



From: L R 
Sent: 07 July 2026 14:43
To: Local Plan
Cc: 
Subject: Response to Main Modifications
Attachments: FOQM Newham Local Plan Main Mod.pdf; FOQM Signatures re Local Plan Main Mod.pdf

Dear Planning Team,

Please find attached our submission to the Main Modifications consultation. There are two documents, one is our submission and the second is a set of signatures from people who want to register their point with the Council, which we have gathered in recent days. I hope this is acceptable.

Thank you.

Best wishes

Lucy Rogers
Friends of Queen's Market



7 July 2026

FRIENDS OF QUEENS MARKET

Response to the Local Plan Main Modifications

AM1

It is notable that the Mayor's new foreward places more emphasis on fairness, equality and growth for the benefit of all residents, supporting our case for the importance of retaining and valuing Queen's Market for the reasons we have outlined during this process. For the Council's intentions to be successful, the narrow vision of 'growth', which puts things like tall buildings centre stage, need to be balanced with other forms of growth, such as a more healthy population and social development.

MM18

The modifications to Table 1 Tall Building Zones add the words **generally** and **approximately** to the height limits, allowing those heights to be increased. Should this modification be accepted, the increase in floors would presumably add to housing numbers not calculated within the Plan. The addition of these housing numbers would reduce the need for the proposed tall building zone on Queen's Market which represents unjustified overdevelopment of the site.

MM19

New policy D4.5: Tall buildings outside the zones.

If this new policy is approved it would clearly replace the need to designate Queen's Market as a tall building zone, as the policy could potentially be used to build tall buildings subject to conformity with other policy. The de-designation of the Queen's Market site as a TBZ would be supported by D4.5 where it says: ***'opportunities to increase density without tall buildings should be explored'***.

Notwithstanding, we object to the introduction of D4.5 that would allow numerous tall buildings outside designated tall building zones throughout Newham, including on the Market (should it be de-designated as a TBZ). It was clearly the council's intention to restrict and control tall buildings and heights when writing the Plan but somehow developers have argued otherwise. The negative effects of this form of development are clear from the functional, visual and environmental impacts described in the Plan such as in D4.3 implementation. The modification (**AM 33**) demonstrates that overshadowing cannot be avoided: *'Development proposals for tall buildings should avoid or minimise overshadowing, which can negatively affect plant growth, as well as the quality of existing and proposed public open space, including water spaces.'*

Given these negative impacts explicit in the Plan, it would appear to be unjustified to extend tall buildings permissions into other areas.

MM21

D4 justification new text: ***'The 22 tall building zones cover significant areas of transformation within the three opportunity areas (OAs) and include the majority of the site allocations reflecting their status as 'transform' areas of the borough.'***

This new wording is unclear, as 'their status' could be understood to mean that all 22 tall building zones are transform areas of the borough. If so, we argued that it is not justified or appropriate for Queen's Market site to be a 'transform area'. Planners said in the Examination that they see a transform area as being based on building types and quality of the buildings, which does not allow for a proper consideration of the market's role.

'Tall Building Zones reflect an assessment exercise undertaken to identify suitable locations for tall buildings. This was informed by a townscape sensitivity screening assessment and suitability scoping exercise. **Suitable locations have been identified based on an assessment of existing and emerging heights, proximity to public transport, impact on open space and heritage assets. The opportunity**

for growth and the constraints identified through the assessment have informed the tall building spatial hierarchy, which establishes different roles for different parts of the borough and considers the importance of Town and Local Centres as hearts of their neighbourhoods.'

This new text stating that there has been an informed assessment for 50m high buildings on the QM site does not make it true. As we pointed out, the assessment, scoping and screening for Queen's Market were inconsistent and lacked consistency and justification. Prevailing heights in the area and public transport accessibility were exaggerated. It was stated by the planners during the Examination that "potential growth [on the QM site] is a steer that is corporate", suggesting that assessments were made only after the site was chosen. In any case, as in the wording in D4.5 noted above, growth / increase in density should not be dependent on tall buildings. The assessment also omits the question of whether tall buildings can deliver the social and genuinely affordable housing that is needed, and the facts show that they do not. In **MM34**, new added text for policy HS8 sets out clearly the homelessness problem. It is reflected in the Mayor's new introduction (AM1): *'Delivering genuinely affordable housing our people can afford, including pushing private developers to build more housing our people actually need'*.

MM30, MM31, MM33, AM21, MM207, MM208

We support these modifications to the plan, which are positive regarding Queen's Market, market policy in general and need for social impact assessments. While the modifications are important additions we do not believe that they alone would mitigate against tall building development of the kind that is proposed through market's TBZ designation.

ENDS