLA

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
187	Ballymore Properties	Development Interest - Private	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not justified or effective or consistent with national policy	Propose that the whole of the Thameside Industrial Estate should be identified as a 'transition zone' between the recent residential development to the west and the Tate and Lyle site to the east. In view of this, the whole of the Thames Road site should be identified as strategic site S32.	Yes	No change proposed. Core Strategy proposes retention of Thameside East as a Strategic Industrial Location. This is supported by the borough employment land review and discussions with other key stakeholders e.g. GLA
314	Port of London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks	Appendix 1 - Site Schedule Site S08	Soundness - not Justified; not Consistent with National Policy	In relation to criterion 6, and on the basis that Thames Wharf is not within the Royal Docks (and therefore the four safeguarded wharves within the area are Peruvian, Manhattan, Sunshine and Tate & Lyle), is the Core Strategy really proposing a consolidation which includes the Tate & Lyle facility?	Unstated	See minor amendment under this ID.
314	Port of London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks	Reason Justification, Site S08	Soundness - not Justified; not Consistent with National Policy	Within the reasoned justification it should be noted that, in accordance with the London Plan, any consolidation of wharfage should be to improve the cargo-handling characteristics of the remaining wharfage, rather than a desire to free up river frontage for other alternative uses. The references to relocation of the wharves elsewhere in the Borough appears to lack an evidence base should be removed.	Unstated	No change proposed

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
314	Port of London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks	Appendix 1 - Site Schedule Site S08	Soundness - not Justified; not Consistent with National Policy	No objection in principle to Thames Wharf being consolidated within Thameside West; however the PLA is not aware of any evidence base to suggest that this is viable at the former Carlsberg Tetley site and as Peruvian Wharf is already a safeguarded wharf, it would not be possible to merely transfer extant cargo-handling capacity at Thames Wharf to Peruvian. These issues are also relevant in relation to Site SO8-Thames Wharf (pp36), although the PLA notes that this does state that such relocation must be appropriately delivered.	Unstated	A borough wide review of wharves is being undertaken. This will feed into the GLA review. The policy wording is considered appropriate to retain flexibility over the plan period as evidence is brought forward for proposals. This will be subject to further discussion between GLA and LBN.
352	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not justified	Whilst the proposals set out in the Core Strategy for the Royal Docks are generally supported as currently proposed the core strategy is not in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to Strategic Industrial Land and Safeguarded Wharves.	Unstated	A borough wide review of wharves is being undertaken. This will feed into the GLA review. The policy wording is considered appropriate to retain flexibility over the plan period as evidence is brought forward for proposals. Subject to discussion between GLA and LBN
352	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not justified	Support the inclusion of the additional triangle of land to the north of Lyle Park leading up to West Silvertown station on the basis that access to Peruvian, Sunshine and Manhattan wharfs will not be compromised.	Unstated	No action required.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
352	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not justified	Do not support release of SIL at Thames Wharf. Thames Wharf is a safeguarded wharf that is in operational use and is well used; secondly, this would bring loss of SIL up to 55% within Thameside West which could compromise the use of the remaining SIL and the operation of its safeguarded wharves. Further work is needed to ascertain whether relocation to the Carlsberg Tetley Wharf is a practical option from a navigational point of view. In addition the Carlsberg Tetley site is covered by the Silvertown Crossing safeguarding and from a wharf perspective we would not want to swap Thames Wharf for Carlsberg Tetley and then find in a few years that the site is lost or compromised due to the Crossing. This would result in a net loss of wharves in an area where it is important to keep them. The Thameside West work identifies that if the wharves were made available there is demand from wharf operators for twice as much wharf land as is designated.	Unstated	A borough wide review of wharves is being undertaken. This will feed into the GLA review. The policy wording is considered appropriate to retain flexibility over the plan period as evidence is brought forward for proposals. Subject to discussion between GLA and LBN
352	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not justified	As currently drafted the Core Strategy is not in general conformity with the London Plan however the GLA would like to investigate with the borough the potential for rationalising the wharfs in Thameside West through this process.	Unstated	A borough wide review of wharves is being undertaken. This will feed into the GLA review. The policy wording is considered appropriate to retain flexibility over the plan period as evidence is brought forward for proposals. This will be subject to further discussion between GLA and LBN.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
166	ExCeL London	Development interest - Private	S3 - Royal Docks	Reasoned Justification	n/a	A further paragraph should be added stating the following: 'The ExCeL estate and its wider environment will continue to thrive, building on its success as both an exhibition and Olympic venue, and building on the opportunities for development for a mix of uses. Further opportunity for development post-Olympics will be encouraged.'	No	
171	Brett Aggregates	Development Interest - Private	S3 - Royal Docks	Section 9 in consultation portal		Policy refers to 'rationalisation of employment land to achieve considerably higher value employment uses and jobs density than currently exist, including a phased release of strategic industrial land (SIL) over the plan period'. Industrial Sites should only be released for alternative development if the alternative use is appropriate and not in conflict with adjoining uses.	No	
214	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest Group (Conservation/heritage)	S3 - Royal Docks		n/a	Reference to a rejuvenated centre at North Woolwich [with Local Centre improvements under way] is welcomed. The Trust also supports the statement that 'The Council will not support the development of sites in a piecemeal way particularly where this would prejudice the realisation of the overall vision for the area.	Unstated	
173	Brett Aggregates	Development Interest - Private	S3 - Royal Docks	Paragraphs 9.9, 9.10, 9.11, 9.13	N/A	The Core Strategy proposes the release of Thames Wharf, and the possibility of consolidation at either Peruvian Wharf, or the Carlsberg Tetley site. Do not disagree with proposal but seek clarification on what Newham means by a consolidated wharf. We would not want to see consolidated uses that might conflict with sand/gravel/concrete batching operation.	No	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
314	Port of London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks	critierion 6	Not Justified or consistent with National Policy.	Whilst the PLA is content with the principles of the wharves in Thameside West being consolidated (an approach considered appropriate within the DRLP), the PLA is not aware of any evidence base to suggest that a relocation of the wharves to the east of the borough is either viable or feasible. This should be deleted. Any consolidation of wharfage should be to improve the cargo-handling characteristics of the remaining wharfage, rather than a desire to free up river frontage for other alternative uses.	Unstated	See minor amendment under this ID
164	ExCel London	Development interest - Private	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not justified	Support concentration of new low carbon technologies, manufacturing and research in Royal Docks, but consider singular approach to land use is unsound. Propose change to Policy S3 to state that Council also support the other types of activities in the area.	No	Policy positively encourages such sectors, and the leisure economy in line with LBN/MoL Royal Docks Vision. Other proposals will be considered in accordance with other Development Plan policies. Do not consider proposed change adds clarity to policy. No change proposed.
165	ExCel London	Development interest - Private	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not effective	Policy S3 should highlight the potential of ExCeL to accommodate future development to help contribute to the place-making and strengthening of Custom House, in association with new CrossRail station not only as a local centre but as an area which can make a significant contribution in terms of leisure facilities, jobs and other ancillary services.	No	Policy S3 refers to enhanced centre at custom House, new CrossRail station and links to ExCel estate. Role of ExCeL is considered to be sufficiently dealt with in Newham Today section and Policy S3. No change proposed.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
165	ExCel London	Development interest - Private	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not effective	The last paragraph of the policy is too specific and inflexible. We consider that the council should not state that it does not support piecemeal development per se, but only where it is clear that opportunities for larger objectives are being missed	No	This paragraph has been included in Policies S2-S5. This recognises the size of the strategic sites and emphasises the importance LBN places on comprehensive regeneration and phasing, particularly within the arc of opportunity. No change proposed.
165	ExCel London	Development interest - Private	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not effective	Propose additional bullet point to policy S3: The ExCeL estate will also provide a range of services including retail and leisure to support its residential, business and leisure community.	No	It is considered that sections 1 and 2 of the policy provide sufficient policy coverage. No change proposed.
269	Newham FoE	Interest Group	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness	London City Airport (Spatial policies 34) The "impacts" referred to (bad air quality and noise" are harmful to local residents.	Unstated	Policy S3 does not refer explicitly to London City Airport. Covered by Policy INF1. No change is proposed.
355	Jane Riches	Resident	S3 - Royal Docks			Keep the City Airport down for air travel - it is hell for residents, visitors and workers.	Unstated	Covered by INF1 which states that further expansion will need to be carefully considered with regard to impact on the development of sites within the Royal Docks, and S3 notes potential constraints of Airport on development sites in Royal Docks. No change proposed.
355	Jane Riches	Resident	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not specified	Keep best of existing architecture and avoid architects doing lots of different buildings/colours. All new buildings should fit with the surrounding area.	Unstated	Policies SP1, SP3, SP4 and SP5 set out the Council's approach to design. No change proposed to Policy S3.
355	Jane Riches	Resident	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not specified	Please make sure that Lyle Park is kept as beautiful as it is.	Unstated	Lyle Park is identified as green space on the UDP proposals map. The Core Strategy does not propose to change this designation.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
355	Jane Riches	Resident	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not specified	Need to ensure industries control their smells and make sure there is no noise for residents- eg music, noisy dogs.	Unstated	Extant UDP environmental policies and Core Strategy Policies SP2 consider impacts of new development in terms of noise, smells etc. Other environmental health legislation controls existing development. No change proposed.
355	Jane Riches	Resident	S3 - Royal Docks		Soundness - not specified	Request public access along River Thames as access currently restricted.	Unstated	Policies S1 and INF7 refers to enhanced opportunities for walking, cycling, recreation and water-based transport, and access to blue ribbon network. Minor amendment proposed to refer to linking Lea Valley Park and River Thames.
385	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks	Appendix 1 - Site Schedule Site S08 - Thames Wharf	Soundness - not specified	Encourage the borough to prioritise development around existing DLR stations to allow creation of the right conditions to facilitate delivery of a new station requiring significant levels of developer funding.	Unstated	Site schedule indicates that this site is likely to come forward in the medium term given the constraints on the site. No change proposed.
385	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks	Appendix 1 - Site Schedule Site S08 - Thames Wharf	not specified	The phrase 'new DLR station' gives the impression that the construction of Thames Wharf stations in progress which is not the case. TfL requests that it rather says 'potential DLR station'.	Unstated	See minor amendment under this ID
389	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks	Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S19 (adjacent site)	not specified	Request further detail on river crossings including consideration of a new road / passenger ferry service and in the longer term a fixed link.	Unstated	Consider this is adequately covered by point 7 of Policy s3 and INF1. No change proposed.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
410	Alan Haughton	Resident	S3 - Royal Docks		not specified	The PSZ is created on around 97,000 flights that LCY submitted. It should really cover the next 15 years to which their masterplan says they will have 173,000 flights which is nearly double what they submitted and in accordance with ATWP. The PSZ restricts development.	Unstated	PSZ is remodelled regularly by CAA as necessary (e.g. if a significant expansion is approved which has not already been assumed in the modelled risk contour), with updates published on the Council's website. All development currently has to have regard to the PSZ. No change proposed.
410	Alan Haughton	Resident	S3 - Royal Docks		not specified	Cable Car application approved by Newham Council introduces societal risk around the airport and a full investigation of this risk from London City Airport should be investigated.	Unstated	The Core Strategy supports additional river crossing including cable cars, and notes the permitted Greenwich to Royal Victoria link. A full assessment was made of the risk of locating this in the vicinity of the Airport; the MoL has now endorsed this application.
410	Alan Haughton	Resident	S3 - Royal Docks		Not specified	Object to expansion/growth of London City Airport as they are already breaching air quality as shown in ODA report.	Unstated	Covered by policy INF1. Policy S3 recognises potential constraints of the airport on development within the Royal Docks.
475	Friends of the Earth - London	Interest Group (Environment)	S3 - Royal Docks		Not specified	Should have a clear policy against allowing any expansion at the airport which is clearly incompatible with policy SP2 on Healthy Neighbourhoods, and the Mayor's targets for reducing CO <sub>2</sub> .	Yes	Covered by Policy INF. Policy S3 highlights potential constraints on development sites in Royal Docks due to LCA location. No change is proposed.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
475	Friends of the Earth - London	Interest Group (Environment)	S3 - Royal Docks		Not specified	The 50% flight increase application showed that this would have taken one air quality receptor over an EU legal limit for NO2 when this would not have been the case without that, which is unacceptable. Any further expansion would also be completely unacceptable. The recently revised PSZ is based on a number of aircraft movements of less than 100,000, rather than 120,000, due to noise constraints, according to a letter from the DfT.	Yes	Policy S3 does not refer explicitly to London City Airport. The reasoned justification to the policy notes that proposals for future expansion of the airport will need to be carefully considered in light of impacts on the local environment. INF1 states that further expansion will need to be carefully considered with regard to impact on the development of sites within the Royal Docks. The policy is considered to strike a reasonable balance and therefore no change is proposed.
479	KTI Energy	Development interest - Private	S3 - Royal Docks		Not specified	Seek to develop a 90MWe renewable CHP station on the UNEX site in Thames Road, Silvertown, receiving its SRF, RDF and woodchip by river, supplying green electricity and heat to the Lower Lea Valley. We objected in 2010 to Ballymore seeking a change of use of the Unex site from industrial to residential.	Unstated	Core Strategy does not propose to change designation of Thameside East from employment.
382	GLA/TfL	Statutory Consultee	S3 - Royal Docks		Unspecified	Since other strategic transport schemes such as East London Transit and DLR extension to Dagenham Dock are currently without committed funding as part of TfL's current investment plan, TfL requires that the council supports the improvement of the bus network as part of the spatial policies for the Royal Docks area. Given the absence of a masterplan for the area, the strategy should express support for pooling of Section 106 monies from developments in the area to support an improved bus service in light of the high trip generation and future cumulative demand expected from proposed developments.	Unstated	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
352	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	S3/INF5			Support local centre centred around Silvertown Quays and Minoco Wharf, although further discussions will be needed on the exact location and nature of the centre as proposals for these two sites move forward.	Unstated	No change proposed.
189	Ballymore Properties	Development Interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule - S-22 Minoco Wharf	Soundness - not justified or effective	- the description of S22 is inconsistent with the maps of the site which show a small part of the SIL release extending west of Lyle Park and running alongside North Woolwich Road as far as West Silvertown DLR station. This should be corrected	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID
280	Quintain Estates and Development	Development interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule - Whole document	Soundness - not justified or effective	In broad terms, Quintain Estates and Developments support the proposed Core Strategy but consider that some additional clarification should be introduced in policies that affect the potential development of the Carlsberg-Tetley / Thames Wharf site at Silvertown, in particular its relationship to Canning Town and to the Royal Docks areas and proposals for the relocation of the safeguarded wharf. We have expanded on the reasons for the representations in respect of the detailed comments.	Yes	see response to detailed reps

