

Local Plan Evidence Base Engagement Audit Trail

February 2018

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Engagement Audit Trail by Theme.....	4

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Engagement Audit Trail (also referred to as the 'Engagement Evidence Base') draws together, in summary, the messages delivered through various formal and informal engagement processes undertaken as part of Local Plan review, since the adoption of the Core Strategy (2012) and following on from the Detailed Sites and Policies DPD (2016). These have been collated into a series of topic and thematic based 'engagement logs' that demonstrate how engagement with stakeholders has fed into the plan-making process.
- 1.2 This Engagement Evidence Base is part of, and should be read in conjunction with, the Local Plan Review: Statement of Consultation (2018) which can be found on the Council's website.
- 1.3 Below is a list of abbreviations commonly used within the audit trail:

AEYH SPD	Altering and Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document
BAP	UK Biodiversity Action Plan
CCG/NCCG	Newham Clinical Commissioning Group
DSPDPD	Detailed Sites and Policies Development Plan Document
DtC	Duty to cooperate
ELWA	East London Waste Authority
GLA	Greater London Authority
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
JWP	Joint Waste Plan
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LPR I&O	Local Plan Review Issues and Options consultation (Reg. 18)
MOL	Metropolitan Open Land
MWG	Members Working Group
NMS	(Newham) Mayor's Show
OA	Options Appraisal
PLA	Port of London Authority
Reg. 19	Local Plan Review Proposed Submission consultation

2. Engagement Audit Trail by Theme

Spatial					
Engagement Drawn Upon	Spatial Sub-theme	Stakeholder groups	Key Matters Raised	Take forward / Next Steps?	Reason
Borough-wide - Policies S1-6					
LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; IDP consultation; Newham Survey 2016; Newham Household Panel Survey 2015; Members Working Group; cross-departmental engagement.	Strategic Principles/Spatial Strategy: Good growth - balancing the need for homes, jobs, infrastructure etc.; ensuring stable, mixed and balanced communities; resilience objectives.	Local residents; Councillors; DtC partners (GLA, TfL, NCCG, ESFA); Business representatives; Infrastructure providers; other Council departments (Regeneration, Education, Leisure); Developers & Landowners.	General support. Support for community cohesion objectives. Development interests support higher density, genuinely mixed use, but raised the issue of not enough ambition for the plan to significantly increase housing delivery, particularly referring to the extent of SIL release in the Royal Docks, not prioritising intensification of density/efficient use of land, and the restrictiveness of new prescriptive requirements for strategic allocations (e.g. green space, schools, employment-led designations, building heights). Local residents and members are supportive of the principle of 'homes not at the expense of jobs'; businesses and property agents highlight a stressed property market due to residential values, and the GLA make clear that employment land release for housing needs to be approached cautiously. Residents and members have also shown concern that the benefits of development are not reaching existing communities and that infrastructure is not keeping pace with growth. Residents also concerned with over-reliance on the potential of strategic sites and redevelopment of public lands to realise social infrastructure needs.	Yes. Revised S1 policy addresses and defines the Strategic Principles of 'good growth', which is also the basis for updating growth parameters (see below).	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018). See also Homes and Jobs audit trail.
LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; Duty to Cooperate; LBN Mayor's Show 2016 & 2017; Members Working Group.	Strategic Principles/Spatial Strategy: Coherence and Integration - comprehensive delivery and masterplanning; integration of development in (and contribution to) existing fabric, including maximising benefits of heritage assets and correcting historic shortfalls; hierarchy of places and identity of neighbourhoods and town centres.	Developers & Landowners; Local residents; Councillors; DtC partners (Historic England).	General support for placemaking, context-sensitive development and connectivity. Engagement with residents/ members expressed desire for better integration of development into Newham's existing fabric. Historic England: highlighted the need for a more proactive approach to maximising the use of heritage assets through explicit policy reference, and ensuring that developers should be informed about local character to help integrate development into existing fabric.	Some. Revised S1 policy strengthens support for coherence and integration principles, and further details are included in Appendix 1: Strategic Site Allocations through indicative heights based on local character and place hierarchy, and stating other physical or functional requirements for that site to fulfil its strategic potential (e.g. green space, social infrastructure). Principles are further detailed in relation to Forest Gate, Green Street and Canning Town town centres as part of S4 and S6 Policies. References to heritage included in all relevant sections of S1-S6 policies. Character Study updated and referenced as a policy implementation tool.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017) Tall Buildings Study (2017) and Tall Buildings Study (2018).
Duty to Cooperate; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation.	Strategic Principles: Sustainability -design, technology and management techniques covering all stages of development	Local residents; DtC partner (Environment Agency); Developers & Landowners; Infrastructure providers.	General support, including for achieving significant modal shift away from car. The spatial strategy and strategic framework need to link with sustainability principles and their spatial expression.	Yes. Revised S1 policy addresses sustainability at a strategic level, while policies S2-6 further detail spatial aspects that go beyond site-by-site application of the principles set out in SC policies.	See Options Appraisal (2018).
LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; Duty to Cooperate; Newham Survey 2016; Newham Household Panel	Spatial Strategy: Growth parameters - total outputs updated.	Local residents; Councillors; DtC partner (GLA); Business representatives; Developers & Landowners;	The outputs of the spatial strategy require updating to reflect recent evidence base (ELR, SHMA) and changes in policy approaches to homes and jobs, but also in light of strengthened Strategic Principles. Nationally, the Government is pushing for a significant uplift in homebuilding, with targets proposed based on a standard formula. The draft New London Plan is also pushing for significantly higher delivery of homes, particularly on small sites, while taking a more reserved approach to release of employment land.	Yes. Updated housing and jobs targets in line with H and J policies, limited release of SIL supporting new allocations, new employment allocation and designations. Infrastructure requirements highlighted through the IDP, and transferred into the spatial strategy for each neighbourhood area through S2-6, and into	See Options Appraisal. See also DCLG Housing White Paper (2017) and draft New London Plan (November 2017).

Survey 2015; engagement with developers/landowners				strategic site allocations or new non-strategic allocations where need sufficiently justified. Engagement with the GLA is ongoing as part of both plan-making processes.	
LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; DtC; LBN Mayor's Show; Members Working Group.	Spatial Strategy: Connectivity - bridges, cycling and walking improvements particularly along docks/rivers, DLR/Crossrail, new street links.	DtC partners (GLA, TfL, PLA, neighbouring boroughs); Local residents; Councillors; Developers & Landowners.	Engagement with Members/ local residents: calls for more connected network of green spaces, improved access to waterfronts and across rivers, further cycling infrastructure, improved traffic and better bus connections and rail transport capacity. General support from DtC partners and the development industry for policy to incorporate such issues.	Yes. Revised Spatial Strategy of S Policies highlights opportunities provided by new and improved strategic infrastructure, expansion and capacity improvements for the rail and bus networks, and improvements to Key Movement Corridors and creation of new key routes. Also covered by strategic Sites' including through more localised key connections. Changes to INF2 also supports step change in take-up of sustainable modes of travel, permeability and connectivity improvements etc.	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017).
LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; Members Working Group; internal engagement with LBN Regeneration; LBN Mayor's Show.	Spatial Strategy: Vision - review of place character and opportunities, to achieve transformational change	Local residents; Councillors; other Council departments (Regeneration/ Planning); Developers & Landowners	Engagement with members and residents have raised a series of issues: emerging socio-economic role of the borough (particularly opportunity areas and town centres); more support for grassroots regeneration initiatives; extending the benefits of development more widely; hierarchy of town centres, vitality and functionality. Vision should be updated to reflect current challenges and opportunities. Some developers want specific recognition of the Opportunity Areas set out in the draft new London Plan and their frameworks and the GLA calls for ongoing collaboration on the frameworks.	Yes. Vision and spatially-relevant objectives updated and embedded in Spatial Strategy section in S policies. Local Plan objectives redefined in line with key corporate aims. Explicit reference to OAs set out in the draft new London Plan not taken forward though collaborative work between LBN/GLA continues.	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017).
Stratford & West Ham (Policy S2)					
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Shows 2016 & 2017; DtC; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Good Growth	Local residents; Councillors; DtC partners (GLA, TfL); Developers & Landowners.	The additional local population is supporting socio-economic growth. Suggestion to redevelop the 1960s-70s tower blocks. Support for intensification of development in the area, including through taller buildings.	Some. Positive transformations already achieved are noted in para 5.16. More explicit support for higher development densities included (para 1.a and 2.c). Policy reference to redevelopment of tower blocks not taken forward as an aspiration currently but not prohibited by the plan (Implementation para 5.23).	Policy continuation with updated spatial strategy to support further transformational change in the area. See Options Appraisal (2018).
Members Working Group; internal engagement with LBN Regeneration; LBN Mayor's Shows 2016 & 2017	Stratford Metropolitan Town Centre	Local residents; Councillors; other Council departments (Regeneration); DtC partners (GLA; Historic England)	Stratford is gaining international recognition as a destination and business location. Overall good retail offer. Evening and night time economy a strength that is supported by residents, members and the GLA. Focusing visitor economy here is further supported by GLA. The town centre needs to be more inviting for people with disability, families and older people, through improved quality of public realm and provision of diverse spaces. More opportunities for business and education. Area suitable for tall buildings of 20+ storeys, but must be clear how the conservation areas will be protected.	Yes. Updated vision for Stratford integrated into policy. Public realm improvements more clearly outlined, including in terms of parity of quality (para 2.a.) Reference to enhanced education, healthcare and other community spaces included (para 2.j.). Range of business opportunities in the town centre as well as through the area better highlighted (para. 1.b & 2.a. b. & 2.g). Night time economy supported (para 1.b & policy J1). Tall Building Area covering Stratford Central strategic site allocation and references to re-valuation of heritage assets, particularly St John's and University conservation areas to ensure their protection and integration.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update) and Tall Buildings Study (2018).
Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Heritage	Charities; DtC partners (Historic England)	Risk of loss of character. Policy needs to ensure explicit references to conservation of the historic environment, particularly in light of tall building designation. West Ham park includes recognised historic views towards Stratford's St John's Church and Canary Wharf that may be impacted by tall buildings. Clarify meaning of 're-valuation' of heritage assets.	Yes. Tightened support for consideration of local character through reference to key assets (para 2.a & e, and S05 text). Policy amendment (para 2.e) to refer to West Ham Park, its setting and view to St John Church in Stratford. Updated Character Study referenced as an implementation tool (para 5.27). Meaning of 're-valuation' of heritage assets clarified in policy SP5 new implementation para.	The views from the park are noted in Historic England's Register of Historic Parks & Gardens (List entry number: 1001685). There is more limited scope to protect the view to Canary Wharf which crosses the boundary into Tower Hamlets. However, the view to Stratford is within the scope of the Local Plan, and it's further supported by the listing of St John's Church. See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), and Tall Buildings Study (2018).

Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2017;	Green Infrastructure & Blue Ribbon Network	Local residents; Councillors.	The Olympic Park and West Ham Park are major assets, but Stratford Park needs enhancing as currently seen as a crime spot.	Yes. Policy requires improvements to parks and open spaces to facilitate their active and safe use.	See Options Appraisal (2018) and Character Study (2017).
LBN Mayor's Show 2017; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation.	Connectivity	Local residents	Great transport links, but could improve cycling links to Canning Town, along Romford Road, and to other areas. Improved access to Plaistow Station relevant to this community neighbourhood. Further DLR enhancements planned.	Yes. Required public transport improvements, including cycling and walking environments, more clearly outlined in policy.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017) and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018)
Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Sustainability	Local residents	There is scope to better integrate local energy generation into all new developments in the area. Issues with air quality. Environmental impact from 'dirty businesses'. More trees alongside roads to help reduce air pollution and create more pleasant environment to promote walking.	Yes. Support for local energy generation part of the spatial strategy. Healthy Streets approach, which includes promotion of landscaping/trees, promoted through INF2 for wider borough (see Transport infrastructure Audit/ OA).	See Options Appraisal (2018).
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Shows 2016 & 2017; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; Internal consultation.	Strategic Sites (S05 Stratford Central, S10 Abbey Mills, S29 Plaistow North)	Local residents; Councillors; Developers & Landowners; DtC partners (Historic England, TfL); Infrastructure providers (Thames Water); Regen & planning colleagues.	Olympic legacy has changed the context of S05; issues of convergence between old & new parts of town centre remain, specifically regarding quality of public realm. Explicit reference to night-time economy, cultural uses, and hotels should be made. Developer, resident and Member support for tall buildings in this location. Historic England push for clarification of how local character will inform design. Ongoing discussions with TfL re Plaistow Station (outcome = no TfL plans to redevelop within plan period). Some concern from residents re high density car free development, but the allocation does not specify such. General concerns re green space and infrastructure sufficiency addressed by theme policies.	Alterations to S05 text (including recognising loss to LLDC boundary). S29 map to show Greenway links. Water infrastructure issues highlighted in sites schedule.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017) and the Tall Buildings Study (2018). Changes (to site allocations within plan) also include clarification of constraints and other information.
Royal Docks (Policy S3)					
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Shows 2016 & 2017; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; DtC (particularly as part of OAPF); cross-departmental engagement; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Good Growth	Local residents; Councillors; DtC partners (GLA, TfL); local businesses (LCA)	General support for the strategic principles and vision of the area as a unique, high quality waterfront mixed use urban quarter, for the strategy to move towards other employment sectors/opportunities (SMEs, height-tech) and for industrial intensification. Developer interests object to the limited housing target for the area, and want further release of SIL to reflect current land vacancies. Support from local businesses and GLA for the more limited release of SIL coupled with introduction of agent of change and buffering principles. Some concern over persisting 'hope land value' affecting SIL intensification. Residents, members and businesses support more emphasis on jobs in the area. Residents want development to be accompanied by provision for local retail and services. Residents and GLA highlight need for greater innovation in housing/ employment models. All stakeholders identify a need for coordinated infrastructure planning. Residents question how they might be involved in the creation of a strategy/vision document for the area. The economic and regeneration role of the airport should be further recognised.	Yes. The spatial framework for the Royal Docks continues to protect viable employment land (para 1.a and 1.b) and requires new mixed use redevelopment to integrate the 'agent of change' principle and adopt appropriate transition/buffering and mitigation, including through co-location, intensification and other innovative approaches (para 1.a. & b., 2.d.). Local centres strategy updated (para 2.b); North Woolwich Gateway allocation expected to contribute to the diversification of community uses available near North Woolwich local centre, supporting its regeneration and vitality. The IDP identified as an implementation tool to guide infrastructure investment (para 5.44), which will include projects emerging through the ongoing Enterprise Zone's Detailed Delivery Plan work in collaboration with the GLA (para 5.32). Role of the airport as a catalyst for investment and its contribution to London's international role further recognised (para 5.37).	See Options Appraisal (2018) and Statement of Community Involvement (2015).
LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Wharf Consolidation	DTC partners (PLA; GLA); Developers & Landowners; local business representatives;	General support for the consolidation spatial strategy. Mayor's Safeguarded Wharves Review to be published at a later stage; any proposals not to use / retain the safeguarded wharves will need to be properly justified. PLA note phasing of wharf consolidation and release is key to success of wharf strategy. Some non-safeguarded wharves are part of PLA's consolidation strategy. Should clarify what the consolidated wharf uses are expected to integrate with, in para 2.e.	Yes. Clarified para 2.e to reflect strategy outlined in strategic allocation Central Thameside West, i.e. new uses to be SIL conforming and complementing the consolidated wharf activity. Wharf release phasing clarified in justification and implementation, outlining that wharves should only be released following consolidation (para 5.38 and 5.42); phasing already reflected in relevant strategic allocations (S08, S20), with Managed Transition criteria (Policy J2)	See Options Appraisal (2018).

				protecting important but non-safeguarded wharves. Ongoing engagement with PLA and GLA to facilitate delivery of strategy, subject to results of Mayor's Safeguarded Wharf Review. Clarification that the Tate & Lyle Refinery wharf remains operational and is not subject to relocation (para 5.37).	
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2017;	North Woolwich	Local residents; Councillors;	Residents and Members think North Woolwich lacks character and facilities, including retail and community facilities. Tate Institute could be brought back into community use.	Yes. North Woolwich Gateway strategic allocation (S04) expected to provide complementary uses well connected to the local centre. Continued policy support for public realm improvements in the local centre.	Existing policy already covers the points raised so continuation is important. See Options Appraisal (2018), Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update), and Character Study (2017).
Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Heritage	Local residents; DtC partners (Historic England);	The Former Tate Institute is an important cultural heritage asset that should be revived. Policy needs to ensure explicit references to conservation of the historic environment.	The IDP sets out community centre/library needs going forward. References to historic assets already included in policy (para 2.h) and strategic allocations under constraints and advisory information (S20, S21, S23, S04). The Tate Institute's cultural heritage asset status addressed through policy SP5.	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017).
Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Blue Ribbon Network	Local residents; Councillors; DTC partner (PLA);	Residents, members and PLA want better use of river and docks (water activities, transport, and continuous riverside access).	Yes. Further allocations for mixed use development (S09, S20, S04) to deliver riverside access and activities. Spatial strategy support for continuous riverside access (para 2.a), riverboat services (para 2.f); support for mooring through policies INF1 and INF6.	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017). See also Blue/Green infrastructure audit trail
Members Working Group; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation;	Green/Open Space	Local residents; Councillors;	Residents want development to provide quality, inviting public spaces, including streetscape and enhanced/activated parks; this should include a strategic green infrastructure plan for the Royal Docks. Lack of sufficient green space within existing neighbourhoods in North Woolwich; question inclusion of green space by Lyle Institute in HSG allocation. Members note Lyle Park needs to be better connected to surrounding neighbourhoods.	Yes. Spatial strategy now refers to the creation of a network of new and enhanced green and open spaces and continuous waterfront access (para 2.a); is also expected that the strategic site allocations will contribute new green spaces of various scales integrating a green grid approach through activation of policy INF6. Policy support for new street-based local centres (para 2.b) enabling new quality public realm, enhanced public realm for North Woolwich Road (para 2.c) and activation of Lyle Park and Royal Victoria Gardens (para 2.h, and strategic allocations S20 and S04).	See Options Appraisal (2018) and Character Study (2017). See also the IIA for HSG28 that accompanied the DSPDPD (page 56).
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Shows 2016 & 2017; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; DtC (including through OAPF work); Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Connectivity	Local residents; Councillors; DtC partners (GLA, TfL)	Support for the vision for North Woolwich Way, but more detail should be provided. Residents want development to address connectivity (including riverside and dockside access and connections over road and rail barriers), provide better cycling infrastructure and increased permeability. Public transport capacity and reliability needs to be improved, and traffic issues addressed. Support for new DLR station at Thameside West, but its position on maps needs to be corrected. Support for a Silvertown Crossrail station. North Woolwich Ferry could be decommissioned in the long term. Support for Thames river crossing, but need to be designed in such a way to allow for the full range of river uses to continue, especially large sea-going vessels. Support for protection of navigation infrastructure (radar stations and sightlines). Support for principle of separation of industrial and residential traffic.	Yes. Policy review supports further connectivity (para 2.a, 2.c and 2.f, as well as criteria set out in policy INF2). Strategic sites support further local improvements to connectivity and permeability. The potential of the ferry decommissioning has informed site allocation S04 North Woolwich Gateway (see below). Ongoing work as part of the Enterprise Zone's Detailed Delivery Plan. Ongoing engagement with TfL regarding the feasibility of a new Crossrail station by the airport.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018).
Member's Working Group, DtC liaison, LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation., PREAPP discussions	Strategic Sites (S22 Minoco, S09 Silvertown Landing, S07 Central Thameside West, S20 Lyle Park West, S23 Connaught Riverside, S04 North Woolwich Gateway, S21 Silvertown Quays)	Developers & Landowners; DtC partners (Historic England, GLA, TfL); Infrastructure providers (Port of London Authority, Thames Water);	General support for allocations. Developer resistance to prescribed building heights. Comments around flood protection requirements affecting viability and necessitating an increase in density. Some complaints from developers regarding extents of SIL retention (though GLA evidence supports approach). PLA / GLA / LBN alignment regarding wharf consolidation needed. Natural England concern over impacts of riverside sites on Thames ecology (protected by SC4 and considered in IIA). Lyle Park West allocation should address Minoco Wharf development and DLR to deliver a coherent neighbourhood	Amendments where relevant to residential typologies and building heights (see site allocations). Links to policies J1 and SP8 (that detail agent of change principles) where relevant. Water infrastructure issues highlighted in sites schedule. Reference to listed monuments added where relevant. S21 amended to clarify scope for public realm and	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), and Tall Buildings Study (2018). Changes also include clarification of constraints and other information.

		planning colleagues; local residents; Council departments (i.e. pupil place planning)	and improve activation of park. Some concern regarding introducing residential uses near SIL in S23 but buffer identified, conversely some criticism that buffer too substantial. Resident support for continuous riverside walking and cycling routes. School requirement added to S23 through Pupil Place Planning engagement. Resident comments regarding need for diverse uses and improved public realm / river access in S04; DtC comments about need to consider future of the ferry crossing.	connectivity improvements (via DLR viaduct space).	
Canning Town & Custom House (Policy S4)					
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2017; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Informal engagement with local residents group; Cross-departmental engagement; DtC; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Good Growth	Local residents; Councillors; other Council departments (Regen; Pupil Place Planning); DtC partners (NCCG)	General support for the aspirations for the area. Some developers object to the limited housing target for the area. Sustaining the regeneration programme for the area continues to be a priority supported by councillors and residents alike, but local residents want more effective engagement, and ensuring that benefits are spread more widely (quality of public spaces throughout the area; affordability and access to housing, work space and community facilities; more local job opportunities); also, need to minimise disruption to community and local services/facilities during redevelopment. More emphasis needed on creating a mixed and balanced community.	Yes. Principle of mixed and balanced communities strengthened in Policy S1 and further referred to in Policy S4. Vision and spatial strategy for the area updated to reflect recent strengths, opportunities and challenges, including the need to deliver the Leaway and other pieces of physical and social infrastructure, and highlighting local employment opportunities. Minor SIL release of Cody Docks waterfront, and mooring for workboats further considered in policy INF7. Updated Character Study highlights assets, listed and non-listed, that are valued by the local community and should be re-valued and enhanced as part of the development process; the study is now a policy implementation tool. Importance of West Ham recognised through inclusion as a secondary focus (para 1.a).	See Options Appraisal (2018).
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Shows 2016 & 2017; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation;	Canning Town Town Centre	Local residents; Councillors; Developers & Landowners;	Town centre needs a larger food store and more diverse shops overall. The market and community facilities are important to local residents. Night time economy an opportunity. Members want better integration of the new and the old parts of the town centre. Support for tall buildings in this area.	Yes. Vision and spatial strategy updated to reflect key needs and opportunities (para 2.a).	See Options Appraisal (2018). See Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update). See Character Study (2017). See Tall Buildings Study (2017) and Tall Buildings Study (2018).
Informal engagement with local residents group; Cross-departmental engagement.	Freemasons/Custom House and Excel Centre	Local residents; other Council departments (Regen);	Residents want an improved range of independent shops as part of a functional local centre, and prioritising long term benefits from Crossrail investment. Custom House needs better, more legible links to Canning Town town centre.	Importance of Custom House as a secondary focus for the local community highlighted (para 1.a), and the spatial strategy adding further detail of the growth objectives, including creation of a sustainable community (para 2.b). The Local Plan vision and spatial strategy take a long term view (15 years). Connectivity supported through existing policy ('activity street' and 'residential street') being carried forward. Delivery of the aspiration for 'activity street' connection is further supported through new strategic allocation Coolfin North (see below).	See Options Appraisal (2018). See Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update). See Character Study (2017).
Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	West Ham Station	Developers and landowners;	West Ham Station not recognised fully in the spatial strategy. Developers see potential for a Tall Buildings Area. West Ham should become a community neighbourhood on its own to recognise its full potential.	Updated policy includes strategic recognition for West Ham as one of the secondary focuses for intensification in the area (para 1.a).	Not possible to designate new neighbourhood community for West Ham as these are defined through Ward boundaries. See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017) and Tall Buildings Study (2018).
Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; DtC;	Leaway & Lea River Park	Charities; DTC partners (LB Tower Hamlets, PLA); Developers & Landowners;	Strong support for delivery of the Lea River Park, including new bridges and other connections, but developers argue for more flexibility in the quantity and location of green space (see S11 and S18 below). Accurate identification of most up-to-date plans for bridges and other connectivity improvements. PLA to be consulted on options for bridges over the Lea south of the A13.	Mapping and policy wording reviewed to support the most recent feasibility and design work for bridging links along the Leaway. PLA referenced as a consultee for all relevant strategic allocations (S08, S18, and S12).	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017).
LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation;	Cody Docks	Developers & Landowners;	Cody Docks transitioning to cultural economy and community uses, with further development masterplanned; mooring opportunities.	Cody Docks waterfront released from SIL designation. Support for cultural and creative uses included in the spatial strategy (para 2.i).	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017).
LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation;	Green/Open Space	Local residents;	Green space provision could be enhanced and more spaces created.	Support for provision of more significant green space in the area through large scale developments (para 2.k), and linear green	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017).

				route promoted between Custom House Station and Canning Town town centre (para 2.e).	
LBN Mayor's Show 2017; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Heritage	Local residents; DtC partner (Historic England);	Lack of heritage is a problem for establishing a character for the area. Policy needs to ensure explicit references to conservation of the historic environment.	Existing heritage assets supported in policy to ensure they are integrated, enhanced and activated to contribute to the evolving character of the area (para 2.a, 2.k); presence of heritage assets highlighted for all relevant strategic site allocations.	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017).
LBN Mayor's Show 2017; Members Working Group	Tall buildings	Local residents; Councillors;	Resident and members concern over cumulative impact of very tall buildings.	Added spatial strategy requirement to address distribution of tall buildings in Canning Town (2.a) and existing cumulative tall building impacts in the dockside area (para 2.h). Criteria for consideration of cumulative impact of tall buildings detailed in policy SP4.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Tall buildings Study (2017) and Tall Buildings Study (2018).
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2017; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Connectivity	Local residents; Councillors; other Council departments (Regen);	Good transport links, but Canning Town Station needs further enhancements to accessibility/capacity to support planned growth in the area. Improved connectivity to Leaway needed and more walking/cycling opportunities along waterways. Residents and members also highlight need for better bus connections with neighbouring areas. Custom House Crossrail will also support the airport.	Connectivity included as a thread through all relevant spatial strategy points: Canning Town (para 2.a); Custom House (para 2.b); Freemasons Road (para 2.b); creation of new 'residential' and 'activity' streets; new links to overcome barriers (para 2.f, 2.h); improvements to key movement corridors (2.j); green connections, including Lea River Park/Leaway (para 2.k).	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018).
LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; engagement through ELR preparation;	Strategic Sites (S08 Thames Wharf, S11 Parcellforce, S13 Manor Road, S14 Canning Town central, S15 Canning Town east, S16 Silvertown Way East, S17 Silvertown Way West, S18 Limmo, S28 Custom House, S30 Royal Victoria West, S12 Canning Town Riverside, S06 Coolfin North)	Infrastructure providers (PLA, ESFA, Thames Water Utilities); Developers & Landowners; Council departments (Pupil Place Planning, Regen); DtC partners (EA, GLA, LBTH); local residents	General support for allocations. Developer resistance to prescribed building heights. School needs established. Viability effects of gasholder remediation should be recognised. Some resident commentary re too much height (i.e. at S28). Some resident resistance to S06.	Take forward allocations with some edits (see Reg.19 and schedule of mods). Water infrastructure issues highlighted in sites schedule. Flag need to consult PLA on river crossings. For S11 indicate benefit of links across River Lea. Edits to S13 treatment of open space. S18 extended to south plus arrows indicating connectivity across the Lea / into LBTH. Sites schedule to flag safeguarded wharves where relevant.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018), Tall Buildings Study (2018), Character Study (2017). Changes include clarification of constraints and other information.
Beckton (Policy S5)					
Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation.	Good Growth	Developers & Landowners; Utility providers; DTC Partners (TFL, GLA).	Support for the strategy of developing the area for both industry and housing, but significantly more homes than identified could be delivered. Support for recognition of the continued important role of utilities infrastructure. Should note potential co-location of transport infrastructure and residential; feasibility testing for the DLR depot in this regard. Burden to mitigate the impact of the Sewage Treatment Plant should be on developers, not on Thames Water.	Yes, with minor amendment to clarify requirement for innovative solutions to manage the impact of capacity enhancements for utilities infrastructure (para 2.i, 5.59 and 5.63), the need for other developments to complement through application of agent of change principle (para 2.i) and to note that identified housing quantum is a minimum estimate.	See Options Appraisal (2018).
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2017.	Beckton East District Centre	Councillors; Local residents.	Town centre lacking diversity, including socialising spaces, community facilities and leisure uses.	Yes. Revised policy includes need for a more diverse range of town centre uses. New Alpine Way allocation also expected to contribute to its vitality and viability and legibility.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), and the Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update).
LBN Mayor's Show 2016; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation.	Gallions Reach retail park	Residents; Developers & Landowners.	Support for strategy to transform into a major town centre; the retail park already has the draw of a town centre and is seen as a destination for both shopping and leisure. Development of centre likely to come in phases and should not be restrained by overall masterplanning for the area; policy should not be too prescriptive about when there will be an increase in floorspace or the exact mix of uses. Mapping should reference 'new major town centre' and identify the retail park as the boundary.	Yes, existing policy aspiration further clarified (para 2.a).	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), and the Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update).
Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Heritage	DtC partners (Historic England, Thames Water	Policy needs to ensure explicit references to conservation of the historic environment.	Existing policy already addresses this, with review adding protection of views from the Greenway, as an important local historic assets	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017).