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
138	London City Airport	Development interest - Private		Appendix 2 - schedule of UDP policies to be superseded by Core Strategy, para. 20.1 on consultation portal	Soundness	The inconsistency between MOZ11 and E11 needs to be resolved by the council and the phrase 'otherwise developed out' needs further explanation. E11 in the Core Strategy is not a like for like replacement for UDP Proposal MOZ11. This is because the latter covered all the land on the south side of King George V dock right up to Albert Road. E11 marks London City Airport as an Employment Hub but on the Royal Docks Proposal Plan on page 32 this is shown as only extending half way along King George V Dock (possibly to area that includes the public and staff car parks for the airport).	No	MOZ11 does not form part of E11. Map accompanying Policy S3 shows extent of E11 Employment Hub. Part of MOZ11 has been development for housing. The remainder is not considered strategic. However, opportunity sites could be considered further in Site Allocations DPD. Minor amendment to Appendix 2 to clarify relationship of MOZ11 with proposed E11, and the phrase 'otherwise developed out' - see minor amendment under this ID.
184	Ballymore Properties	Development Interest - Private		Appendix AP1 - Strategic Site Schedule	Soundness - not justified or effective	Dispute location of new local centre in West Silvertown. Reasons include the barrier effect of the DLR viaduct, the strategic role of North Woolwich Road, the absence of short term retail parking on North Woolwich Road and the changes in site levels.	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID
191	Ballymore Properties	Development Interest - Private		Appendix AP1 - Strategic Site Schedule, Section 19	Soundness - not justified or effective	Consider Thames Road Industrial Estate should be included as a Strategic Site (incorporating release of 3.5ha of SIL, 3.5ha for residential led mixed use, and greater access to the river)	Yes	No change is proposed. Core Strategy proposes retention of Thameside East as a Strategic Industrial Location. This is supported by the borough employment land review and discussions with other key stakeholders e.g. GLA
130	London City Airport	Development interest - Private		Proposals Map	Soundness - consistency with national policy	Suggests an inconsistency between this map and the one shown of Beckton on page 42.	No	No change proposed (Beckton map only shows part of Royal Docks area/extent of LCA land)

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
150	London City Airport	Development interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S08 - Thames Wharf	Soundness - not justified or effective or consistent with national policy	The revised London City Airport's Public Safety Zone, as confirmed by the Civil Aviation Authority to the London Borough of Newham on 15 March 2011, does not show it extending onto the Thames Wharf site and should be deleted.	No	See minor amendment under this ID
151	London City Airport	Development interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S08 - Thames Wharf	Soundness - not justified or effective or consistent with national policy	The revised London City Airport's Public Safety Zone, as confirmed by the Civil Aviation Authority to the London Borough of Newham on 15 March 2011, does not show it extending onto the Thames Wharf site and should be deleted.	No	See minor amendment under this ID
131	London City Airport	Development interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S19 -Royal Albert Basin	Soundness - not justified or effective or consistent with national policy	Albert Basin site, located as it is not far from the eastern end of the airport's runway, is not a suitable location to site family housing (often planned with gardens/outside space) due to the noise from arriving and departing aircraft.	No	No change proposed. Site has been allocated in the UDP for mixed use development. The Core Strategy is not changing this approach, and also states in INF1 that further expansion will need to be carefully considered with regard to impact on the development of sites within the Royal Docks.
131	London City Airport	Development interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S19 -Royal Albert Basin	Soundness - not justified or effective or consistent with national policy	Furthermore due regard needs to be taken of the airport's Public Safety Zone which passes through the southern part of this site and which would preclude land here being developed for housing (as per DfT Circular 1/2010 'Control of Development in Airport Public Safety Zones').	No	All proposals will need to take this into account as is currently the case. No change is proposed. The revised PSZ is to be included on the proposals map on adoption of the Core Strategy.
131	London City Airport	Development interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S19 -Royal Albert Basin	Soundness - not justified or effective or consistent with national policy	Aerodrome safeguarding requirements also need to be taken into account for any development in this location.	No	This is the case at present; this covers the whole borough and is therefore not represented on the UDP proposals map. Policy T30 of the UDP which relates to this is not being superseded by the Core Strategy.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
130	London City Airport	Development interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S21 - Silvertown Quays	Soundness - consistency with national policy	Part of the Silvertown Quays site falls into the airport's Public Safety Zone (PSZ) and should be protected from development incompatible with that stated in the DfT Circular 1/2010	Unstated	All proposals will need to take this into account as is currently the case. No change is proposed. The revised PSZ is to be included on the proposals map on adoption of the Core Strategy.
418	Mr R Kirpalani	Resident		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S21 - Silvertown Quays	Soundness, not effective	The Council policy on the Royal Docks is seriously flawed. Whilst the Royal Docks is pretty, Council totally ignores the noise from London City Airport. I am in South Beckton and the noise is hell. The Council needs to look at the Airport Master Plan, because they say they want to expand to 18million passengers by 2050. When the airport opening and there was a public enquiry and they restricted flights to 30,000. All limits on the airport are now gone. We have seen runway extensions, bigger jets, more traffic, and more pollution. Houses should not be building in the Royal Docks! We cannot open our windows or even enjoy the open spaces. What is the point of building houses in the area?. The Council approved expansion from 76,000 to 120,000 air movement. Also, there is no mention of the Public Safety Zone (airport crash zone), which is a controversial topic in itself.	Unstated	Strategic site allocations and Policy INF1 recognise Airport as a current (PSZ, Heights restriction etc.) and potential constraint on development. No change proposed.
184	Ballymore Properties	Development Interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S22 - Minoco Wharf	Soundness - not justified or effective	Support proposed SIL release and S22 strategic site. However, text needs to be revised to clarify that SIL is also to be released around the DLR station west of Lyle Park adjacent to North Woolwich Road.	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID
184	Ballymore Properties	Development Interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S22 - Minoco Wharf	Soundness - not justified or effective	Minoco Wharf should be renamed Minoco to reflect the enlarged site area	Yes	No change proposed

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
187	Ballymore Properties	Development Interest - Private		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S22 - Minoco Wharf	Soundness - not justified or effective or consistent with national policy	Dispute location of new local centre in West Silvertown. Reasons include the barrier effect of the DLR viaduct, the strategic role of North Woolwich Road, the absence of short term retail parking on North Woolwich Road and the changes in site levels.	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID
421	Mr R Kirpalani	Resident		Appendix 1 - Site Schedule S22 - Minoco Wharf	Soundness - not justified or effective	The Council policy on the Royal Docks is seriously flawed. Whilst the Royal Docks is pretty, Council totally ignores the noise from London City Airport. I am in South Beckton and the noise is hell. The Council needs to look at the Airport Master Plan, because they say they want to expand to 18million passengers by 2050. When the airport opening and there was a public enquiry and they restricted flights to 30,000. All limits on the airport are now gone. We have seen runway extensions, bigger jets, more traffic, and more pollution. Houses should not be building in the Royal Docks. Also, there is no mention of the Public Safety Zone (airport crash zone), which is a controversial topic in itself.	Unstated	Strategic site allocations and Policy INF1 recognise Airport as a current (PSZ, Heights restriction etc.) and potential constraint on development. No change proposed.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
282	Quintain Estates and Development	Development Interest - Public-Semi Public		Appendix 1 -S08 - Thames Wharf	N/A - but suggest wording amendment.	In broad terms we do not consider that Policy S3 is unsound and support its thrust and direction, although additional clarity could be added to the map. However, the relocation of the Safeguarded Wharf at Thames Wharf should not be conditional or related in any way to a requirement to consolidate with Peruvian Wharf. It has not been shown that requiring consolidation this option is deliverable and thus would be less effective than allowing for a simple relocation to Carlsberg-Tetley. Object very strongly to any suggestion that the relocation of the Thames Wharf space should be dependant or conditional on consolidation with Peruvian Wharf. This would not be consistent with Policy S3(6) which refers to "Consolidation and/or relocation". This approach would be unsound as it would be ineffective and undeliverable due to the lack of involvement of delivery partners. Suggest new wording for paragraph 9.11 - see full representation for details.	Yes	
326	Port of London Authority	Statutory Consultee		Appendix 1 - S22 Minoco Wharf	Unspecified	Although the PLA notes the reference to the consolidation of the wharves within the Thameside West, it is unclear why (as Minoco Wharf is not safeguarded) the reference is made in this designation rather than in relation to a wider Thameside West designation. Notwithstanding this, the PLA is uncertain as to the reference to Policy J2 in this context. Reference should be made to the safeguarded wharves in the 'Further Information' section.	Not Specified	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
325	Port of London Authority	Statutory Consultee		Appendix 1 Site Schedule - Site S08	Soundness - not Justified; not Consistent with National Policy	No objection in principle to Thames Wharf being consolidated within Thameside West, however the PLA is not aware of any evidence base to suggest that this is viable at the former Carlsberg Tetley site and as Peruvian Wharf is already a safeguarded wharf, it would not be possible to merely transfer extant cargo-handling capacity at Thames Wharf to Peruvian. These issues are also relevant in relation to Site SO8-Thames Wharf (pp36), although the PLA notes that this does state that such relocation must be appropriately delivered.	Unstated	A borough wide review of wharves is being undertaken. This will feed into the GLA review. The policy wording is considered appropriate to retain flexibility over the plan period as evidence is brought forward for proposals. This will be subject to further discussion between GLA and LBN.
93	London City Airport			Proposals Map and para. 8.9	Soundness - consistency with national policy	Request Para 9.8 reworded to not that not all development is precluded in a Public Safety Zone.	No	See minor amendment under this ID

## Beckton

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
45	London Borough of Barking and Dagenham	Statutory consultee	S5	Map 8	Effective	Requests map show more accurately the route of the proposed DLR extension and the route of the proposed Barking to Royal Docks Bus Corridor referred to in INF1.	No	See minor amendments under this ID. The bus corridor is already shown diagrammatically as site T4, and this is considered appropriate as a precise route for the corridor is yet to be agreed.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
50	Thames Water	Statutory consultee	S5	Bullet point 10	Effective	Supports policy including reference to waste processing and recycling and de-designation of Beckton STW as Metropolitan Open Land however requests text be added to end of bullet point 10 as follows: 'where practicable and cost effective'.	No	
50	Thames Water	Statutory consultee	S5	11.7	Effective	Requests minor amendments to paragraph to make reference to strategic importance of Beckton Sewage Treatment Works Extension Project and Thames Tunnel Project.	No	See minor amendment under this ID
61	Notting Hill Housing	Development interest (private)	S5		Effective	Suggests strategic site S19 should sit within policy S3 Royal Docks.	Unstated	Strategic Site S19 is included in the S5 Beckton policy area, consistent with the boundary of the Beckton Community Forum/
132	London City Airport	Local business	S5		Consistent with national policy	Suggests that housing development at the southern end of spatial end close to London City Airport is not compatible with London City Airport and the Air Transport White Paper 2003 and Public Safety Zone.	No	Consideration of amenity impacts arising from neighbouring uses is provided for in Policy SP2 and Policy SP5.
135	London City Airport	Local business	S5	Proposals Map	Consistent with national policy	Land to the south of King George V DLR station included in the London City Airport employment hub should be designated for mixed use development.	No	This Employment Hub is located within the S3 Royal Docks policy area - refer to comment and minor amendment under ID 138
136	London City Airport	Local business	S5	Appendix 1 -S19	Consistent with national policy	Suggests that housing development at the southern end of spatial end close to London City Airport is not compatible with London City Airport and the Air Transport White Paper 2003 and Public Safety Zone.	No	Refer to comment under !D 132

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
172	National Grid Property Holdings	Development interest (private)	S5		Justified, effective	Suggests that improvements to the environment and infrastructure are not considered and as such, along with designation of East Beckton as an Employment Hub, the development potential is not realised. Strategic Site S19 Albert Basin has the potential to be expanded to include consultees land.	Yes	
297	One Housing Group	Development interest (private)	S5		Effective	Supports bullet point of policy and provision for new public space, however does not support the policy statement 'the Council will not support the development of sites in a piecemeal way particularly where this would prejudice the realisation of the overall vision for the area or where timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure. Large applications should be accompanied by realistic phasing proposals' and does not support any proposal for further masterplanning.	No	
297	One Housing Group	Development interest (private)	S5	Appendix 1 -S19	Effective	Suggest that housing around Albert Dock Basin should comprise mix of unit sizes rather than just medium density/medium family.	No	
432	Mr R Kirpalani	Resident	S5	Appendix 1 -S19	Justified, effective	Considers that policy does not consider amenity impact of London City Airport on Beckton and suggests that Category A aircraft should not operate from the airport.	Unstated	Consideration of amenity impacts arising from neighbouring uses is provided for in Policy INF1.
436	Mr R Kirpalani	Resident	S5		Justified, effective	Considers that policy does not consider road congestion in rush hour.	Unstated	Consideration of road congestion is provided for in Policy SP7.
356	Greater London Authority	Statutory consultee	S5	11.9	n/a	Supports Metropolitan Open Land designation being removed from operational land and extended to Beckton Riverside.	Yes	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
386	Greater London Authority	Statutory consultee	S5		n/a	Notes regarding intensified town centre at Gallions Reach that Transport for London requires that the council supports improvements to the bus network in the area through pooling of Section 106 monies.	Yes	Consideration of improvements to the bus network is provided for in Policy INF5.

## Urban Newham

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear?	Comment
228	Mr Freek Janssens	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Green Street should be designated as a major centre not a district centre	Unstated	
232	Mr Freek Janssens	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Policy does not recognise the national and international importance of Green Street. Suggested addition to wording.	Unstated	See minor amendment under this ID232.
232	Mr Freek Janssens	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Diverse units of different sizes should be aimed for in Green St	Unstated	Minor clarification in INF5 under comment ID 233.
234	Mr Freek Janssens	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Objection to failure to recognise 'intangible cultural, social and economic assets'. Suggests additional wording.	Unstated	The point is addressed by "other place making assets" in the policy. See however minor amendment to SP5 made in response to comment ID 235
237	Mr Freek Janssens	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Policy does not take into account the importance of having good infrastructural access to places of fresh, affordable and appropriate food in Urban Newham. Suggests additional wording.	Unstated	This point is addressed in Policy INF5 and SP2 (see minor amendment under ID 277).
238	Mr Freek Janssens	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Objects to focus on promoting change as if it was a bad place to live whilst ignoring existing asset. Suggest change to wording.	Unstated	
239	Mr Freek Janssens	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Include West Ham United Football stadium as a strategic site and remove Queens Market as strategic site.	Unstated	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear?	Comment
248	Friends of Queens Market	Stakeholder group	S6		Unspecified	Green Street should be designated as a linear town centre or linear shopping street	Yes	
253	Friends of Queens Market	Stakeholder group	S6		Unspecified	Green Street should be designated as a linear town centre or linear shopping street	Yes	
253	Friends of Queens Market (Saif Osmani)	Stakeholder group	S6		Unspecified	Replace words (page 50, point 11 line 3) 'quality evening offer' with: 'variety of evening offers'	Yes	
253	Friends of Queens Market	Stakeholder group	S6		Unspecified	p.50 point 11 line 5. Use of 'gateway' applied to linear street is inappropriate. Designate open green spaces.	Yes	The provision of green spaces in areas of deficiency is supported in INF6.
253	Friends of Queens Market	Stakeholder group	S6		Unspecified	p.50 point 11 line 7: Development on Queen's market (site) would damage existing market and threaten the services it provides.	Yes	
253	Friends of Queens Market	Stakeholder group	S6		Unspecified	p.50 point 11 line 8: Object to current wording and propose alternative.	Yes	
253	Friends of Queens Market	Stakeholder group	S6		Unspecified	p.50 point 12 line 4. In addressing 'tired post war estates' objector would not like to see the demolition of family sized dwellings which are a local need.	Yes	Policy H1 supports the provision of further family housing and additional housing generally.
257	Friends of Queens Market	Stakeholder group	S6		Unspecified	Queens Market should be restored, refurbished and continue to offer its current and long standing unique offer of low cost food and cloth for disadvantaged communities. Take a more holistic approach towards recognising and differentiating food centres to enhance localism.	Yes	Site S27 and Policy S6 provide support for the retention of a market on the site.
344	Dr Elizabeth Crowhurst	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Queens Market is not a suitable site for housing. West Ham stadium would be a good site.	Unstated	
433	Lucy Rogers	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Queens Market is not a suitable site for housing. West Ham stadium would be a good site.	Unstated	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear?	Comment
433	Lucy Rogers	Individual	S6		Unspecified	It is inappropriate to single out a section of Green Street and turn it into "a more focused centre with clear gateways". Green Street should not be divided into 'town centre' and 'non town centre'	Unstated	
457	Mr Roger Sanna	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Queens Market is not a suitable site for housing. West Ham stadium would be a good site.	Unstated	
458	Mr Roger Sanna	Individual	S6		Unspecified	It is inappropriate to single out a section of Green Street and turn it into 'a more focused centre with clear gateways'. Green Street should not be divided into 'town centre' and 'non-town centre': this will ruin its character and damage the livelihoods of traders at the extreme north and south ends. Designate the whole of Green Street as a town centre	Unstated	
91	Liam Adam	Individual	S6	Urban Newham	Unspecified	Queens Market is an authentic local cultural, social and economic centre within Newham and therefore should be treated as a true asset of this borough not a planning opportunity. Other cities celebrate and protect their markets such as Bangkok, Barcelona and Venice. It would be fantastic if Newham could do the same. West Ham football site should be earmarked for housing then an impressive community club could also be built on this site. There could be indoor football, cricket, basketball and arts facilities.	Unstated	
478	Friends of the Earth-London	Interest group (environmental)	S6		Not indicated	Supports representations from Friends of Queen's Market regarding demolition. Specifically does not want market demolished. Consider other sites for housing instead.	Yes	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear?	Comment
8	Newham College of FE	College of FE	S6	Appendix 1 -S26	Legal compliance, soundness, effectiveness	Inconsistency of Site 26 and town centre boundary. Amend East Ham town centre boundary to include all of strategic site 26 (including East Ham campus) and to include 'mixed town centre uses'	Yes	
133	Tesco Stores Ltd	Business / developer interest	S6		Soundness, effectiveness, justification, consistency with national policy	Policy does not comply with PPS4 because it fails to take account of the need for improved foodstore provision and the need for a foodstore to anchor Green Street and reduce the substantial overtrading of other foodstores.	Yes	Retail capacity is dealt with on a borough-wide basis in policy INF5, with appropriate elaboration in spatial policies.
228	Mr Freek Janssens	Individual	S6		Unspecified	Policies S6 and also SP1, SP5, SP7 fail to recognise the importance of the whole of Green Street as a town centre destination. Also, delete S6 para 12: "local" and delete from S6 para 11 "This will demand innovation in design and formats to secure a more focused centre with clear gateways"	Unstated	The definition of "local" shopping parades is justified in INF5 and consistent with approach to ribbon development in SP7.
168	East Ham Market / Land Management	Business interest		Appendix 1 - S26	Soundness, effectiveness	Residential development above retail may not be viable and may delay and complicate progress. Suggest omission	No	
168	East Ham Market / Land Management	Business interest		Appendix 1 - S25	Soundness, effectiveness	Not sure what is meant by 'boundary': if it refers to street market formation in Pilgrims Way where space and bus stops available, then strongly support	No	
133	Tesco Stores Ltd	Business / developer interest		Appendix 1 - S27	Soundness, effectiveness, justification, consistency with national policy	West Ham stadium should be a retail led development and not an 'urban village' as expressed in the policy. The CS does not reflect the previous commitment in the Choices document to develop a masterplan.	Yes	See Minor Amendment proposed under this comment ID133.
174	Mr Stephen Butters	Individual		Appendix 1 - S27	Not legally compliant	Policy does not protect Queen's Market in its current form. Suggests change to wording.	Yes	
241	Pauline Rowe	Individual		Appendix 1 - S27	Unspecified	Delete from the schedule "mixed use...comprising residential and community' and add "Refurbish market without demolition"	Yes	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear?	Comment
328	Obsidian	Developer interest		Appendix 1 - S24	Unsound, justified or effective.	Seeking policy amendment to reflect emerging Forest Gate SPD; suggest wording amendment.	Yes	
339	Green Street Businesses	Business interest group		Appendix 1 - EC3	Not sound, justified or effective	Green Street town centre boundary should be extended.	Yes	
339	Green Street Businesses	Business interest group		Appendix 1 - EC3	Not sound, justified or effective	Queens market should not be developed upon with residential construction (sic)	Yes	
339	Green Street Businesses	Business interest group		Appendix 1 - EC3	Not sound, justified or effective	West Ham football ground to be developed as a 'housing colony' (sic)	Yes	
342	Dr Elizabeth Crowhurst	Individual		Appendix 1 - site S27	Unspecified	Queens Market is too small to accommodate housing above the market. The early morning noise and market activities make the market an unsuitable location for housing. Suggest wording amendment.	Unstated	
431	Lucy Rogers	Individual		Appendix 1 - S27	Unspecified	Queens Market is too small to accommodate housing above the market. The early morning noise and market activities make the market an unsuitable location for housing. Suggest wording amendment.	Unstated	
65	Newham sixth form college	Education / development interest		Strategic site schedule Appx1	Not legally compliant, unsound, justified, effective or consistent with national policy	The New Vic site's redevelopment is needed to secure the relocation of the college to West Ham; the site should be designated as a strategic site.	Yes	
225	Mr Sasha Laurel	Individual		Appendix 1 - S27	Unspecified	Site indicated is too small for housing and a market. Change text to "and refurbish the market without demolition"	Unstated	
456	Mr Roger Sanna	Individual		Appendix 1 - S27	Unspecified	Delete from the schedule "mixed use...comprising residential and community' and add "Refurbish market without demolition"	Yes	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear?	Comment
160	National Grid Property Holdings Ltd (Ms Stephanie Weeks)	Property interest		Appendix 1 -Strategic Sites Schedule - U1	Not justified or effective	JWDPD Schedule 2 site at Beckton Riverside has a number of constraints that leaves 2.1ha of developable land compared with the 7ha required by the JWDPD. Amend CS in line with the JWDPD the outcome of which is not known (EIP early April 2011).	Yes	

## Successful Places

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
14	ODA	Statutory	SP1	SP1 GLOSSARY	N/A	Suggest a definition of meanwhile uses would be useful.	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID.
101	Workspace Group	Development interest (private)	SP1		N/A	Support high quality design.	Unstated	
229	Mr F Janssens	Resident	SP1	5	unspecified	Should delete reference to the need to reduce edges and severance, as edge/fringe development benefits town centres.	Unstated	This is not the concern of this policy, but is dealt with in policy SP7, which does not take this view.
245	St John's Church Stratford	Interest group (faith)	SP1	bullet 8	unspecified	There is no mention of the need to safeguard existing traditionally-built housing, allowing residents to move to larger properties within the local neighbourhood. Community stability is a key part of successful places.	Unstated	See policies H1, H3, but also proposed minor amendment under this comment ID
260	Friends of the Earth - Newham	Interest group (environment)	SP1			Support, especially ref to environmental quality features.	Unstated	
400	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development interest (private)	SP1	1st phrase	unspecified	Should downgrade requirement to 'seek to respond' rather than require a response, as this is too onerous for meanwhile uses.	Unstated	Justification given in Reasoned Justification - 1st para