		Utilities).		(para 2.h). Updated Character Study, to be used as an implementation tool.	
Members Working Group; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Connectivity	Councillors; Developers & Landowners; DtC partners (TfL, PLA, Thames Water Utilities);	Support for DLR network expansion, including new DLR station to serve Beckton Riverside. Gallions DLR station requires platform lengthening and capacity improvements. Residents concerned with lack of overlooking of alleyways (safety issue). Members concerned with car oriented development and insufficient public transport leading to high traffic in the area. PLA general support for river crossings and river boat services.	Yes. Policy further supports new connections, permeability and natural surveillance improvements to promote walking and cycling (para 2.a, 2.b, 2.f), and public transport enhancements (2.f, 2.g).	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018).
LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; DtC (GLA, TfL, ELWA) discussions; pre-application engagement; Internal consultation (regen, DM colleagues etc.)	Strategic Sites (S19 Albert Basin, S31 Royal Albert North, S01 Beckton Riverside, S02 Alpine Way)	Councillors; Developers & Landowners; DtC partners (GLA, EA, TfL); Infrastructure providers (Thames Water, PLA, ELWA); Council departments (Pupil Place Planning, Regeneration).	General support for allocations. Developer resistance to prescribed building heights. School needs established. Re Beckton Riverside: developer objections to linking transformation of Gallions Reach to wider redevelopment; TfL flag the need for depot retention / expansion of capacity; Thames Gateway Bridge Safeguarding should be reviewed; need for odour studies given BSTW.	Take forward site allocations, amendments where relevant (see Reg.19 and schedule of mods) to: residential typologies; building heights. In Sites Schedule highlight water infrastructure issues; need to consult PLA on any river crossing options; flood risk related constraints. Continue long-term engagement re Beckton Riverside. Pursue Joint Waste Plan review.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018), and Tall Buildings Study (2018). Changes also include clarification of constraints and other information.
Urban Newham (Policy S6)					
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2017.	Heritage	Local residents; Councillors; DtC partners (Historic England)	Conservation Areas are viewed as a strength, but issues with encouragement of gentrification, affordability and sensitivity to change. Privately let properties often have poor management and maintenance. Policy needs to ensure explicit references to conservation of the historic environment.	Conservation of historic environment already appropriately addressed by policy. Reference added to Forest Gate's cultural heritage (para 2.a.i). Historic setting of West Ham Park now protected though policy (see also Policy S2 above). Updated Character Study, highlighting areas of sensitivity to change such as Conservation Areas, to be used as an implementation tool.	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017).
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2017; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation;	Green Space	Local residents; Councillors; Developers & Landowners; Charity;	Large parks (Wanstead Flats, Central Park, and West Ham Park etc.) are important community assets and their setting needs to be protected and enhanced. MOL in the east is in poor condition/inaccessible and some development could subsidise improvements. GLA oppose de-designation of any MOL.	Yes. New requirement for development within the setting of Wanstead Flats, Manor Park's cemeteries, West Ham Park and Greenway to integrate with and enhance these valued assets (para 2.a.ii, 2.b.ii, 2.c.ii, 2.d.ii, and 2.e.i). Clarification regarding the need to address open space deficiencies in East Ham through a green grid approach, including through access and activation of MOL in the east (para 2.c.ii). Updated Character Study, to be used as an implementation tool.	See Options Appraisal (2018), and Character Study (2017).
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2016 & 2017; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; Internal consultation (regen, DM colleagues etc.)	Forest Gate (including district centre & S24 Woodgrange Road West)	Local residents; Councillors; Historic England; Thames Water	Good independent retailers. Bottom up regeneration initiatives have revitalised the town centre (arts centre, cafes). However, poor quality shopfronts remain an issue. Town centre boundary needs to be amended to better reflect the north-south focus and need to integrate over Romford Road; Romford Road not perceived as part of the town centre. Active community groups making use of community facilities, schools, gardens, the Gate centre. Forest Lane Lodge, Magpie Lodge and Forest Lane Park are underused. Historic England opposition to tall buildings within the conservation area (S24).	Yes. Recognition of the urban village feel of the town centre, founded on established independent shops, arts and cultural activity, supported by a growing quality evening and night time economy; town centre boundary changes made and new policy requiring better north-south integration across Romford Road (para 2.a.i). Requirement for transformation of environment along key movement corridors which are often subject to ribbon retail development (2.a.ii). Updated Character Study, to be used as an implementation tool.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018) and the Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update).
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2017	Manor Park	Local residents; Councillors;	Poor quality retail. Poor maintenance of buildings. Infrastructure needs to be improved. Railways act as barriers between neighbourhoods.	Existing policy covers these points. Updated Character Study, to be used as an implementation tool.	Existing spatial strategy already covers the points raised so continuation of policy is important, with minor clarifications. See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018), and the Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update).
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's	Green Street (including district centre & S27)	Local residents; Councillors;	Green Park town centre is vibrant and diverse, with international draw. Residents and members raised various issues including: more variety of	Strengthened support for delivery of 'consistently high quality environment' (para	Existing spatial strategy already covers most of the points raised so continuation of policy is important, with minor

Show 2016 & 2017; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Internal consultation.	Queen's Market)	Infrastructure providers (CCG, Thames Water); regen and development management teams	shops; more and diversified leisure uses, including night time economy; continuity of quality public realm; quality of shopfronts; surface water flooding. Elsewhere, Priory Park is underused. A local community group continues to oppose the allocation of Queen's Market but members and residents on the whole supportive given broader potential for investment and improvement. Feedback has included the need to emphasize the market in any redevelopment and retain / deliver ongoing and viable multi-function.	2.d.i), including enhancements to key movement corridors (para 2.d.ii). Redevelopment of the Upton Park football grounds to secure additional community facilities and renewed public spaces (para 2.d.ii). Support for continued importance of Queen's Market as a meeting place for the community (para 2.d.i). Surface water flooding highlighted as a constraint for Queen's Market strategic site allocation; otherwise dealt with through policy SC3. Updated Character Study, to be used as an implementation tool. Clarification of constraints and other information in Strategic Site allocation.	clarifications. Policy reviewed to highlight opportunities to further integrate and enhance key aspects of the area that people value. See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018), Tall Buildings Study (2018) and the Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update).
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2017; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation.	Plaistow	Local residents; Councillors;	Consistent terrace housing is seen as a strength of the area, together with good transport links and cycling infrastructure, including Greenway, and connectivity to Canning Town. Insufficient community facilities.	Strengths reflected in Character Study update which will inform implementation of policy. Area policy (para 2.e.i) further supports integration of and enhancements to the Greenway, and delivery of step-free access at the station.	See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018), and the Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update)
Members Working Group; LBN Mayor's Show 2016 & 2017; LPR I&O (Reg. 18) consultation; Proposed Submission (Reg. 19) consultation; DtC liaison; internal engagement with Council departments	East Ham (including major town centre and S25 East Ham Market, S03 East Ham Western Gateway, S26 East Ham Town Hall, East Ham Northern Gateway)	Local residents; Councillors; Developers & Landowners; DtC partners (Historic England, TfL); Infrastructure providers (CCG, Thames Water); regen, development management & Pupil Place Planning;	Residents and members want to see more investment in the regeneration of East Ham town centre. Quality and accessibility of public realm needs to be improved, including through provision of seating and public (including disabled) toilets. There are still problems with the number of betting shops, hot food takeaways and pound-shops in the area. Leisure uses, library and civic functions are important attractors, with further opportunities to enhance night time economy. Some concern over loss of small employment spaces in the town centre through redevelopment/ conversion to residential. Public transport perceived as overcrowded, but providing excellent links. Strategic sites feedback included pushback from developers regarding prescribed heights; need for assessment of tall building impacts on historic environment; establishing of health and education needs; no TfL intentions to redevelop East Ham station within the plan period (potential 'Northern Gateway' site rejected).	Clarified requirement for town centre public realm that better manages pedestrian flows and activates town centre gateways, and for enhanced street environment along Ron Leyton Way (para 2.c.i). Updated Character Study to be used as an implementation tool. Clarification of constraints and other information in Strategic Sites allocation.	Existing spatial strategy already covers many of the points raised so continuation of policy is important, with minor clarifications. See Options Appraisal (2018), Character Study (2017), Tall Buildings Study (2018), Town Centre and Retail Study (2016 update), and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018). See also DSPDPD Cumulative Impact Evidence Base (2015).

Successful Places

Engagement Drawn Upon	Successful Places Sub-theme	Stakeholder groups	Key Matters Raised	Take forward / Next Steps?	Reason
DSPDPD engagement and consultation; ongoing liaison; Member workshops; Mayors Show 2016 & 2017; LPR Reg 19 consultation	Healthy Neighbourhoods	Ward councillors; Public Health Needs Assessment; Public Health LBN; Newham CCG; local residents	Newham continues to have some of the worst health statistics in London, and the socio-economic environment is a key determinant of this, including housing quality/affordability, ease of active lifestyles, low incomes, prominence of takeaways, access to greenspace etc. Support for restrictions on takeaways alongside other measures (e.g. work to promote healthy offer, food hygiene) - a balanced approach needed, recognising consumer choice and the role as part of local economic development (members, local residents, business interests). Physical inactivity and active use of parks a particular current focus planning can complement (members, Public Health). Also mental health, and increasing concern about 'over-crowding/infrastructure deficits and incremental loss of 'breathing spaces' (small open spaces) (members). CCG is reviewing its Estate, and wider Estate needs in relation to healthy outcomes and related issues such as financial sustainability.	Retention of SP2 and SP10 (consolidated in SP9) with additional cross reference to housing mix, play space, accessible natural green and blue space and requirement for HIA for all Major Developments brought into policy. Activation of parks more clearly referenced in new INF7 policy. Greater focus on the 'green grid' in INF6, INF7 and SC4. New focus on infrastructure sufficiency in INF9 with updated IDP reflecting infrastructure deficits and future needs. Review of healthcare infrastructure needs in via INF8 (including managing redundant space and spatial allocations. Future engagement work to build up further understanding of valued green spaces.	See Options Appraisal (2018) and IDP; engagement evidence a key driver
DSPDPD formal	Quality Design and Place	Ward councillors,	Design quality (including details such as tree planting) increasingly recognised	Maintenance of and careful tightening of	See Options Appraisal (2018); engagement evidence a key

consultation; LPR I&O & Reg 19, Member engagement; Mayors Show 2016 and 2017; Council surveys; consultation on AEYH SPD	Making including Key Corridors	developers and landowners, residents; statutory consultees (Historic England); DM colleagues	as valuable amongst a broader audience, (i.e. not just technical stakeholders) particularly in relation to acceptability of tall buildings, as well as more incremental change in Urban Newham - though some concern about gentrification pricing people out. Experience of it, in relation to crime/fear of crime, connectivity (micro level and north-south)/ walkability; enjoyment and liveability of key spaces (e.g. Key Corridors, town centres) for all are important objectives. Policies generally working well, but sometimes failure at implementation stage/ongoing maintenance (e.g. of shop fronts) and tricky to reconcile some issues (e.g. connectivity of alleyways but also their focus for anti-social behaviour). Mustn't be too prescriptive, but encourage innovation (agents, architects).	policies SP1, SP3, SP7 (e.g. more explicit reference in policy to Secure by Design remit, technical and financial credibility, new Key Corridors). New Altering and Extending Your Home SPD adopted Feb 2018.	driver
LPR I&O & Reg 19, Mayors Show 2017, Members Workshops	Tall Buildings	Ward councillors, GLA, residents, landowners and developers, Historic England.	Robust policy and strategic approach to tall buildings needed - that delivers on design quality promises, provides assurances regarding safety, respects areas of sensitivity and responds to accessibility, and better scrutinises more proposals (heights of 6+ storeys discussed, may be 12 in the Arc, but issues of lower density Beckton and in parts of North Woolwich and Silvertown) (Members, Historic England). Residents see the role of tall buildings in responding to housing need, but emphasise fire safety, design quality including mitigation of microclimate & good landscaping, and appropriate locations - Stratford and Canning Town continue to be seen as most appropriate places for tall buildings, other locations identified are likewise in town centres next to stations. Developers wish to see a design-led approach (case by case basis) and/or push height limits on Strategic sites, and emphasise the role of tall buildings in delivering viability, buffering of certain uses (e.g. industrial) and increased open space; GLA concerned with optimising land use, particularly in accessible locations. Some concern re suitability of tall buildings for families, (but can be mitigated with good management and acknowledgement that increased density doesn't need to mean tall - podium developments with open space good way of increasing density (members). Stratford still seen to be how not to 'do' tall buildings in terms of lack of coherence from schemes permitted pre-Core Strategy.	Tall buildings policy (SP4) clarified and reinforced, with more site-specific guidance on heights (on Strategic Sites) and specification that it applies to all building of 6 or more storeys. Greater emphasis on schemes demonstrating added value particularly in relation to other forms of increasing density. New requirement to demonstrate safety, including fire prevention and safe evacuation.	See Options Appraisal 2018 - engagement evidence base a key driver of tightened policy approach, Tall Buildings Evidence Base Document.
DSPDPD formal consultation and engagement; LPR I&O & Reg 19, Member meetings, Mayors Show 2016 and 2017, Council Surveys, DtC meetings	Heritage and Character	Ward councillors, London boroughs, GLA, residents, Historic England	Development should be sensitive to heritage and conservation design matters. Concern from some residents that valued buildings are being lost/eroded; potential for culture/arts led regeneration large and small scale observed - happening in Forest Gate - new assets can be cultivated (members, GLA). Scope for further Conservation Area designation, and for Strategic Site masterplanning to enhance assets, particularly in the Royal Docks. Certain parks are definitely underused assets (e.g. Lyle Park). Character assets described by area (local residents and councillors)	Character Study updated and more clearly referenced in policy and reflected in updated spatial policies; SP5 carried forward with increase reference to culture and cultivation of new assets. Conservation Area designations to be reviewed when capacity allows.	See Options Appraisal; engagement evidence a key driver
Feedback from local residents; Mayors Show 16 & 17; LPR I&O; Members' workshops	Town Centres	Ward councillors, London boroughs, GLA, residents, developers, landowners	Continued concern from residents about town centre quality - variety of offer, (too many takeaways, betting shops, pound shops, charity shops) environment (indoor markets particularly criticised, also lack of seating, pavement congestion, lack of toilets) and lack of night time offer, some also raised parking - either lack of, or that carparks could be better activated (e.g. for film screening).	Policy SP6 carried forward with minor updates e.g. clearer reference to the Night-time economy. Town centre visions updated in spatial policies S2-6 and relevant Strategic Sites.	See Options Appraisal (2018), engagement evidence base a key driver.
DSPDPD formal consultation and engagement; continuous engagement with local businesses and business operators; Member engagement; LPR I&O and Reg 19 formal consultation; responses to planning applications	Neighbourliness	Industrial operators, residents, members,	Representations generally supported the tackling of issues and approaches proposed when consulted on in the DSPDPD. Responses included support for the 'neighbourliness' assessment (environmental, design and positive neighbourliness) as well as incorporation of standards / good practice guidance (e.g. BFL12/GLA Housing SPG) as a quality benchmark to assess the neighbourliness of development, though some questioned the proportionality and appropriateness particularly of positive requirements. More generally, most comments made by residents in response to planning applications concern issues of neighbourliness. Concern about how it is managed in a mixed use environment - particularly with residential moving closer to industry/wharves . Costs involved in design terms are high (as would be rectifying the issue at source). Some concerns from developers in LPR formal consultation that standards sought are inappropriate; other technical experts	Neighbourliness policy SP8 drafted and found sound in the DSPDPD; carried forward with minor updates/clarifications. Increased reference to agent of change elsewhere in the plan, linking back to this policy. The table is an essential part of the policy.	See Options Appraisals (2015, 2018); engagement evidence base a key driver.

			suggested additions.		
DSPDPD formal consultation and informal engagement; LPR I&O & Reg 19 reps; Member engagement ; Mayors Show 2016 and 2017; Council Surveys; responses to planning applications.	Cumulative Impact	Ward councillors, residents, commercial operators	Cumulative impacts of certain uses, notably betting shops, takeaways and nightly stay hostels is multiple, notably in relation to health and the liveability of the borough/image projected with consequent impact on regeneration and churn. Survey work demonstrated low tolerance of clustering (linear and aerial). Much concern by residents that they bring down town centres and wider neighbourhoods, and crowd out other uses, from conventional housing to different types of shops and services - notably more quality leisure. Commercial operators argue otherwise - concerning the local economic benefits they bring, and wider regulation, and that policy controls are excessive and not evidence based. Cumulative impact issues also arising in relation to infrastructure sufficiency, air quality and noise, plus traffic congestion.	Over-arching cumulative impact policies drafted and found Sound in the DSPDPD (Sp9, SP10). Consolidated into one policy (SP9) in LPR and otherwise clarified - some issues moved to more relevant thematic policies. INF9 re-drafted to flag more clearly the issue of infrastructure sufficiency.	See Options Appraisals (2015, 2018) and Cumulative Impact Evidence Base. Engagement evidence base instrumental in justifying the strong policy position.