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
452	University of East London	Development interest (public)/public agency	SP1		N/A	Supports, especially design quality, creating healthy etc neighbourhoods, and balance between jobs and homes.	Unstated	
464	LB Hackney	Statutory	SP1		unspecified	Support reference to need to reduce edges and severance between borough and neighbouring areas.	Unstated	
358	Greater London Authority	Statutory	SP1/SP4		unspecified	Support - for high quality development and rationale for location of tall buildings. Suggests that townscape considerations also need to be taken into account alongside accessibility in the Arc.	Unstated	SP1 cross references SP4, which is clear that place-making, legibility and sustainability considerations apply. It is clear in RJ and in the specification of further work in the penultimate bullet point that this includes consideration of character and hence townscape, and the last bullet of the policy also clearly refers to townscape considerations such as integration. Policy SP1's and Policy SP3's townscape considerations would also apply. See also proposed minor amendment under this ID however.
15	ODA	Statutory	SP2		N/A	Support overall direction of the Objective and the Policy are supported, and also working with health care partners in delivery, with cross reference to IDP. However, it is noted that no health care specific elements are listed within the IDP - CS should either include planned facility needs or identify in the supporting text to the policy the path being followed to identify what those needs are prior to inclusion in a future iteration of the IDP.	No	Implementation section cross references IDP, which refers to plans for 4 PCT hubs.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
52	Thames Water	Statutory	SP2		N/A	Support the 2nd bullet point of the policy seeking to improve Newham's air quality. Recent improvements to Beckton STW have included significant odour abatement technology.	No	
109	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)	SP2	Implementation point 1	N/A	Seeks to make health impact assessment subject to circumstances	No	Flexibility between HIA or consideration of health impacts in the Design and Access Statement is allowed for.
198	British Waterways	Public agency	SP2		Consistent with national policy	Wishes to see reference to 2 waterways references that acknowledge them as recreational assets and health contributors.	No	See proposed minor amendment made under this ID.
227	Mr F Janssens	Resident	SP2		unspecified	Policy fails to recognise the importance of safeguarding existing places of healthy, affordable and appropriate food	Unstated	See proposed minor amendment made under this ID.
258	Friends of the Earth - Newham	Interest group (environment)	SP2		n/a	Supports especially healthy eating and improvements to air quality	Unstated	
402	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development interest (private)	SP2		unspecified	Support policy, but wish for role of existing open space to be acknowledged, through enhancements/access improvements.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this ID.
412	Mr A Haughton	Individual (resident of LBTH)	SP2		unspecified	Concern that PSZ related to airport's current permitted flight limit is not acknowledged. Public safety conflict with cable car. Air quality standards being breached in vicinity of airport. Aircraft noise also an increasing problem.	Unstated	See minor amendments proposed under this comment ID. PSZ is remodelled regularly by CAA as necessary (e.g. if a significant expansion is approved which has not already been assumed in the modelled risk contour), with updates published on the Council's website.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
483	University of East London	Development interest/other public agency	SP2		unspecified	Support the improvement of the community's health through well designed public realms that are favourable to walking, cycling and social activity.	Unstated	
478	Friends of the Earth (national)	Interest group (environment)	SP2		unspecified	Strengthen healthy neighbourhoods text at "which respond appropriately"	Yes	See minor amendment proposed for this ID
16	ODA	Statutory	SP3	4th bullet point	N/A	Suggests clarification needed re whose role it is to analyse character/role of Character Study.	No	See minor amendment proposed under this ID.
199	British Waterways	Public agency	SP3		N/A	Wishes reference to be made to various waterways design guidance	No	See proposed minor amendment under this comment ID.
226	Mr F Janssens	Resident	SP3		unspecified	Objects to policy because it fails to recognise and appreciate the existing genuinely mixed use areas within the borough.	Unstated	See minor amendments proposed under this comment ID.
235	Mr F Janssens	Resident	SP3		unspecified	Policy does not adequately take into account intangible social and cultural assets of Urban Newham / Newham	Unstated	See proposed minor amendments proposed under this ID.
271	Friends of the Earth - Newham	Interest group (environment)	SP3			Supports, but questions deliverability of high quality public realm in practice (viz area around East Ham Station).	Unstated	The matter of concern is addressed by policy SP6 and SP7, as well as SP3. The implementation section of the policies emphasises the role of partnership working, guidance. Maintenance must also be provided for as part of the response to the policy criteria.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
296	Quintain Estates and Development	Development interest (private)	SP3	Implementation point 1	Effectiveness	Should delete, as confusing and potentially onerous to refer to all these design criteria.	Yes	See minor amendment proposed under this consultation ID, which provides for clarification. Refers to these varied sources as helping to structure a Design and Access Statement, i.e. provide guidance as to how to comply with the policy, and therefore aid the developer to present their case.
321	East Thames Group	Development interest (semi-public)	SP3	13.3		Support -welcomes commitment to high quality neighbourhoods	Unstated	
347	Action and Rights of Disabled People	Interest group (disability)	SP3		Effective/general conformity with London Plan	Whilst refers to inclusivity, makes no reference to GLA guidance on Inclusive Environments.	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID.
460	Met Police Authority	Statutory	SP3		unspecified	Supports policy concern to promote sense of safety and security, and measures to help crime and ASB. Seeks to have a requirement that all developments comply with Secured by Design Principles.	Unstated	No change needed. Guidance is referenced and signposted in implementation section. Bullet point 6 clearly requires these principles to be attended to, but is expressed in a way that people can relate to. RJ also elaborates as to what the principles mean in design terms.
404	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development interest (private)	SP3			Support Policy SP3.	Unstated	
17	ODA	Statutory	SP4			Support approach to tall buildings, but suggest more detail on zones/areas within Canning Town and Stratford needed - map would be helpful.	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
100	Workspace Group	Development interest (private)	SP4		N/A	Support policy given benefits of tall buildings	No	
110	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)	SP4		N/A	Agree with the statement in reference to the location of tall buildings.	Unstated	
140	English Heritage	Statutory	SP4	Various	Effectiveness	1. Too vague re preferred locations for tall buildings, and where they would be inappropriate.	No	See minor amendments proposed under this comment ID
140	English Heritage	Statutory	SP4	Various	Effectiveness	2. No necessary caveat re protection of the historic environment and local context	No	See minor amendments proposed under this comment ID, but also reference to local character, place-making and context in policy bullets 2, 3, 5 and 6; also in Reasoned Justification 2nd paragraph.
140	English Heritage	Statutory	SP4	Various	Effectiveness	3. Further work needed not specified sufficiently; no commitment to a borough-wide tall buildings study	No	See minor amendments proposed under this comment ID, but also Character Study which forms the initial sieving that would be done by a borough-wide tall buildings study and is the basis to the policy's spatial framework.
140	English Heritage	Statutory	SP4	Various	Effectiveness	4. Detailed criteria needed to assess the acceptability of tall buildings against	No	See last 2 bullets of policy, which emphasise that tall buildings will be assessed against design policy SP3 and SP5, with particular attention to key tall building issues.
140	English Heritage	Statutory	SP4	Various	Effectiveness	5. Implementation point not clear in its intention	N	See minor amendments proposed under this comment ID re role of larger sites in RJ. No further change felt to be needed.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
162	ExCeL London	Development interest (private)	SP4	2nd bullet	N/A	Supports policy, but wishes a specific reference in bullet point 2 to the ExCeL estate and potential for tall buildings there.	No	This is contrary to the spatial strategy specified and justified, which refers to tall buildings being suitable for Strategic Sites in the Arc, given their large scale and ability to be planned accordingly.
215	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest group (local heritage)	SP4			The Trust welcomes a strategic approach to the location and form of tall buildings. This has not always been the case and the mistakes of the past should be resisted as setting precedents for future developments. Particularly support definition of tall buildings, and importance of regard to heritage assets and their settings'.	Unstated	
304	Genesis Housing	Development Interest (semi public - RSL)	SP4	bullet point 4	Effectiveness	Wish to see point amended to acknowledge work Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan work which allows for a landmark building outside the Stratford Metropolitan area on the Bow Bridge Wharf Site.	No	See minor amendment proposed in relation to ID140, which clarifies status of Masterplan work. Policy already allows for the case to be made on place-making, legibility, accessibility etc grounds for tall buildings in the Arc but outside of the Stratford Metropolitan area, where on strategic sites. A landmark building does not have to be tall: scaling would still need to be appropriate to context (the definition in the tall buildings study is <i>up to 24 storeys</i> ).
329	Obsidian FG Ltd	Development interest (private)	SP4	Bullet 2	Justified, effective	Seeks modification to more accurately reflect Forest Gate Masterplan	Yes	FG masterplan has no status, and is not a valid justification for policy as compared to a policy based on a borough-wide strategy. However, see minor amendment suggested in relation to comment ID 141

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
405	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development interest (private)	SP4		unspecified	Support Policy SP4.	Unstated	
482	University of East London	Development interest/other public agency	SP4			Support statement re tall buildings' suitability in the Arc in accessible locations	Unstated	
305	Quintain Estates and Development	Development interest (private)	SP4		N/A	Support Policy SP4	Yes	
18	ODA	Statutory	SP5		N/A	Support policy and its objective	No	
141	English Heritage	Statutory	SP5	Reasoned Justification paragraph 1	Effectiveness, justified	1. Inappropriate to refer to EH as having overlooked Newham's heritage, propose new text.	No	See minor amendments proposed under this comment ID which removes the singling out and clarifies this is benign not malign neglect, and via implementation section, that partnership on an ongoing basis is intended.
141	English Heritage	Statutory	SP5	MAP	Effectiveness, justified	2. Map should include other heritage asset types, to give them due weight	No	See proposed minor amendments under this comment ID
141	English Heritage	Statutory	SP5	Implementation/ Reasoned Justification paragraph 1	Effectiveness, justified	3. Expand scope of implementation and refer to extent of heritage at risk	No	See proposed minor amendments under this ID
147	Theatres Trust	Interest group (Theatres)	SP5		N/A	Concerned that cultural facilities are not given explicit protection, particularly in face of competition from higher value land uses.	No	See proposed minor amendment under this comment ID.
230	Mr F Janssens	Resident	SP5		unspecified	Policy fails to recognise the importance of the whole of Green Street as a town centre destination, and the importance of a blend between pre-defined functions and open-ended spaces (value of edges/ribbons).	Unstated	Not in line with policies SP7 and INF5. However policy SP3 recognises the importance of flexible public spaces.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
236	Mr F Janssens	Resident	SP5		unspecified	Inadequately protects intangible assets. Wishes to refer to social and economic assets.	Unstated	See proposed minor amendments proposed under this ID to clarify definition of character.
254	Friends of Queens Market	Interest group (local campaign)	SP5	Reasoned Justification	unspecified	Wish to see Queens Market explicitly referenced in Reasoned Justification because it part of a cultural infrastructure in the provision of affordable, culturally -appropriate fresh food and cloth but also due to its historic location, local character and as a unique asset to Newham overall. Also wish to see it locally listed.	Yes	CS is not a means to secure local listing, and would be inappropriate to single out this asset. See however minor amendment proposed under this ID which cross references the Character Study where these assets are discussed.
406	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development interest (private)	SP5		unspecified	Support approach to heritage assets, but note that approach needs to be realistic re re-use - viability, and asset value (quality).	Unstated	Flexibility allowed for by national policy (PPS5) which local policy should not repeat.
427	Lucy Rogers	Local Resident	SP5	MAP	unspecified	Support for defence of assets other than heritage assets which Queen's Market is. Seeks that map should show Queens Market, which should be locally listed.	Unstated	CS is not a means to secure local listing, and it would be inappropriate to show Queens Market and not other cultural assets on the map. See however minor amendment proposed in relation to this comment ID which cross-references the Character Study where Queens Market and other similar assets are identified.
485	University of East London	Development interest/other public agency	SP5		unspecified	Support the objective but believe that the approach to the reuse of buildings in conservation areas should be considered on a site-by-site basis, in the context of the wider objectives for an area.	Unstated	Flexibility denoted by PPS5.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
19	ODA	Statutory	SP6	Final bullet	N/A	The final bullet point of the policy refers to a clearly defined network and hierarchy of centres. It would be useful here to include a table of existing and proposed town and local centres, indicating their place within the centre hierarchy to help interpretation of the policy	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID which more cross-references INF5 more clearly.
111	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)	SP6		N/A	Agree with the policy which advocates that town and local centres should be 'vibrant, vital and valued'.	Unstated	
163	ExCeL	Development interest (private)	SP6		Effectiveness	Should allow for additions to the town centre hierarchy in the Royals and as part of major regeneration, to ensure Core Strategy is sufficiently flexible.	No	This is an INF policy matter which is dealt with within INF 5 bullet point 9 in relation to additional local centres. The retail strategy supported by the evidence base, which factors in projected population growth related to housing and does not identify the capacity for any further town centres beyond the strategic growth at existing centres already identified.
246	St John's Church Stratford	Interest group (faith)	SP6		unspecified	There is no mention of the significance of Christian Churches or other faith buildings within town centres, despite the importance in terms of built heritage, community facilities and places which contribute a variety of services to a successful town centre.	Unstated	Falls within definition of cultural and community uses in bullet 4 of the policy, and in encouraging response to local character bullet 7. As a use, they are also referred to in the RJ para 4.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
255	Friends of Queens Market	Interest group (local campaign)	SP6	5th bullet	unspecified	Wishes to amend reference to markets to expand it and more explicitly acknowledge their benefits to read 'restoring local street markets, to provide choice, encourage local start-up businesses and entrepreneurship to meet local needs'	Yes	Policy is phrased to allow for consideration of a range of market types, and reasoned justification para 4 is clear that a variety of retail formats are beneficial for this reason. The importance of small business space is also acknowledged in policies J2 and INF5. See also proposed minor amendments. More explicit regeneration plans are covered in spatial policies.
274	Green Street Businesses (Dr Singh)	Interest group (local businesses)	SP6	Bullet point 6	Justified, effective	Seeks to delete reference to hot food takeaways as a problem use, arguing that to single them out is un-evidenced and contrary to promotion of the area for tourism.	Unstated	Takeaways are noted as a key problem in many of the borough's centres by the Retail and Town Centre Study 2010, and by many local residents and elected members, who have repeatedly asked that we tackle them.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
288	Green Street Businesses	Interest group (local businesses)	SP6		Justified, effective, consistent with national policy	Failure to acknowledge some centres are international tourist destinations, which should be reflected in them being treated individually and not within the national norm; failure to commit to working with local business groups for mutual benefit.	Yes	Town centre policy is formulated within the structure of national and London-wide policy, and development for tourists encouraged in larger centres. Green Street's tourism role is acknowledged in S6 and INF5 already, though see minor amendments proposed under this comment ID. This affects the vision for the centre, but does not mean it should be treated differently in relation to the key principles of town centres prescribed by higher level policy. See proposed minor amendments in relation to INF5, SP6 and S6 in relation to commitment to work with local businesses as part of policy implementation.
407	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development interest (private)	SP6			Support Policy SP6.	Unstated	
461	Met Police Authority	Statutory	SP6		n/a	Support from perspective of need to include policing infrastructure in town centres - in particular support for diversifying uses and encouraging the location of services and flexible community space in Town and Local centres.	Unstated	
486	University of East London	Development interest/other public agency	SP6		unspecified	Supports the idea of town and local centres being at the heart of neighbourhoods, and seeks that new housing is supported by new local centres.	Unstated	See policy INF5.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
20	ODA	Statutory	SP7		N/A	Objective and policy supported and welcomed though could be further information on differentiation to be made based on street position in hierarchy.	No	Proposals map shows street hierarchy. Policy deliberately doesn't distinguish between different streets in the hierarchy as quality aspirations apply to all.
201	British Waterways	Public agency	SP7		Consistent with national policy	Reference should be made to waterways, and their potential for sustainable transport.	No	Waterways and sustainable transport are dealt with in INF2 and INF7. Reference is made in RJ of SP7 to the fact that many of these points are applicable to waterways, but that they are dealt with more appropriately under INF policies. Minor amendment proposed under this comment ID provides for further clarity.
218	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	Interest group (local heritage)	SP7	List of streets	unspecified	Suggest Pier Road and North Woolwich centre be added to the list of streets, reflecting its gateway status, ongoing investment and improvement opportunities.	Unstated	
266	Friends of the Earth Newham	Interest group (environment)	SP7		unspecified	Difficult to understand the paragraph beginning 'many measures will tackle both these...' Consolidation of ribbon needs to be balanced against local access. Inappropriate photo used.	Unstated	Policy INF5 is cross referenced. This provides for protection of isolated shops and local shopping parades where these provide for local access.
276	Green Street Businesses	Interest group (local businesses)	SP7	Policy	Not legally compliant or sound, not justified or effective	Ribbon development should be consolidated if possible but exemption should be given to tourist centres to develop under market forces, ensuring established markets are not destroyed in the name of academic correctness	Yes	Boundaries dealt with by INF5; in the case of Green Street to be defined by a subsequent DPD.
348	Action and Rights of Disabled People	Interest group (disability)	SP7		Effective	Policy as written suggests inclusive access will be removed or inclusive access will be ignored in the process of de-cluttering.	No	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
231	Mr F Janssens	Resident	SP7		Unspecified	Fails to acknowledge importance of whole of Green Street - i.e. value of ribbon development.	Unstated	Not dealt with in this policy - see INF5 which notes boundaries will be revised in a subsequent DPD.
276	Green Street Businesses	Interest group (local businesses)	SP7	Policy	Not legally compliant or sound, not justified or effective	Respondent does not understand Objective 1 re: 'reclaiming the street'. Requests deletion of Objective1	Yes	see minor amendment proposed under this ID
200	British Waterways	Public agency		References	N/A	Wish reference to be made to various waterways design guidance.	No	See proposed minor amendment under this comment ID.

## Jobs

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of Consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
99	Workspace Group	Development Interest (Private)	J1		Unsound - Effective	The policy should include a stronger emphasis on the promotion small and medium sized enterprises.	No	
178	Dr Jaswir Singh - Green Street Businesses	Local Business	J1		Unsound - Justified Effective	Inadequate retail evidence base (GVA Grimley report) which doesn't allow for redressing town centre boundary issues. It is the majority view of businesses on Green street that the "town centre" boundary as per UDP needs to be reviewed and extended.	Yes	Town centre boundary issues dealt with in INF5 (implementation).

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of Consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
221	Dr Jaswir Singh - Green Street Businesses	Local Business	J1	14.1, 14.5, 14.9	Unsound - Justified, Effective	Reference in reasoned justification to capturing public sector jobs with central government rationalisation is not worthwhile. Para 14.9 should include to "work with town managers, creating them where do not exist, and to review town centre boundaries in the interest of the town centre, as best judged by the managers thereof, and any local trade representative organisations, if any exist."	Yes	Town centre boundary issues dealt with in INF5 (implementation). See minor amendment under ID 221.
341	National Grid Property Holdings	Development Interest (Private)	J1		Unsound - Effective	Policy J1 includes part of the Beckton Riverside site within the Arc of Opportunity. Given that the site only partially falls within the Arc of Opportunity this provides conflicting strategic ambitions for an area that should be considered as a whole. It is suggested that the site is excluded from the Arc of Opportunity entirely.	Yes	The spatial extent of the Arc of Opportunity shown on the map in the introductory section in the Submission Version has been extended to include a major development area in East Beckton which previously had been omitted in a drafting error.
21	Olympic Delivery Authority	Statutory Consultee	J1			The Objective and Policy is welcomed and supported.	No	
204	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee	J1		N/A	Suggest that reference be made to the potential for business barges as flexible workspaces particularly attractive to SME creative and ICT businesses. Examples already exist at Paddington Basin and Hale Wharf at Tottenham Hale, which provide interest and activity on the water.	No	Policy promotes affordable and flexible local workspaces. This does not preclude the use of business barges.
267	Friends of the Earth (Newham)	Interest Group (Environment)	J1		Unspecified	The document does not engage with some negative aspects of the current job market including low pay, insecurity, bad working conditions, and jobs going to people travelling long distances into the borough.	Unstated	J3 deals with access to the job market and up-skilling, in order that local people can benefit from growth sectors. Mixed uses to help reduce travel to work are promoted across the plan. See also minor amendment proposed under this comment ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of Consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
112	Bouygues Development	Development Interest (Private)	J1		N/A	Support but suggest adding text to the policy: <i>'Taking a flexible and responsive approach to planning applications where a significant growth in local jobs is proposed'</i> .	No	See minor amendment under this comment ID
368	Princes Trust	Interest Group (charitable organisation)	J1		N/A	Support for facilitating young people's involvement in creative industries, increasing entrepreneurship and supporting micro businesses, particularly as a means of addressing issues of unemployment and encouraging inward investment into the local economy. Note role of voluntary & community sector such as the Princes Trust, in this.	No	Role of partner organisations noted in Implementation bullet point 3.
408	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development Interest (Private)	J1			Support the shift in the Borough's economy away from traditional industrial activity and towards more modern employment activities including a hotel, retail and leisure uses, all of which employ people.	Unstated	
113	Bouygues Development		J1	14.3 p77	Unspecified	In the previous 'Choices for the Core Strategy', p.36, bullet point 2 (Investing in the New Economy) it is stated: 'Transforming Stratford and Canning Town as key engines for growth in the retail, leisure and office sectors, building on the Olympic Legacy and excellent transport connections'. This should be incorporated into the Core Strategy, emphasising the economic importance of Canning Town.	No	This policy direction is reflected in the designation of these areas as employment hubs, as elaborated in the spatial policies.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of Consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
98	Workspace Group	Development Interest (Private)	J1 & J2		Unsound - Effective	Supports the release of employment land over the plan period, but concerned does not go far enough in recognising role of mixed use development in providing for modern, flexible workspace for SMEs, consistent with PPS4's wider definition of employment-generating land uses (residential cross-subsidising). This is also applicable to the restrictions placed on SIL. This is consistent with longer term demand trends, and could enable a higher level of economic development.	No	SIL restrictions derived from London Plan.
359	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	J1/J2		conformity with London Plan	The proposed SIL and wharf policies are not in general conformity with the London Plan. Following interrogation of the methodology and analysis of the wider sub-regional balance of supply and demand for industrial land GLA officers set out in the response to the 'Choices' document that there may be scope for up to 90 hectares of release. As such Newham now propose to release 77 hectares of industrial land through a plan-led approach. However there are concerns regarding the proposals to release Strategic Industrial Land in Thames-side West.	Unstated	Plan-led approach explained in reasoned justification to this policy and spatial policies.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of Consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
308	Quintain Estates Development	Development Interest (Private)	J2		Unsound - Justified, Effective	<p>If it has been established through the LDF process that some former employment sites should be reclassified as mixed use development sites, it should not then be necessary to demonstrate that there is no longer any demand for employment use on that site when development proposals come forward. Suggest the final bullet of Policy J2 be deleted as contradicts penultimate bullet point'.</p> <p>Suggest that the Thames Wharf &amp; Limmo entry on the Borough-wide employment land re-designations table be updated. It may be appropriate to separate the Limmo and Thames Wharf sites to reflect that the former was only a borough employment allocation whereas the latter is Strategic Industrial Location (part of Thameside West). It would be clearer to note in the Proposed Change column of Thameside West that there is scope for transfer of 11.7ha on the Thames Wharf site.</p>	Yes	See proposed minor amendments under this comment ID.
335	National Grid Property Holdings Ltd	Development Interest (Private)	J2	14.2 and Proposals Map	Unsound - Justified, Effective	<p>Owing to the improvements undertaken to Beckton Sewage Treatment Works and the intention to create a community at S19, Beckton Riverside site is not a suitable location for industry, and is suitable for residential use, there is an undetermined mixed use planning application on the site. The following changes to the Core Strategy are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beckton Riverside should be deleted from Policy J2.</li> <li>• The net gain in industrial land at Beckton Riverside described in the Strategic Industrial Locations Redesignations table (p81) should be amended to remove the potential gain</li> </ul>	Yes	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of Consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
						<p>created by the inclusion of the riverside site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Riverside site is shown as a "Proposed Addition to the SIL" on the proposals map (p82). This should be excluded entirely from the SIL designation.</li> </ul>		
22	Olympic Delivery Authority	Statutory Consultee	J2			The Objective and Policy are welcomed and supported.	No	
470	Maxmillia Properties	Development Interest (Private)	J2	Paragraph 14.2 & Borough-wide employment land redesignations table		Support the objective of Policy J2; welcome and support the proposed release of 4.1 ha of employment land within the Tidal Basin Area. Consider that further guidance should be provided for proposals for non-employment uses within the de-designated locations. In particular guidance on the requirements for demonstrating that there is no longer any demand for ongoing employment use.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
51	Thames Water Utilities	Statutory Consultee	J2		Unsound, Effective	Thames Water does not object to the identification of Beckton STW as part of this SIL as the site is operational utility land of strategic importance and function. The Core Strategy should explain that the part of Beckton Riverside SIL at Beckton STW is designed to protect its strategic utility function and not to encourage its development for wider industrial purposes.	No	This is covered in the spatial policy S5 and IDP, which clearly outlines the crucial role of the sewage works in this location.
319	Port of London Authority	Statutory Consultee	J2		Unspecified	Policy is referred to elsewhere within the Core Strategy as a policy driver for the consolidation of the wharves within Thameside West. However, whilst there is reference to SIL, there is no reference to wharves and the PLA is uncertain as to this approach.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of Consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
463	Metropolitan Police Authority	Statutory Consultee	J2		Unspecified	The provision of patrol and custody facilities are vital to the successful implementation of the MPA's estate strategy and these uses are similar to that carried out on most employment/industrial sites, and are employment-generating (as recognised by the London Plan). As such, it is recommended that the changes are made to Policy J2 to refer to employment generating uses.	Unstated	Land uses permitted on SIL are defined by the London Plan. Employment-generating uses are allowed for in release criteria. Permitted uses on non SIL employment land to be covered in DMPM. See minor amendment under this ID.
159	Mr William Falco	Local Business	J2		Unsound, Effective	Pleased that Thames Road East is to remain an Employment Hub. The reason why the site has an occupancy rate of 50% is because the landlords impose restrictions and limitations on the leases which make it impossible to trade. They also prohibit use of the Tay Wharf facilities. These limitations and restrictions make it very difficult to continue trading. There is an obvious need to encourage the Employment Hubs to be successful and to police the activities of unscrupulous landlords. Imposing a 'vacant business tax' might work but the imposition of a CPO after a vacant time spell should not be ruled out.	Unstated	
137	London City Airport	Local Business	J2	14.2, and proposals map.	Unsound	Proposed release of King George V (south side): This airport land proposed for release is inconsistent with map on p42 under S5 Beckton Spatial Policy.	No	This employment hub in its entirety is displayed on the map on p32 under S3 Royal Docks Spatial policy. Site allocations in relation to much of the release area will be dealt with in the DCPM/Site Allocations DPD.
70	London Thames Gateway Development Corporation	Statutory Consultee	J2		N/A	Text within Reasoned Justification does refer to avoiding piecemeal development; it may be helpful if this formed part of the policy.	No	This is covered in the policy under the criteria for industrial land release and in spatial policies.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of Consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at examination?	Comment
196 & 197	Rooff Ltd	Local Business	J2		N/A	Supports release of Strategic Industrial Land at Marshgate Lane	No	
182	Ballymore Properties Ltd	Development Interest (Private)	J2		Unsound - Justified, effective, consistent with national policy	Support release at Thameside West Strategic Industrial Location but object to the failure to identify the Thameside Industrial Estate as a Strategic Site.	Yes	
411	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development Interest (Private)	J2		Unspecified	Support release of employment land at West Ham Mills, which includes Sugar House Lane. Broadly support the criteria listed on page 79. However, with regards to the fourth criterion of the policy, which states that the development proposal must 'create a significantly higher number of jobs than those that might be lost', feel that more emphasis should be placed on the quality of jobs created rather than the quantity and should be considered on a site-by-site basis	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID and ID470.
63	Newham Sixth Form College	Interest Group Education provider	J3		Not legally complaint, Unsound - Justified, Effective, Consistent with National Policy.	The reasoned justification should include reference to Newham Sixth Form college as one of the education providers within the Borough	Yes	Included as minor amendment under comment ID 63.
23	Olympic Delivery Authority	Statutory Consultee	J3			The Objective and Policy are welcomed and supported.	No	
369	Princes Trust	Interest Group (charitable organisation)	J3			Support the policy, in particular the focus of increasing employment opportunities for local people.	No	
414	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development Interest (Private)	J3			The requirement that all major development should enhance the access of Newham residents to work is broadly supported.	Unstated	