Jobs					
Engagement Drawn Upon	Jobs Sub-theme	Stakeholder groups	Key matters raised	Take forward / Next steps?	Reason
Reg 18 Consultation, Reg19 Consultation, Evidence base engagement; Ongoing liaison with businesses and operators, Members Working Group, DSPDPD formal engagement and informal consultation	Management of employment land and change	Members, Residents, Industrial Agents/Operators, developers.	Representations recognised the increasing demand to balance the delivery of both jobs and homes as part Newham's strategy, concern particularly re protecting existing businesses and fostering growth potential. Stakeholder engagement noted that there is particular pressure on industrial land to high value land uses, but continued demand of such land, particularly from logistics users wanting to be close to markets (in part driven by residential development); lack of sites means businesses are taking on sub-optimal sites and leases. General support in formal consultation for plan-led and managed release of SIL to deliver new homes and other mixed use, as well as opportunities to support increased economic opportunities through development. Developers and industrial operators raised the issue of managing neighbouring impacts of commercial and non-commercial uses - support for agent of change principle and buffering. Some criticism from developers of 'manged transition/release' requirements. Some explicit support for various LILs and LMUAs, though various development interests promoting LMUA designations instead of LILs and of housing only instead of LMUAs.	See Policies J1 & SP8 (agent of change expectations) J2 (management of employment land, including release/transition) and associated Spatial Policies including Strategic Site specifications which include buffering of extant SIL. J2 as revised includes most of Policy J4 drafted and adopted as part of the DSPDPD, which introduced LILs, LMUAs, and clearer managed release and transition criteria. Continue to monitor employment land and demand evidence.	See Options Appraisal 2015 & 2018, plus ELR 2017 (parts 1&2)
Reg 18, Reg 19, Ongoing liaison with infrastructure commissioners; Member Working Group, Stakeholder Workshops, Mayors Show; evidence base engagement.	Economic Development Opportunities	Commissioners, Members, Residents, Industrial and Cultural Stakeholders, GLA,	Strength of rate of start-ups, town centre businesses, though some need for diversification. Opportunities brought by Crossrail, airport, growing visitor, cultural and night-time economy (particularly in Stratford) - including displacement from more central boroughs; some concern re crime/ASB but general appetite from residents to increase choice. Importance of good infrastructure - energy, telecoms, transport of remarket access, business continuity etc.	See J1, INF5, SP6 and INF1, INF4. Maintain up to date intelligence on growth sectors/business needs.	See Options Appraisal 2018
DSPDPD formal consultation and informal engagement; LPR Reg 18/19 consultation; Members'	Skills and Access to Jobs	Residents, members, developers, providers, business groups	Members were clear that homes should not be delivered at the expense of jobs, and of the importance of maximising economic benefits for local employment through development, (noting the role of Workplace) which is also supported by residents. Education providers note that there is a particular need to improve employment opportunities for young adults (years 17-24) and highlight the important role that education has in promoting skills to support economic	See J3 as revised which sets out clear jobs targets whilst notes need to be cognisant of viability and scheme specifics, and J1 (re employment strategy, first introduced in the DSPDPD in J4 to support J1). J3 also clarifies expectations around accessibility. Planning obligations SPD will	See Options Appraisal 2015 & 2018

workshops, Council Surveys; ongoing liaison with industrial operators and business groups.		opportunities for all and growth across the borough. Developers raised objections for a target based approach to construction and end user jobs for Newham's residents highlighting viability and specialist construction/end user jobs - importance of flexibility. Issue of accessibility of places of employment by public transport, particularly out of hours.	support this policy.	
--	--	---	----------------------	--

Homes

Engagement Drawn Upon	Homes Sub-theme	Stakeholder groups	Key Matters Raised	Take forward / Next Steps?	Reason
I&O; Reg 19; GLA meetings	Housing Delivery	Development interests; residents.	<p>Significant growth in recent years - supply has not kept up with demand, resulting in a significant backlog from under delivery. Largely (I&O) respondents (residents and development industry) demonstrated support for the Council's position in terms of housing delivery ambitions of varying types, albeit with a number of suggestions for policy refinement. Developers have highlighted the need to for OAN/ London Plan targets to be included with more ambition for delivery together with further SIL release to prioritise housing over jobs. In particular the call from the development industry has been to ensure flexibility remains within policy to prevent delays to delivery. Arguments from the industry that Beckton, Royal Docks and Canning Town ambitions should increase.</p> <p>The Draft London Plan target 38,500 units 2019 -2029 (excl. LLDC) and DCLG draft needs based figure (incl. LLDC) of 38,400 over the 10 years from 2016 - 2026.</p>	Housing target that reflects ambitions for significant housing delivery. Update to S1 - S6 delivery figures, H1 and site schedules required. Support windfall delivery on undesignated/ unallocated sites. However further industrial inappropriate (see Jobs).	Rejection of the London Plan draft (and untested) housing target due to it no longer being capacity derived through the small sites element that relies on conversion and/or densification of existing properties. New untested draft housing target is unachievable/ arrived at through questionable methodology - posing threat to the borough's ability to delivery strategically through a plan-led system. A capacity derived target far in excess of the current London Plan figure, arrived at through delivery and phasing assumptions determined through consultation with delivery partners, is favoured. This target ensures housing ambition that reflects realities of delivery avoiding any problems with future housing delivery tests. This also accords with the strategic vision to ensure that land for jobs is also safeguarded. For this reason, further industrial land release - giving housing precedence over other land uses - is not supported. See Options Appraisal (2018) for further discussion.
Members Working Group (MWG); I&O; Reg 19.	Family housing	Members; development interests	<p>Members/evidence clear about the need for continued support for family homes - particularly as they are harder to achieve in new builds. I&O revealed support for the prioritisation of family housing and an acknowledgement of its importance to the borough, together with criticism of the possibility of prioritising its delivery over affordable, particularly given unknown impacts on viability processes. Consultation included developer criticism of the existing policy position (39%), questioning evidence base and expressing preference for a more flexible approach to policy especially in light of draft London Plan. Landlords: the position on family housing within the borough restricts HMOs and the availability for non-families, resulting in unlettable units unaffordable to families.</p> <p>For 4 bed plus housing there is support for the delivery of larger family units, though acknowledging that larger units are significantly less likely to come forward, Members' are supportive of large unit conversions to flats or maisonettes, provided that an adequate amount of amenity space can be safeguarded and they still yield family homes. In addition, support for deconversion of HMOs.</p>	Ensure continued protection of existing and delivery of new family housing (albeit relaxing delivery of the 39% to be sites capable of delivering above ten units) - support via evidence. Allow for conversion of large homes (4b +) . Preferred option to allow subdivision of large units provided all result in 4 beds to be written into H4 and justified by SHMA interrogation.	<p>No evidence in Newham that homes are unlettable or that family housing restrictions exacerbate the housing crisis. Churn as a key matter to be addressed for the delivery of mixed and balanced communities - a problem in itself which has the potential to increase with unfettered HMO policy that would impact family housing.</p> <p>The SHMA provides the evidence that back up these identified issue of the need for family housing, with policy providing necessary flexibility from viability etc.</p> <p>Introducing a clearer position on when conversions of larger units are deemed acceptable, may help prevent further appeal losses of larger units plus further policy on conversions will be a strong disincentive for unlawful practices and will provide a strong policy tool to address known unlawful conversions. Retaining and ensuring new 4 bed units from conversions will also contribute to the modest need (approx. 30 a yr. over the plan period) which is otherwise unmet through new developments. In terms of supporting the deconversion of HMOs, given the existing evidence base and policy position on the need to protect stock from conversion to, it is logical to support the opposite process, closing what is an existing policy gap. See Options Appraisal (2018) for further discussion.</p>

Newham Residents' Survey 2016; I&O; LBN Mayor's Show (NMS); Newham Annual Residents Survey 2015; Reg. 19	Affordable housing	Residents; developers	<p>General support for 50% approach - public concerns surrounding the lack of modern affordable housing and high property prices (public highlight that there exists opportunities to add to existing poor quality/ older stock). Included support for the affordable housing floor, on site affordable provision, social rented properties, affordability not being at the expense of quality. No support from the development industry to prioritise affordable housing over family units, and the introducing a specific threshold for intermediate home ownership products was resisted.</p> <p>GLA are generally supportive of the Council's approach, however suggest (with development industry) compliance with the minimum 35% threshold affordable housing without public subsidy (and to not make additional units above subsidy subject to tenure split). Suggestions made by developers to follow the SPG and seek affordable housing on a habitable room and that review mechanisms linked to early specified milestones, be more suited to be contained in a SPD. Dev industry response also drew attention to the impact of review mechanisms in terms of investment risk, calling for specification of early specified milestones in an SPD rather than policy.</p>	Policy H2: Retain position on affordable housing, however more clearly defined the Council's existing expectations in relation to viability assessment.	Affordable housing policy (as existing) satisfies London Plan/ NPPF requirements and is aligned with borough need and the availability of affordable housing remains a significant strategic issue in the borough. The levels required continue to be supported by evidence base (SHMA, 2016), thus no change the affordable housing ask was proposed as part of review. Complete alignment with the Mayor's Affordable Housing SPG/ draft policy is inappropriate for a number of reasons not least its position as a contested SPG rather than adopted policy or the draft position. Seeking affordable housing on a habitable room basis will result in less affordable housing cumulatively due to the family housing target which decreases hab rooms within schemes. No change was proposed to policy that would allow for below the 50% target to come forward without interrogation of viability and the clarification of this point within policy will assist in cutting down time over viability negotiations and also continue to allow for Newham to maximise delivery. See Options Appraisal (2018) for further discussion.
External briefings; internal workshops; I&O; MWG; Newham Residents' Survey; Reg 19.	PRS	Development interests; Members	PRS' position in the housing market as a major provider and a low risk consistent product continues to grow, however given Newham's needs policy must ensure family/ affordable housing is not prejudiced in PRS delivery and that where possible it remains on site. The welcoming of PRS within policy has received support albeit with developers calling for consistency with the Mayor's SPG in terms of housing and flexibility over family housing as part of the PRS mix, resisting dual viability statements, seeking to ensure that the planning system doesn't control tenancy lengths, calling for flexibility over design guidance and removing the locational restrictions. Members acknowledge that a broader rental market provides greater choice for residents, and can create more vibrant and active areas.	H1/H2: Introduced policy clauses specific to PRS, welcoming delivery as part of broader housing mix/ in the correct locations, defining the product and providing stipulations in terms of offsite family housing.	Recognising PRS' growing role in meeting housing need is essential to ensuring the delivery of a mix and choice of housing across the borough. However facilitating its delivery must be balanced against ensuring that it doesn't crowd out other much needed housing types and must be conditional upon it being provided in a format/ through management arrangements that ensures a quality, recognised build to rent product. See Options Appraisal (2018) for further discussion.
MWG; CNCs; internal meetings with other service areas; Landlords Focus Group; Newham Mayors Show (NMS); DSPDPD formal engagement and informal consultation.	Specialist housing	Residents; development interests; Members	Members consider need to ensure adequate considerations are made regarding older peoples housing provision. Adult social care commissioners highlight numerous specialist accommodation needs at a small scale but considerable need for temporary accommodation - mostly for homeless families - housed in nightly stay hostels, on longer term tenancies. H7 impedes the Council's ability to convert existing stock in certain appropriate locations to nightly stay hostels. A suggestion has been made for specific reference to houseboats within policy.	H1: Acknowledgement of modular housing as a temporary use within policy and relaxation of the locational requirements of nightly stay hostels to apply only to larger units in H3 (which combines specialist housing policies H5 - H7 first adopted by DSPDPD). Houseboats as specialist housing are already considered under H3, however more suitable for ref in INF policies.	The overriding concern of the Council is redressing the imbalanced housing supply, stabilising the existing community, and building stable mixed and balanced, sustainable communities, with other needs catered for in the context of this policy. Most elements of policy for specialist accommodation were written into the DSPDPD (adopted 2016) thus older persons need is covered within current policy, however actual delivery will require the catching up of market forces (see Options Appraisal 2015). No evidence exists to attest that housing families together in temporary accommodation in more residential areas is problematic for the existing population. Acknowledging that modular housing is a potential source of dealing with extreme temporary demand is necessary to take advantage of existing opportunities. See Options Appraisal (2018) for further discussion.
LBN Mayor's Show; Understanding Newham Survey; MWG; Liveability Study; internal engagement; DSPDPD formal engagement and informal consultation.	Housing Quality	Residents; commissioners; Members	Satisfaction levels with accommodation quality are relatively high, although this reduces for those renting (social housing or private market). Residents remain concerned about overcrowding and poor quality stock within the borough, particular in relation to HMOs (acknowledging however that this has improved with licensing; whilst Members remain concerned about poor quality accommodation in terms of the specialist offer (particularly hostels along the Romford Road). Some Member concern that attempts will be made to extend a house and then convert it (under the 4 bed exceptions policy). Specialist quality: Adult social care commissioners confirm that the BABIE standard for nightly stay accommodation is no longer extant. Wheelchair adapted housing (10% Part M 3) not being delivered in accordance with need in terms of size, tenure etc. Thus resulting in long waiting times for those on	H1/3: Maintain existing policy in relation to quality already in H1 and H6 (first introduced by the DSPDPD and moved to H3) subject to updates to address specialist concerns. H4 to contain minimum outdoor amenity space that would be required per property if converting from a large home to smaller family homes. Stipulate that both London Plan internal and external space standards will be adhered to.	Housing quality is fundamental to the vision of creating stable, mixed and balanced communities, and whilst mainstream housing satisfaction levels is a positive step towards achieving stability within Newham's population, the policy position must be maintained by the Local Plan to allow more recent policies set out in the DSPDPD regarding specialist housing quality the opportunity to bed down (see Options Appraisal 2015). Updates to policy will ensure supported housing provision is covered within the Local Plan, thus further solidifying within policy adequate measures to deal with quality standards and safeguarding. Overall, this supports the wider planning policy context and corporate