## Homes

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main points	Participate at EIP?	Notes
10	Newham College of Further Education	Development interest (private)	H1	15.11	Not legally compliant and unsound. Justified, Effective, Consistent with National Policy	Policy H1 insofar as it relates to the 39% family housing target is unsound and inflexible. This element of Policy H1 should be removed.	Yes	
179	London Borough of Redbridge	Statutory Consultee	H1		Unsound, Justified, Effective	The 39% three bedroom target is not consistent with the findings of the East London SHMA and the Newham SHMA, which identify a large need for one and two bed units (60%). Concerned about the impacts of the policy on Redbridge. Suggest the reference in the supporting text to the three bedroom target: <i>"especially preferred where it is affordable"</i> , should be included in the policy wording.	No	
181	Ballymore Properties Ltd	Development interest (private)	H1		Unsound. Justified, Effective, Consistent with National Policy.	Seek third bullet point of Policy H1 to read: <i>"seek 39% of new residential accommodation to be 3 bedroom for families (assessed on a habitable room basis), subject to the assessment of viability impacts on a case by case basis"</i> .	Yes	Box H1' is referenced in Reasoned Justification. Suggested wording contrary to evidence base and strategic aim of the London Plan to provide housing for families.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main points	Participate at EIP?	Notes
299	One Housing Group	Development interest (public/semi public)	H1		Unsound. Justified.	Object to the 39% family target. The policy should allow for some flexibility in terms of housing mix, site specific characteristics, the character of the surrounding area, scheme viability and the availability of subsidy. Consider housing provision should reflect findings of SHMA. Seek bullet point 3 of Policy H1 is redrafted to state:  <i>'Seek 39% of the number of new homes to be suitable for families ( two bed four person and above) taking account of the site location, site specific considerations and viability issues'</i>	No	'Box H1' is referenced in Reasoned Justification.
350	Action and Rights of Disabled People in Newham	Interest group (disability rights)	H1		Not legally compliant - General Conformity with London Plan. Unsound - Justified, Effective, Consistent with National Policy	<i>Seek all new homes meet the Lifetime Homes standard...</i> is not is general conformity with the draft replacement London Plan insofar as the use of 'seek'. Request the word 'seek' is deleted.	No	
336	East Thames Group	Development interest (public/semi public)	H1		Unsound - Justified.	It is not clear how provision will be made for families who require a larger home (more than 3 bed) and there does not appear to be reasoned justification for this.	Unstated	
306	Genesis Housing Group	Development interest (public/semi public)	H1		Unsound - Effective.	The text from 'Box H1' should be included in the main Policy H1 wording before the reasoned justification for emphasis and clarity from the outset.	No	'Box H1' is referenced in Reasoned Justification.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main points	Participate at EIP?	Notes
331	Obsidian FG Ltd	Development interest (private)	H1	Housing Delivery Table (page 86)	Unsound - Justified, Effective.	Policy H1 should be amended to more accurately reflect the emerging Forest Gate Masterplan. The Policy seeks 39% of new homes to be 3 bed family units. Suggest amendment to read ' <i>Seek 39% of the number of new homes to be 3 bedroom for families, subject to an assessment of the individual site circumstances and location in context.</i> ' Also seek amendments to Policy H1 'Table Housing Delivery by Phase and Community Forum Area' to seek a range of housing provision of up to 1000 units for Forest Gate over the next 10 years to reflect the emerging masterplan.	Yes	'Box H1' is referenced in Reasoned Justification.
448	Lancaster Plc.	Development interest (private)	H1		Unsound - Consistent with National Policy.	Suggest that the 39% family housing bullet point be modified to outline that this is an overall strategic target and should be subject to individual site specific considerations.	Yes	'Box H1' is referenced in Reasoned Justification.
24	ODA	Statutory consultee	H1		N/A	Objective and Policy welcomed and supported.	No	
53	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	Statutory consultee	H1		N/A	Support the reference within this policy for new neighbourhoods to fit in within their urban character	No	
454	University of East London	Development interest (private)	H1		Unspecified	Provision should also be allowed for sites for student housing, with some change of use flexibility for the future.	Unstated	
415	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development interest (private)	H1		Unspecified	Support the objective. The requirement for family housing should be applied on a site-by-site basis. Support lifetime homes and wheelchair accessible targets. Support Box H1.	Unstated	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main points	Participate at EIP?	Notes
114	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)	H1	Points 3 and 4	N/A	Support Policy H1. Suggest that in addition to the 39% family bedroom target it should be stated that there may be exceptions to the percentage of family units in locations less suited to this type of unit (such as town centre locations), where the site development is shared with a number of other town centre uses.	No	
97	Workspace Group	Development interest (private)	H2		Unsound - Effective, Consistent with National Policy.	A flexible approach to specific site negotiation for affordable housing should be incorporated into the policy. Wording amendment suggested.	No	Flexibility covered in 'Box H1'
180	Ballymore Properties Ltd	Development interest (private)	H2		Unsound - Justified, Effective, Consistent with National Policy.	The content of 'Box H1' should be added into the policy. Suggest adding a final bullet point to read: "The affordable housing package for individual sites will be assessed against the above objectives and in the context of site viability, the availability of public subsidy, and the existing tenure mix in the locality".	Yes	'Box H1' is separate from policy wording as it is relevant to Policies H1 and H2.
301	One Housing Group	Development interest (public/semi public)	H2		Unsound - Effective.	Policy should emphasise the need for each scheme to be considered on its own merits, taking account site conditions, site context, the availability of subsidy and scheme viability. Bullet point 2 of draft Policy H2 should be written as an aim rather than a requirement, to allow flexibility.	No	Flexibility covered in 'Box H1'
307	Genesis Housing Group	Development interest (public/semi public)	H2		Unsound - Effective.	Policy should allow for new affordable housing products (as per Annex B of Planning Policy Statement 3 - February 2011) and a flexible approach to the percentage of rental market levels applied in defining affordable rent. Viability also needs to be recognised. Instead of referring to Box H1 (contained in a separate policy), this flexible approach should be emphasised in the main text of policy H2.	No	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main points	Participate at EIP?	Notes
361	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	H2		Unsound - Not in general conformity with the London Plan.	The Strategy should make clear that off-site affordable housing and in-lieu payments should only be considered in exceptional circumstances and such circumstances should be set out in the policy and should reflect those in draft replacement London Plan paragraph 3.67. The council need to ensure it provides sufficient flexibility in the text to make the necessary policy changes as new Government policy on affordable housing emerges. The departure from the 50% 'viable' target is still questioned by the Mayor.	Unstated	
333	Obsidian FG Ltd	Development interest (private)	H2		Unsound - Justified, Effective.	It would be appropriate for Policy H2 and Box H1 to recognise the special circumstances that could apply to comprehensive regeneration schemes. Seek the inclusion of a further bullet point which says: ' <i>The need to promote and achieve economic regeneration in line with Council policies and priorities including Forest Gate (add others as necessary).</i> ' This same bullet point could also be appropriately added on to the last bullet point of Policy H2.	Yes	
450	Lancaster Plc.	Development interest (private)	H2		Unsound - Consistent with National Policy.	Reference should be made to viability with regard to the 35-50% affordable housing negotiation target, perhaps adding "subject to viability" at the end of the sentence.	Yes	Flexibility covered in Box 1.
25	ODA	Statutory consultee	H2		N/A	Objective and Policy welcomed and supported.	No	
71	LTGDC	Statutory consultee	H2		N/A	Support Policy H2.	No	
116	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)	H2		N/A	Recommend that at the end of the policy is added 'subject to site specific circumstances'. The policy needs to repeat changes in the funding regime for affordable housing and the potential for alternative forms of affordable housing that may be necessary.	No	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main points	Participate at EIP?	Notes
417	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development interest (private)	H2		Unspecified	The policy should allow for a lower proportion when sites and proposals are considered on their merits, in certain situations there should be recognition that 0% is appropriate.	Unstated	Flexibility covered in 'Box H1'
390	East Thames Group	Development interest (public/semi-public)	H2		N/A	Support Policy H2.	Unstated	
309	Quintain Estates Development	Development interest (public/semi public) / Statutory Consultee / Development Interest (private)	H2 and S4		Consider sound on form but state Policies S4 and H2 are unsound in text.	Policy H2 is not consistent with Policy S4(1). Policy H2(3) applies the 35:65 affordable/market housing split to the Canning Town and Custom House SPD area whereas Policy S4 applies the 35:65 split to the Canning Town Community Forum Area, which is larger. Use of specified target for affordable housing delivery with no reference to viability as proposed by policy H2 is unsound. Support the reference to the "mix and tenure considerations" in Box H1 in Policy H2(2); these should also be taken into account when considering the appropriate level of social housing in the Canning Town area, which Policy H2(3) does not currently provide for.	Yes	Minor amendment proposed to delete tenure mix reference in policy S4, see minor amendment under ID292.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main points	Participate at EIP?	Notes
372	London Gypsy and Traveller Unit	Interest group (gypsy and traveller needs)	H3		Unsound - Consistent with National Policy.	The proposed core strategy does not conform to national policy or the issue of Gypsies and Travellers referred to in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, or circular 01/2006. The policy should make it clear that the target for new pitches remains. 15.26 Refers to addendum 198, the Newham Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2010, which includes 2 pages on the situation of Gypsies and Travellers, particularly in East London. Why is this figure not included within the main draft core strategy? Or because of the reference to the Newham JSN document, does this mean that in fact the core strategy does, by default, include those pitch numbers?	Yes	
26	ODA	Statutory consultee	H3		N/A	Objective and Policy welcomed and supported.	No	
357	Action and Rights of Disabled People in Newham	Interest group (disability rights)	H3	15.26	Unspecified	Suggest minor amendment to wording.	No	Minor amendment included, ref. ID357
362	Greater London Authority	Statutory consultee	H3		Unspecified	The Mayor supports the borough's considered recognition of specialist accommodation needs, including the needs of students and older people in policy H3. However, Concern is raised over the omission of any recognition of the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Show people. In accordance with Policy 3.8 B(i) of the draft replacement London Plan.	Unstated	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main points	Participate at EIP?	Notes
387	Illius Properties	Development interest (private)	H4		Unsound - Effective, Consistent with National Policy.	Policy is not flexible enough to address future housing needs. Recommend that the second paragraph of the policy is altered to read: 'The Council will only support conversion or alteration of existing dwellings to alternative residential accommodation where it can be demonstrated an adequate standard of accommodation can be provided, in line with relevant development standards, and that neighbouring residential amenity is not detrimentally impacted upon. This will include an analysis of available infrastructure to accommodate the proposals, including car-parking, refuse storage and amenity provision.'	No	This suggestion is in effect the same approach as the existing unsuccessful UDP policy.
27	ODA	Statutory consultee	H4		N/A	Objective and Policy welcomed and supported.	No	
72	LTGDC	Statutory consultee	H4		N/A	Support protection of existing housing stock and resisting conversions of existing family housing.	No	
360	Greater London Authority	Statutory consultee	H4		N/A	Supports Policy H4, but highlights the need for further work through an SPD to 'flesh out' the spatial extent of conversions and HMO's. This additional piece of work should be signposted in the policy and supporting text.	Unstated	
384	London Gypsy and Traveller Unit	Interest group (gypsy and traveller needs)		Appendix 4 - Monitoring Strategy	Unsound - Consistent with National Policy.	The main section in the proposed Core Strategy refers to a number of groups who may benefit from specialist accommodation. Gypsies and Travellers are not mentioned.	Yes	
115	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)		Page 88, Box H1	N/A	The contents of Box H1 should be stated in each policy which has the potential to affect a scheme's viability and deliverability that the levels advocated by the Council are subject to individual site circumstances and cross referenced to 15.1 H1.	No	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main points	Participate at EIP?	Notes
351	Action and Rights of Disabled People in Newham	Interest group (disability rights)		Appendix 5 - Glossary	Unspecified	Suggest minor amendment, addition to glossary.	No	Minor amendment included to assist interpretation, see ref. ID351.

## Sustainability and Climate Change

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
28	ODA	Statutory consultee	SC1	Bullet point 2, 16.5	n/a	Suggests policy should go further: major developments (non-residential) should be required to meet BREEAM 'Excellent' rather than 'BREEAM' 'Very Good'.	No	Council would support this change.
96	Workspace	Development interest (private)	SC1		Effective, consistent with national policy	Suggest policy on Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM is not consistent with national policy and does not refer to viability or feasibility.	No	Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM include non-energy elements and energy criteria of Level 4 / 'Very Good' are consistent with national policy on energy and low carbon development.
420	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development interest (public)	SC1	1st line of policy	Unspecified	Requests text is added to start of policy 'Where possible'.	Unstated	
420	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Development interest (public/private)	SC1		Unspecified	Requests additional text be added to policy: 'Every planning application for development should be decided on its own merits with regards to sustainability, as there will be certain circumstances where it will not be possible to meet the all of the above criteria.'	Unstated	
54	Thames Water	Statutory consultee	SC1		n/a	Supports policy coverage of Code for Sustainable Homes (level 4) and sustainable urban drainage.	No	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
216	Environment Agency	Statutory consultee	SC1			Supports requirement for all developments to achieve a water consumption target of 105 l/p/d.	Yes	
216	Environment Agency	Statutory consultee	SC1	Bullet point 6	n/a	Supports policy coverage of green/brown roofs.	Yes	
455	University of East London	Other (education)	SC1			Supports policy coverage of minimising waste, making better use of water and minimising flood risk and protecting and enhancing biodiversity.	Unstated	
466	London Borough of Hackney	Statutory consultee	SC1	Bullet point 5		Supports policy statement 'working with partners to maintain existing flood defences'.	Unstated	
466	London Borough of Hackney	Statutory consultee	SC1			Supports the inclusion of policy.	Unstated	
67	Natural England	Statutory consultee	SC1	Bullet point 8	n/a	Wants to see reference to greenspace connectivity made in bullet point 8.	No	See minor amendment under this ID
216	Environment Agency	Statutory consultee	SC1	Bullet point 5	n/a	Wants to see reference to Planning Policy Statement 25 Practice Guide	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID
445	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Statutory consultee	SC1		n/a	Wants to see reference to Lee Valley Park Authority and its plans and strategies	Unstated	See minor amendment under this ID
95	Workspace	Development interest (private)	SC2		Effective, consistent with national policy	Suggests policy is not necessary: repeats policies contained within the London Plan and national policy.	No	Policy sets out forthcoming set-changes to higher level policy regarding energy and low carbon development.
95	Workspace	Development interest (private)	SC2		Effective, consistent with national policy	Suggests It is inappropriate to insist that new development should connect to a decentralised energy networks.	No	Policy INF4 includes detailed policy on decentralised heat and power networks.
117	Bouygess Development	Development interest (private)	SC2	Bullet point 1	Unspecified	Requests text to be added to end of policy: 'subject to the viability and deliverability of the scheme'.	No	Additional text would be inconsistent with higher level policy.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
311	Quintain Estates	Development interest (private)	SC2		Unspecified	Requests additional paragraph be added: 'The Council will have regard to the effect of full compliance with these measures on scheme viability in setting carbon reduction requirements for individual schemes to ensure that there is no prejudicial effect on the delivery of other Core Strategy priorities'.	Yes	Additional text would be inconsistent with higher level policy.
29	ODA	Statutory consultee	SC2		n/a	Objective and policy is welcomed and supported	No	
261	Friends of the Earth (Newham)	Resident interest group (environment)	SC2		n/a	Supports policy coverage of low carbon development	Unstated	
220	British Waterways	Statutory consultee	SC2		n/a	Wants to see reference to the use of waterways for local heat and power networks.	No	See minor amendment to policy INF4 under this ID
365	Greater London Authority	Statutory consultee	SC2	Box SC2	n/a	Wants to see step-changes / phasing for energy and low carbon development updated in line with present status of national policy.	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID
30	ODA	Statutory consultee	SC3		n/a	Objective and policy is welcomed and supported	No	
55	Thames Water	Statutory consultee	SC3		n/a	Supports policy coverage of sustainable urban drainage schemes and reference to the potential for flooding from sewers.	No	
262	Friends of the Earth - Newham	Resident interest group (environment)	SC3			Supports policy coverage on flood risk from the hard-standing of domestic gardens and public open space	Unstated	
219	Environment Agency	Statutory consultee	SC3		n/a	Wants to see reference to the requirement for developments to be set back from waterways for the purposes of biodiversity and local amenity.	Yes	See minor amendment to Policy INF7 under this ID
217	Environment Agency	Statutory consultee	SC3	Bullet point 2	n/a	Wants to see reference to PPS25.	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID
217	Environment Agency	Statutory consultee	SC3	Bullet point 4	n/a	Wants to see reference to improving, enhancing and re-naturalising defences.	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID
217	Environment Agency	Statutory consultee	SC3	Bullet point 3	n/a	Wants to see reference to London Plan and Planning Policy Statement 25.	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
217	Environment Agency	Statutory consultee	SC3		n/a	Wants to see reference to the requirement for development to be setback from waterways to enable maintenance and improvement of defences.	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID
471	London Borough of Hackney	Statutory consultee	SC3		n/a	In regards to Policy SC3 Flood Risk, working with partners to maintain existing flood defences is supported and LBH would wish to work with LBN on this issue.	Unstated	
56	Thames Water	Statutory consultee	SC4	Map 11	Justified	Wants Proposed Sites of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINC) on site of Beckton STW extension should be removed.	No	Proposed SINC locations supplied by partners set out in biodiversity evidence base.
31	ODA	Statutory consultee	SC4		n/a	Objective and policy is welcomed and supported.	No	
73	London Thames Gateway Development Corporation	Statutory consultee	SC4	Map 11	n/a	Supports proposed Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) at Twelvetrees Crescent.	No	
263	Friends of the Earth - Newham	Resident interest group (environment)	SC4		n/a	Supports policy objective 'protect, enhance and create habitats for biodiversity across Newham'.	Unstated	
466	London Borough of Hackney	Statutory consultee	SC4			Supports the inclusion of policy.	Unstated	
68	Natural England	Statutory consultee	SC4	Bullet point 2	n/a	Wants to see reference to Biodiversity Action Plan removed to increase scope of policy.	No	See minor amendment under this ID
68	Natural England	Statutory consultee	SC4	Bullet point 3	n/a	Wants to see reference to designation of new Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs).	No	See minor amendment under this ID
222	British Waterways	Statutory consultee	SC4		n/a	Wants to see reference to the requirement of enhancement measures to be appropriate to their setting and not hinder navigation.	No	See minor amendment under this ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
472	London Borough of Hackney	Statutory consultee	SC4		n/a	1. LBH recognises and supports the inclusion of policies SC1 Climate Change, SC4 Biodiversity and INF6 Green Infrastructure.	Unstated	
209	Environment Agency	Statutory consultee			Effective, consistent with national policy	Considers Core Strategy is unsound because it does not adequately address land contamination and remediation.	Yes	See minor amendments under this ID for Policy SP2, Policy SC1 and Policy INF3.
224	Plaiستow Properties Limited (Mr John Sewell)	Development interest (private)		Map 11	Justified	Suggests Site of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINC) should not be shown to extend in to client's property.	No	SINC boundaries are provided by partners set out in the biodiversity evidence base.

## Infrastructure

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
354	Action and Rights of Disabled People	Interest Group	IN1	Paragraph 17.9		Should refer to disabled people, not people with disabilities, in accordance with social model of disability adopted by the Council in 1995.	no	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
46	London Borough of Barking and Dagenham	Statutory Consultee	INF1		Legal Compliance and Soundness	Amend reference to DLR extension to clarify that safeguarding proposals are supported by the relevant agencies and that alternative alignments will not be entertained, as issues surrounding the alignment should be addressed through the safeguarding process.	No	Safeguarding has not yet been agreed - consider reference in policy to alternative alignments retains flexibility. However see minor amendment under this ID to include reference to support from other agencies.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
270	Newham Friends of the Earth	Stakeholder group	INF1			More consideration is given to economic investment and ease of travel to other places (page 106) and facilities for passengers (page 108) than to the health and well being of local residents. The location near the City Airport was undesirable. Would the building of 1,000 more homes in the Docklands coincide with the building of a second LCA runway?	Unstated	No change. The policy supports a finer grain of connectivity between Newham and neighbouring boroughs with emphasis given to providing access for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport with road-based crossings. The Core Strategy does not provide for a second runway at LCA and acknowledges the potential impact of further expansion on the potential of development sites around the safety zone. The effect of this is to indicate reasons not to support future expansion although no cap is given due to the current legal proceedings.
312	Quintain Estates Development	Developer Interest - Private	INF1		Unsound, not justified or effective	Consider paragraph regarding safeguarded wharves is not sound as currently proposed as it is not the most deliverable or flexible option, nor is it internally consistent with Policy S3(6).	Yes	see minor amendment under this ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
322	Port of London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF1		Not specified	Whilst the PLA notes and supports the position of the Core Strategy in relation to safeguarded wharves and is content with the approach towards consolidation within Thameside West, the PLA seeks clarification as to the remaining element of this policy ( Proposals for alternative sites... ) in order to fully assess the approach taken. The PLA further supports the policy approach to use, improve and support proposals for the Borough's waterways. Within the reasoned justification, and more particularly that part related to safeguarded wharves, the PLA would note that it is not aware of any evidence base to suggest that the wharves can be appropriately (in accordance with the test within the London Plan) relocated to the east of the Borough. As such, this should be deleted. Additionally, the approach within the London Plan to the consolidation of wharfage is designed to improve the cargo-handling characteristics, rather than because the space across the river or that this frontage should be freed up for other alternative uses. The PLA supports that part of the reasoned justification as it relates to the use of the Borough's waterways.	Unstated	No change
398	Greater London Authority	Statutory consultee	INF1		Unsound	TfL requires that the Council expresses support for river crossings as per London Plan policy 3C.15 and Consolidated Draft Replacement London Plan Policy 6.4 Para 6.18B.	Yes	No change proposed. This will be subject to further discussion between LBN and TfL.
398	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF1		Unsound	The current policy to restrict availability of the Silvertown crossing to general traffic only during closure of the Blackwell Tunnel is not in general conformity with the London Plan	Yes	see minor amendment under this ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
398	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF1		Unsound	There is no clear planning reason within the document as to why the implementation of the Gallions Reach river crossing should be supportable only on grounds that funding is secured for the delivery of the DLR extension to Dagenham Dock	Yes	see minor amendment under this ID
476	Friends of the Earth, London	Interest Group (Environment)	INF1		Not specified	We object to the policy which is completely unqualified and road crossings proposed by the Mayor would be expected to add considerably to traffic in the area and would be likely to be incompatible with policy SP2 and SC2 on climate change.	Yes	No change
465	London Borough of Hackney	Statutory Consultee	INF1			<p>1. In general terms LBH has no major issues with the Strategic Transport sections of the Submission Document. LBH recognises and generally supports the commitments to the Strategic Transport Network as set out.</p> <p>2. Other general comments are provided in connection with LBH's response to the LB Newham Draft LIP (to be provided separately from the LBH Transportation Department).</p>	Not stated	
74	LTGDC	Statutory Consultee	INF1		N/A	Welcome this policy and the support given to projects such as International trains calling at Stratford Station, safeguarded river crossings at West Silvertown and Gallions Reach, Extensions to the DLR from Gallions Reach to Dagenham Dock, East London Transit bus link from Barking to Canning Town via Beckton and the Royal Docks. Support future wharves study. Note that although the DLR extension to Dagenham Dock is mentioned in INF1, it is not included within the Strategic Site Schedule and Designations.	No	Minor amendment under ID 74.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
367	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF1			The document sets out that that future growth (above the 120,000 currently approved) in line with the airport's masterplan will need to be carefully considered. The Mayor's position is that 120,000 capacity is the maximum acceptable.	Unstated	
393	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF1			TfL requests that support is given within the Core Strategy to the possible increased capacity and service enhancements on Thameside Essex C2C service which would improve rail accessibility - although these were removed in the spending review, further support is expected to be made in HLOS2.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
393	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF1	2nd bullet point		Safeguarded river crossings should refer to replacement London Plan measures, namely a road-based tunnel linking the Greenwich Peninsula and Silvertown, consideration of ferry-based options east of a crossing at Silvertown, consideration over the longer term of a fixed link at Gallions Reach.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
393	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF1			The DLR extension from Stratford International to Walthamstow Central is not specifically identified in the East Sub Region Transport Plan, although the Plan does support improving rail connectivity north of Stratford. TfL is also seeing to increase capacity on the DLR line between Stratford and Canary Wharf for which the borough's support is requested.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
32	ODA	Statutory Consultee	INF1			Objective and Policy is welcomed and supported	No	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
83	Newham Cyclists (LCC)	Interest group (cycling)	INF1, INF2, SP1,	Pages 21, 54, 108, 111, 112, 113, 114.	Unsound, not effective.	Cycle parking standards set out in the London Plan are minimal and the borough should set out higher minimum cycle parking standards established locally, especially in higher density areas and where car parking is restricted. (See full representation for details)	Yes	see minor amendment under this ID
268	Friends of the Earth - Newham	Interest Group (Environment)	INF2		Unspecified	Community amenities and cycle facilities not addressed.	Unstated	
278	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee	INF2	17.30	N/A	Towpaths provide excellent cycle routes but this must be seen as part of their shared use role, where pedestrians and other more vulnerable users are given priority.	No	
278	British Waterways	Public Agency	INF2		N/A	Towpaths provide excellent cycle routes but this must be seen as part of their shared use role, where pedestrians and other more vulnerable users are given priority.	no	
75	LTGDC	Statutory Consultee	INF2		n/a	The reference to the Lea Valley Fatwalk in bullet point 3 should be amended to Lea River Park (also in Legend for section on S4 and text at S18). Reference to this important LTGDC project is welcomed.	No	See minor amendment under this ID
118	Bouygues Development	Developer Interest - Private	INF2			Agree with points re sustainable transport, particularly first paragraph.	Not stated	
264	Friends of the Earth	Stakeholder Group	INF2		n/a	Pleased to see positive elements in core strategy. Make reference to cycle parking.	Not Stated	This is covered in Policy INF2: 4th bullet states "and adequate public cycle parking both on-street and in secure covered facilities". Reference to other cycle parking made with regard to cycle parking standards (last bullet in policy).

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
33	ODA	Statutory Consultee	INF2			Objective and Policy is welcomed and supported	No	
57	Thames Water	Statutory consultee	INF3		Soundness	Request for reference to national policy in INF3 in relation to the Thames Tunnel and Lee Tunnel.	No	see minor amendment under this ID
277	Quintain Estates	Stakeholder organisation	INF3		Not sound or effective	Propose amendment to policy to include support for new waste facilities at locations in Thameside West and East.	Yes	see minor amendments under this ID
364	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF3		Soundness, justification	The Core Strategy lists four strategic waste sites and whilst it is accepted that not all sites will be listed in the core strategy the policy should be explicit that all existing waste management sites are safeguarded. As currently drafted the core strategy is not in general conformity with the London Plan.	Yes	see minor amendment under this ID
364	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF3		Soundness, justification	The Core Strategy should make specific reference to its waste apportionment figure and recycling targets as specified in the London Plan and specify that the apportionment and recycling targets will be met through the East London Waste Plan.	Yes	see minor amendment under this ID
34	ODA	Statutory Consultee	INF3		n/a	Policy is warmly welcomed.	Yes	
35	ODA	Statutory Consultee	INF4		n/a	Support Policy and Objective. Suggest minor amendment to policy to include requirement for developments to link to local heat networks or include passive provision if connection not suitable at that time.	No	See minor amendment under ID 35.
76	LTGDC	Statutory Consultee	INF4		N/A	LTGDC assume the reference to LTGDC's heat network should be the Thames Gateway Heat Network. LTGDC support the use of a Local Development Order to help bring it forward.	No	See minor amendment under this ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
474	LB Hackney	Statutory Consultee	INF4			The development and potential expansion of district heating and cooling networks within existing and new development areas such as Hackney Wick is supported and LBH would wish to work with LBN to make this happen.	Unstated	
366	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF4			Policy is strongly supported and is in line with those in the London Plan.	Not Stated	
36	ODA	Statutory Consultee	INF5			Support policy and objective. Suggest clarification needed re rationale for maintaining Stratford town centre boundary, and criteria by which it will be judged an integrated Metropolitan Centre	No	Already covered in paragraph 3 of Reasoned Justification.
77	LTGDC	Statutory Consultee	INF5			Supported, particularly change to CT town centre boundary. Should perhaps acknowledge pace of change at Gallions Reach dependent on what happens on neighbouring sites.	No	This is felt to be adequately covered at paragraph 6 of Reasoned Justification.
119	Bouygues Development	Development interest (private)	INF5	Paragraph 17.68	N/A	Agree with extension of Canning Town centre, but suggest explicit reference should be made to the fact that it encompasses Area 7 of the SPD.	No	CTCH SPD is a subsidiary document, which needs to be updated to be aligned with CS in some places. For this reason specific SPD sites are not referenced in the CS.
233	Mr F Janssens	Resident	INF5		Unspecified	Policy does not reflect international significance of Green Street - wishes to see it referenced as a major centre, and to see variety of units, not just larger units aimed for.	Unstated	See minor amendments proposed under this ID. Major role is not indicated by London plan based on existing scale/provision and growth potential. International draw is reflected in S6 amendment - reflecting its character rather than its role within the borough-hierarchy.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
256	Friends of Queens Market	Interest group (local campaign)	INF5		Unspecified	Wishes the linear shopping street role to be referred to, instead of the district centre role	Yes	Not the role of this policy which concerns network and hierarchy role not spatial form, and uses the language of the London Plan. Spatial vision for Green Street is clearly set out in policy S6. Street environments vision set out in SP7
345	Sainsburys	Development interest (private)	INF5		Inconsistent with national policy	Policy should recognise that there may be circumstances when out of centre retail development is appropriate, subject to the PPS4 tests of the sequential approach and impact	No	Policy allows for out of centre retail if justified on grounds of inadequate access, and subject to a retail impact assessment if more than 300 sq m. New retail is however encouraged to be located within new local centres, planned for on the basis of accessibility and footfall as part of major development areas. This recognises the significant problem with A1 voids out of centres, which are affected by suboptimal location; and elsewhere the problems with legibility and out of centre competition they create. PPS4 flexibility and tests would apply in any case. See however proposed minor amendment in relation to this comment ID which clarifies the approach to local access considerations in the absence of alternatives.
363	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF5			Supports proposals for Canning Town and Stratford which are in line with the London Plan,	Unstated	
424	Land Prop/Inter kea	Development interest (private)	INF5		Unspecified	Suggest a new neighbourhood centre at the southern part of Sugarhouse Lane, and a new local centre in the northern part fronting Stratford High Street.	Unstated	See minor amendments proposed under this ID which seek to clarify how non specified local centres/other shopping will be identified and brought forward.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
343	Sainsburys	Development interest (private)	INF5	Bullet 1	Justified	RIA for any out of centre retail over 300 sq m is not justified. It is an arbitrary figure and would require an RIA to be prepared for facilities simply seeking to provide for local need. 500sq m would be more appropriate.	No	300 sq m was the threshold recommended by the Newham Town Centre and Retail Study 2010, based on an assessment of the problem of out of centre retail (competition and voids). Provision for local needs still needs to be considered within an appropriate spatial strategy. See however minor amendments proposed in relation to this comment ID which provides clarification as to the approach for providing for local access.
58	Thames Water	Statutory Consultee	INF6		Soundness	Given its operational status as a sewage pumping station, we are of the view that the policy text should include the de-designation of Abbey Mills Sewage Pumping Station as Open Space.	No	Do not agree; site has visual amenity and biodiversity value, and forms part of a green network along Lower Lea Valley.
473	London Borough of Hackney	Statutory Consultee	INF6			LBH recognises and supports the inclusion of policies SC1 Climate Change, SC4 Biodiversity and INF6 Green Infrastructure. The referencing of east-west links, green corridors and the Lea Valley which will potentially enhance access to open space for Hackney residents is also supported.	Unstated	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
69	Natural England	Statutory Consultee	INF6	Paragraph 17.6	N/A	Encouraged by the inclusion of a Green Infrastructure objective and policy. Recommend the term 'openspace' is substituted by 'greenspace' in the objective summary. In addition, the term 'improve connections' needs to be made explicit. The policy should go further with regards to ecological provision e.g. tree planting, connective landscaping, living roofs and walls and sustainable urban drainage systems. As such, we would expect provision of these measures to be a key priority for achieving this policy and recommend that wording is added to that effect within this section.	No	Covered by Policies SC3 and SC4
441	LVRPA	Statutory Consultee	INF6			Should give more details re LVRP in reasoned justification to policy to give context to proposals.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
37	ODA	Statutory Consultee	INF6		n/a	Objective and policy supported, including reference to QEII Olympic Park being designated as MOL. It would be useful to specify in the implementation section how this will happen (e.g. through subsequent DPD).	No	See minor amendment under this comment ID
78	LTGDC	Statutory Consultee	INF6		n/a	Reference should be provided to the creation of the Lea River Park, perhaps in the second bullet. The diagram on page 126 doesn't show the new Lea River Park and this should be updated.	No	See minor amendment under this ID
79	LTGDC	Statutory Consultee	INF7		N/A	Reference should be made in this policy to the Lea River Park and the strategic aspiration to link the Lea Valley Regional Park to the Thames.	No	see minor amendment under this ID
38	ODA	Statutory consultee	INF7		n/a	Objective and policy is welcomed and supported.	No	
324	Port of London Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF7		n/a	The PLA supports the policy approach and its reasoned justification.	Unstated	