			the list or units that are not fit for purpose for other uses and that require additional resource from LBN to adapt.		agenda. External standards will adequately mitigate against the possibility of extending a house to ready it for conversion. See Options Appraisal (2018) for further discussion.
Internal engagement; I&O; Reg 19; DSPDPD formal engagement and informal consultation.	Non-strategic Housing Sites	Residents; commissioners; Members	Non-strategic residential sites generally didn't receive much comment at consultation stages, aside from Gallions Lock whose allocation is supported by the landowner by resisted by residents and the community due to riverside access and Abbey House which is also supported by the developer.	H1: remove 6 sites from those first allocated by policy H5 of DSPDPD - allocate 5 additional in new draft policy.	Site allocations allocated for their ability to boost housing supply during the plan period; review and update all sites that are identified for housing and mixed use development during the plan period, insuring that they are fit for purpose and highlighting any changes in the development context. Updates the sites introduced as part of the Detailed Sites and Policies DPD 2016 (see Options Appraisal 2015). Overall this is in light of the need to increase housing supply and meet the new housing target. Site removals to acknowledge sites absorbed into new strategic sites or are lost due to build out. See Options Appraisal (2018) for further discussion.

Sustainability and Climate Change

Engagement Drawn Upon	Sustainability and Climate Change Sub-theme	Stakeholder groups	Key Matters Raised	Take forward / Next Steps?	Reason
Ongoing community engagement (e.g Mayor's Shows, Corporate Surveys, Youth Council), DtC partner liaison, Formal consultation inc. I&O / Reg.19	Overall care for environment	Residents (though not a high priority); statutory consultees, other public sector agencies, developers.	Design measures a key mechanism in ensuring development continues to be fit for the future, particularly in the face of climate change; statutory consultees/public agencies desire for Newham to aim higher across the borough, to avoid distinction between new and old areas. Opportunity given scale of new development to include latest technologies. Specific support for minimising carbon emissions, environmental resilience principles, and promotion of wider Environment Agency / Natural England agendas.	SCC policies reorganised to ensure clarity of requirements and ease of use.	See Options Appraisal (2018)
Formal consultation inc. I&O) / Reg.19	Waterways	Public agencies (Canal & River Trust, Lea Valley Regional Park, Environment Agency, Port of London Authority, Residents and community groups	Newham's waterways are an asset that should be preserved, enhanced, and used more for their leisure / amenity benefits. Development alongside should enhance them, more use of waterways (i.e. for transport or residential moorings) should avoid environmental impacts.	Maintain blue ribbon policy, (consolidating into broader GI policy INF6, and new outdoor recreation policy INF7, clarifying overlap with flood risk policies (requirements re flood defence access)	See Options Appraisal (2018)
Corporate Surveys, Mayor's Show, Members' Working Group, Youth Council, Formal Consultation (LPR I&O + all DSPDPD & CS stages), DtC work with neighbouring authorities	Green Infrastructure (GI)	Statutory consultees including CCG / Public Health / Natural England / Environment Agency, Residents, Councillors	Green infrastructure is one of the most frequently cited as valuable elements of resident's environment, both by children, adults via Council-wide surveys, and communicated via Councillor feedback. Feedback has related to the vital use of parks and open spaces, the under-use of some spaces (MOL in the eastern parts of the borough was specifically mentioned by both Youth Council and Councillors) the benefits of trees and general greening within the urban grain (specifically within key locations such as transport hubs and movement corridors), and the loss of smaller green space in favour of development. This message is corroborated by health and wellbeing studies that affirm the significant role green infrastructure can have in people's health, mental health and quality of life. Given the additional environmental benefits in terms of drainage, air quality, biodiversity etc, it is a 'no brainer' that development management should do all it can to preserve existing green	DSPDPD reviewed all greenspace designations, found sound and adopted as part of INF6a in 2016. Consolidated INF6 and SC4 ensures all relevant elements of GI across the borough are afforded protection, (see SC4, INF6) ensure all significant GI elements / projects (notably the Lea River Park) are embedded / foregrounded throughout the plan, (see INF6 and spatial policies notably S4 and S5&S6) linking to the 'live' IDP via INF9. MOL activation and extension is specifically mentioned in INF7, and a green grid approach reflected across SC4, INF6 and INF7.	See Options Appraisal (2018)

			infrastructure and incorporate it wherever feasible, addressing both quantum and quality. Ongoing liaison		
Ongoing liaison, Evidence production (SFRA), Formal consultation (including I&O, Reg.19)	Flood Risk & Drainage	Statutory consultees (Environment Agency); other public agencies	Policy should: reflect the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the requirement to undertake the Sequential Test; promote upkeep and improvement of defences in line with Environment Agency recommendations; promote resilient drainage via use of SUDs, permeable surfaces, and green infrastructure; encourage not just new but existing development to become more flood resilient through retrofitting.	DSPDPD added significant requirements regarding SUDs and sustainable drainage. Maintain coherent flood risk and drainage policy (see consolidated in SC3)	See Options Appraisal 2015 & 2018
Formal consultation (including I&O, Reg.19), IDP preparation	Energy supply	Public agencies and voluntary and community sector, resident groups	We should maximise the opportunities of energy networks and other renewable technologies to deliver sustainable, affordable energy. Newham residents are becoming increasingly aware and vocal about energy sufficiency and climate impacts. Whilst resident engagement in formal Local Plan consultations remains relatively low, there is an awareness of the significant opportunity for updated modes of energy supply that the scale of development within the borough presents. Policy should support low and zero carbon development and on-site renewable energy generation; policy should encourage rather than require energy standards; policy should give consideration to delivery constraints (including viability, historic settings). Warnings not to be too prescriptive regarding heat network connection given viability issues. Suggestions to do more to protect price and service level in the ongoing energy supply to end users.	SC2 maintains support in principle for energy networks and is clarified to state that decentralised energy should be prioritised within energy strategies, with specific support added for heat pumps given potential of water sources and clarification around implementation.	See Options Appraisal 2018
Feedback from DM processes, formal consultations, ongoing liaison	Build standards / efficiency / overheating	Developers, public agencies, some development interests, statutory consultees including GLA	Policy should support sustainable design and construction (general) while being consistent with national and regional approaches. Recent feedback from residents in newer development regarding the problems associated with overheating and ventilation. Developers raise issues of viability and feasibility of BREEAM requirements.	DSPDPD updated references to BREEAM/Zero Carbon subject to viability in SC5. LPR consolidated SC1 remove references to CfSH and Lifetime Homes and updates BREEAM and Zero Carbon requirements, removal subject to viability considerations. New requirements regarding the consideration of overheating added to SC2.	See Options Appraisal 2018
DSPDPD & LPR Formal consultation inc. I&O / Reg.19	Biodiversity	Natural England, Developers, Residents, interest groups	Developers, duty to co-operate partners and residents alike have shown support for biodiversity net gain. Developers and relevant bodies such as Natural England have lobbied for standardisation in the way biodiversity is valued and assessed in order to bring consistency and transparency to the planning process and facilitate its easier consideration / integration into proposals; airport raise the issue of conflict with airport operations and the need for an offset process. Noted that policies should support implementation of the regional (London Plan) approach and have regard to potential 'in combination' effects on any Natura 2000 site. Several note that BAP and other biodiversity evidence is now quite old so BAP projects are not live.	SC5 introduced by the DSPDPD in 2016 gave clearer policy criteria about how biodiversity enhancement would be assessed without needing reference to the BAP. LPR maintains and consolidates biodiversity policy in SC4, (from SC5, INF6 and former INF7) introduces use of published metrics for assessment and valuation and clarifies the net gain expectation.	See Options Appraisal 2015 & 2018
DSPDPD and LPR Formal Consultation. I&O / Reg.19, Members' Working Group, Ongoing liaison with DtC partners	Air Quality	Residents, Councillors, CCG, Public Health	Policies should do more to address air quality concerns / ensure it is not an issue that is ignored. National and EU pressure on Central Government has lead to Local Authorities being asked to improve their response. Particularly relevant in a London borough with significant construction activity.	DSPDPD Policy SP9 flagged air quality as part of a range of cumulative impact issues for more explicit consideration, building on a small reference in SP2. LPR consolidates and expands air quality considerations in new SC5, while maintaining references in SP2 and SP9.	See Options Appraisal 2015 & 2018
Formal consultations (LPR I&O + DSPDPD all stages)	Water Efficiency	Environment Agency, Thames Water	Given London and the South East's status as a water stress zone, policies should do more to ensure water efficiency in new development and seek to improve it via retrofitting.	See revised SC1 which specifies updated water efficiency domestic and non-domestic standards	See Options Appraisal 2018