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
244	Carol Richards	Resident	INF8		Not legally compliant	Should include planning implications from EQIA in the main document. Faith is very important to a large number of people in the Borough of Newham, and people of faith need Places of Worship to maintain and improve their quality of life. Request reference to need for faith facilities and sharing of community facilities in policy.	Unstated	see minor amendment under this ID
272	Friends of the Earth, Newham	Interest Group	INF8		Not specified	Faith buildings - non references except as heritage features.	Unstated	see minor amendment under this ID
316	HMCS	Statutory Consultee	INF8	Paragraph 17.89	Not sound or effective	Propose amendment to include criminal justice and Court facilities	No	see minor amendment under this ID
80	LTGDC	Statutory Consultee	INF8		N/A	LTGDC welcome the further details on education programme set out in this section. Clearer advice could be provided on where new education facilities will be sought alongside development.	No	see minor amendment under this ID
148	The Theatres Trust	Interest Group (Theatre)	INF8		Unspecified	Concerned that no policy in the document provides protection and enhancement of existing cultural infrastructure. Although this is alluded to in INF8 and SP5 we do not think these policies are robust enough to protect cultural facilities. It is vital to protect buildings of great cultural and community benefit which might otherwise be traded in for more commercially lucrative developments and we request that the policies mentioned above are more specific in their guidance of this objective for cultural facilities.	No	Consider policy adequately covers protection of existing facilities.
247	St John's Church Stratford	Interest Group (Faith)	INF8		Unspecified	There is no mention of the contribution of faith groups in the provision and management of community facilities.	Unstated	Last bullet point of this policy refers to encouraging social/third sector provision of services. See also minor amendment under this ID.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
39	ODA	Statutory Consultee	INF8		n/a	Objective and Policy is welcomed and supported	Unstated	
265	Friends of the Earth - Newham	Stakeholder Group	INF8			We are pleased to see some positive elements in the core strategy - Community facilities accessible	Unstated	
429	Land Prop/Inter IKEA	Developer Interest - Private	INF8		n/a	We note and support that development in the Borough should be coordinated with the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities.	Unstated	
468	Metropolitan Police Authority	Statutory Consultee	INF8		N/a	Welcomes INF8 policies: "ensuring development is supported by appropriate facilities to meet local needs"; and "retaining or re-providing community facilities where a local need exists, that can be clearly demonstrated" and reasoned justification text making mention of emergency services.	Unstated	
2	London and Quadrant Housing	Development Interest	INF8	17.89	Soundness	Public Houses should be excluded from definition of community facilities - notwithstanding this, reference to viability/marketing should be included	No	Document considered sufficiently flexible by including some pubs as a community facility where other facilities are lacking in the area.
59	Thames Water	Statutory Consultee	INF8		Soundness	Request adequate reference to the provision of infrastructure to support new development and suggest addition to policy requiring the Council to require the developer to fund in full the appropriate improvements which must be completed prior to occupation of the development if there is insufficient capacity.	No	There is reference throughout the spatial policies and INF 8 to adequate infrastructure being necessary to support new development.
64	NewVic	Development Interest/Public / Semi Public	INF8	Reasoned Justification	Legal Compliance and Soundness	Include reference to the college's role in providing high quality further education to Newham's residents and its plans to rationalise and relocate to an alternative site close to Stratford town centre.	Yes	See minor amendment under this ID. See also minor amendment proposed to Policy S2 in response to comment from ID451.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
469	Metropolitan Police Authority	Statutory consultee	INF9		Not sound, not consistent with national policy	The list of social infrastructure includes 'policing facilities'. It is recommended that Policing facilities is added to the policy	Unstated	see minor amendment under this ID
40	ODA	Statutory Consultee	INF9		n/a	Objective and Policy is welcomed and supported. However, further clarity on the Council's approach to preparing a local Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would be welcomed once proposed changes to the 2010 CIL Regulations become clear.	No	LBN is to consult on a preliminary CIL charging schedule later in 2011. This will form part of a separate examination. However it will be based on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as submitted with the Core Strategy.
81	LTGDC	Statutory Consultee	INF9		n/a	LTGDC welcome the reference on page 133 to the LTGDC tariff for planning obligations.	No	
416	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	T3	Appendix 1 Strategic Connections		Reference to TfL being a delivery partner for the Thames Gateway Bridge should be removed, although safeguarding remains from DfT.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
409	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	T4	Appendix 1 Strategic Connections		East London Transit Phase 2 is not within TfL's current business plan - so any reference suggesting that TfL will be a delivery partner for the scheme should be removed; could present an alternative vision for improving accessibility between Beckton and the Royal Docks placing a greater emphasis on the role of improving bus links through section 106 agreements with developers. LTGDC is currently looking at an alternative scheme for providing a public transport corridor from Barking Town Centre to the Royal Docks.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
419	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	T5	Appendix 1 Strategic Connections		Planning application for this proposal was submitted (rather than expected) in 2010.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
422	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	T6	Appendix 1 Strategic Connections		The lines are to be operational in 2018 rather than 2017.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
434	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee	T7	Appendix 1 Strategic Connections		This extension is not yet opened as suggested in the additional information section.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
9	Newham College of Further Education	Development Interest/Public / Semi Public		Appendix 3 - Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Legal Compliance and Soundness	Reference should be made to College's investment plans in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Yes	see minor amendment under this ID
66	NewVic	Development Interest Public/Semi Public		Appendix 3 Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Legal Compliance and Soundness	NewVic seek the inclusion of its proposed new campus within Appendix 3 (Infrastructure Delivery Plan).	Yes	see minor amendment under this ID
318	HMCS	Statutory Consultee		Appendix 3 - Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Not Justified	This Core Strategy Proposed Submission has not had regard to the evidence previously submitted on behalf of HMCS which stated that Court facilities should be included explicitly within policy as essential social infrastructure. The HMCS has not been consulted on the preparation of Appendix 3 (Infrastructure Delivery Plan).	No	see minor amendment under this ID
60	Thames Water Utilities Ltd.	Statutory Consultee		Appendix 1 - U2 (utilities)	Unsound - Effective	Suggest a change to the last sentence to reflect the current Thames Tunnel project position, add text: 'The second phase of consultation on the Thames Tunnel project is due to start in September 2011. The target date for completion of the Thames Tunnel is 2020, and progress is needed to be demonstrated to limit the infraction risks against the Government.'	No	Agree to update text in schedule to read 'The target date for completion of the Thames Tunnel is 2020'. The governments risk of infraction as regards the EU European Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive is not relevant to the Core Strategy policy; proposed wording not accepted.
152	London City Airport	Development interest (private) / Local Business		Appendix 1 - T1	Unsound	The text in the fourth column of the table needs to be clarified to read: 'The airport had approximately 70,000 flight movements per annum in 2010.' The text in the fifth column of the table needs to be updated to account for the fact that the judicial review hearing has now been heard and judgment received.	No	see minor amendment under this ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
223	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee		Paragraph 17.9	N/A	The reference to riverbus could be extended to passenger transport on the borough's other waterways.	Unstated	
273	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee		Paragraph 17.8	N/A	Support the inclusion of this statement, but in order to avoid the risk of sterilisation of multi-functional waterspaces, we would recommend that the final sentence be amended to the following: "17.18 ...the context for the development of new water transport facilities will be taken into account when determining the appropriateness of new water transport uses. For example, in areas with a context of employment uses, viable waterborne freight uses may be given preferential support over proposals to provide moorings for leisure craft."	No	Minor amendment under this ID.
275	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee		Paragraph 17.28	N/A	We do not consider that river corridors should be described as barriers, as they are often destinations for visitors and activities	No	
278	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee		Paragraph 17.3	N/A	Towpaths provide excellent cycle routes but this must be seen as part of their shared use role, where pedestrians and other more vulnerable users are given priority.	No	
283	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee		Appendix 1 Schedule - General	N/A	British Waterways feel strongly that the level of development coming forward in Stratford (particularly along the waterways, which act as a catalyst for regeneration) could create the required critical mass to make waste transport by water feasible, as well as sustainable, and helping to relieve pressure from congested road networks. We would like to see emphasis put on the potential for this option.	No	See comment under this ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
284	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee		Appendix - Map 13	N/A	This map is not detailed enough to be able to comment on the proposed heat network and extensions.	No	
290	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee		Appendix / Schedule - General	N/A	We would normally consider that "Green Infrastructure" should be expanded to include "Green/Blue Infrastructure" and would query whether this section is intended to include the borough's waterways. Paragraph 17.74 includes reference to canal towpaths but not the waterspace - PPG17 Annex: Definitions states that: "...open space should be taken to mean all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can also act as a visual amenity." Waterways are multi-functional, and therefore often fall between topic areas of transport, sustainability, open space and public realm, tourism, education and biodiversity, so we are pleased that they are targeted specifically in Policy INF7. We would also support the clarification of their inclusion within green (/blue) infrastructure however.	No	Minor amendment under ID 290.

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
293	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee		Appendix - Map 15	N/A	Map 15 - As referred to previously, we consider that the Old River Lea should be more clearly illustrated on this image. At para 17.79 reference is again made to the waterspaces separating open spaces. As previously described, we would object to this reference and argue that waterspaces should be better recognised for bringing people and communities together. At para 17.80 the need for allotments in the borough is mentioned. There are some examples of floating allotment barges on our network, which we would be pleased to facilitate and support in appropriate.	No	See minor amendment under this ID. See also minor amendment proposed to Policy S2 in response to comment from ID176.
310	British Waterways	Statutory Consultee		Appendix / Schedule - General	N/A	Policy point 1 should be amended to read: "Developments located adjacent to the blue ribbon network should integrate with and enhance the waterside environment, providing access and improved amenity to the waterfront to facilitate active use of the waterspace ." Policy point 4 should be amended to read "Access to the blue ribbon network will be improved, including enhanced infrastructure to support opportunities for walking, cycling, recreation and water-based activities and transport including river freight. Para 17.86 should make reference to the borough's other waterways which will be the focus of much more attention with the opening of the Olympic Park. Map 16 should clearly highlight all of the borough's waterways, including the River Lea, and not cut this off at the borough boundary.	No	Minor amendment under ID 310.
425	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee		Appendix 1 Strategic connections		Although it is currently without committed funding, TfL requires that the DLR extension from Gallions Reach to Dagenham Dock is included in the 'Strategic connections and transport links' table.	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID

Comment ID	Consultee	Nature of consultee	Policy	Paragraph	Grounds of challenge	Summary of main issues raised	Wish to appear at EIP?	Comment
428	Greater London Authority	Statutory Consultee		Glossary		Crossrail has been incorrectly referred to as HS2	Unstated	See minor amendment proposed under this comment ID
459	Mr R Sanna	Resident		Schedule of superseded policies/ proposals		Need for park on site of former bus garage in Green Street (former site sh1) given lack of park access in the area.	Unstated	See minor amendment under ID 459.
47	LB Barking and Dagenham	Statutory Consultee		Appendix 1 - T7	effective	The Docklands Light Railway Extension to Dagenham Dock should be included in the list of Strategic Connections and New Transport Links so it is consistent with the most recent London Plan alterations which strongly support this link.	No	See minor amendment under this ID.
42	ODA	Statutory Consultee		Appendix 3	n/a	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is welcomed. It is noted that the majority of items identified within the IDP are known publicly funded items. Where such information is available, infrastructure items being delivered by the private sector and the voluntary sector should also be included.	No	Stakeholder events were held during the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, including the third sector. The IDP will be updated on an annual basis, and there will be further opportunities for private and third sector infrastructure projects to be included.