Infrastructure (Transport)

Engagement Drawn Upon	Infrastructure (Transport) Sub-theme	Stakeholder groups	Key Matters Raised	Take forward / Next Steps?	Reason
Newham Mayors Show, Members Working Groups, Reg 18, Reg 19, Mayors Show,	Ease of Movement Around Newham/ Connections	Residents, Developers, Members, TfL	With increased population growth/major development will have significant impacts on transport/infrastructure across the borough and accessibility/connectivity reliability remain key barriers to public transport usage. Bus service quality is a particular issue especially in the light of growth and ensuring bus service quality for users is secured is key. Station capacity and overcrowding are key issues raised and consideration for impacts on existing and future services users needs to be addressed. Need for greater opportunities and improvements for walking and cycling across the borough (particularly with access to the river in Royal Docks). Car ownership levels remain high and an issue particular around capacity on roads, parking, within town centres and health and environmental impacts around schools. The policy needs to continue to support north/south public transport interventions which remain an issue to movement/quality of service particularly in Urban Newham. Promotion of improved connectivity around new strategic sites particularly in areas with large levels of land use change need to be addressed in policy.	See INF1, INF2, SP7 and spatial policies including Strategic Site allocations which all respond to these issues. IDP will be updated as projects/issues evolve.	See IDP and Options Appraisal 2018
Newham Mayors Show, ongoing liaison with TfL, Members Working Groups,	DLR/Tube/Rail/Crossrail	LBN and Members of the public, Members, TfL	Both capacity and station overcrowding remain key transport challenges and remain an issue with services users in the borough and needs to be addressed in the light of major redevelopment and population growth. It is recognised that Crossrail will open up new opportunities and bring major benefits to part of Newham to improve public transport usage and quality of service alongside associated inward investment. As per the DMTS support for step-free access should be supported in policy as well as promoting a high quality tube/rail service and interchanges at key stations including Stratford. Support for car free development in highly accessible locations to maximise opportunities around stations for sustainable travel.	See INF1, INF2 and spatial policies including Strategic Site allocations which all respond to these issues. IDP will be updated as issues/projects evolve.	See Options Appraisal (2018), IDP, and the Draft Mayors Transport Strategy.
Ongoing Liaison with GLA and PLA, Reg 18, Reg 19,	Wharves	PLA, GLA, Developers, Industrial operators	Approach to wharf consolidation supported by key stakeholders through both consultation stages. Key issues raised around wharf usage and environmental impacts particularly through boats serving the wharves on surrounding uses (costs of mitigation).	Support wharf consolidation & reactivation/expansion approach in policy (INF1, S3, S4, J2) at Peruvian and Royal Primrose Wharf which can facilitate capacity as a result of consolidation. SP8 and J1 re-iterate agent of change approach an expectations, but employment land release/Strategic Site specifications (e.g. of buffering) also reflect this. Awaiting pending wharves study. IDP will be updated as issues/projects evolve.	See Options Appraisal (2018) plus IDP
LPR Reg 18, Reg 19, Members Working Group, Mayors Show, 2017; ongoing liaison with TfL, GLA	Strategic Transport	Reg 18, Reg19, PLA, GLA, Residents, Developers, Industrial Operators,	General support for the policy to continue to promote investment in the strategic transport network to better connect Newham to the rest of London whilst promoting a more sustainable pattern of movement across Newham. Representations received highlighted that negative impacts of transport remain a concern particularly around quality of bus service/reliability, and the barrier effects from surface lines and depots. Whilst there was support for funded and unfunded transport infrastructure aiding regeneration and economic growth, the policy needs to consider the spatial impacts and ensure growth is not at the expense wider regeneration or the quality of environment for all. Support for DLR depot expansions were raised by stakeholders (GLA/TfL), whilst spatial impacts must be addressed to strike a balance between ensuring strategic transport infrastructure to meets growth and development/regeneration objectives are met.	See INF1, and spatial policies S5 and S3 and associated and site allocations; IDP will be updated as issues/projects evolve.	See Options Appraisal (2018) plus IDP
Reg 18, Reg 19, Newham Mayors Show, Members Working Groups, ongoing Liaison with	Sustainable Transport	LBN and Members of the public, Members, Developers, LBN Sustainable Transport	There has been an improvement in sustainable transport in Newham notably through key infrastructure projects; there will need to be a continued promotion of people's access to sustainable transport including high quality cycle and walking routes across the borough, including areas that will see major development such as Royal Docks. Continue improvements in high	See policies INF1 and INF2 which are reflected in spatial policies and successful place-making policies. IDP will be updated as issues/projects evolve.	See Options Appraisal (2018) plus IDP

TfL			quality cycle routes and support for a range of cycle hire/membership schemes across the whole borough is key to increase uptake in cycling, whilst reference to cycle parking standards should also reflect local context to ensure facilities and bike ownership are aligned. More explicit efforts should be made to reduce car usage particularly through car-free development in highly accessible locations should be supported and promotion of car sharing opportunities to maximise sustainable travel with new development. Quality of bus service was raised as an issue throughout the consultations particularly due to road congestion and should be considered particularly noting the impacts from major new development. Improved walking and cycling routes were supported throughout the consultations, with particular opportunities in areas with the greatest land use change to support regular walking and cycling routes as a key component to a series of interconnected neighbourhoods as well as improving access to the river. Air quality and health are key issues and support for active travel measures is welcomed by residents.		
-----	--	--	--	--	--

Infrastructure (Waste & Recycling, Utilities)

Engagement Drawn Upon	Infrastructure (Waste & Recycling, Utilities Infra) Sub-theme	Stakeholder groups	Key Matters Raised	Take forward / Next Steps?	Reason
Corporate surveys, Mayor's Show 2016, Formal Consultations inc. I&O / Reg.19 , continuous liaison with ELWA	Waste management	Residents, Environment Agency, Developers, ELWA	One of residents' most frequent complaints is regarding mishandled waste, policies must ensure all forms of development account for their waste management adequately, allowing collection services to operate safely and efficiently with minimal impacts on neighbours. Advised to 'future-proof' by ensuring development caters for tri-separation.	INF3 revised to make requirements regarding developments (as opposed to waste infrastructure) clearer and more accessible, reference local waste collection guidance, specify requirement to enclose all new facilities.	See Options Appraisal 2018
IDP preparation, Formal consultation inc. I&O / Reg.19, JWP review process (early stages, including liaison with ELWA), London Waste Planning Forum (inc. the GLA)	Waste infrastructure	Statutory consultees including GLA, Thames Water, Environment Agency, English Nature; development interests and local businesses including waste site operators.	Need to safeguard / allocate waste treatment sites to provide sufficient facilities for waste tonnage throughputs or identify equivalent provision elsewhere. Need for environmental protection including the enclosure of all waste facilities. Need to update the 2012 JWP in light of changes patterns of development across the ELWA area.	See updated INF3, and S01 which signals change in the Beckton area. Also need to progress JWP review with partner LPAs (See LDS).	See Options Appraisal 2018
Formal consultation inc. I&O / Reg.19, IDP preparation, ongoing liaison with DtC partners / key	Utilities infrastructure	Statutory consultees including neighbouring boroughs, PLA, GLA, LTGDC, Thames	Expansion needs at Beckton Sewage Treatment Works and in the uplift of energy capacity across the Royal Docks and Beckton. The strategic potential of heat network re development in the Arc of Opportunity, reducing costs and improving sustainability. The need to protect existing energy infrastructure (overhead lines and underground cables e.g.) while minimising the spatial	See updated INF3 / INF4 and relevant Spatial Policies (S5/S3)	See Options Appraisal 2018 & IDP

providers		Water; National Grid; other public agencies; members; development interests	impacts of such infrastructure as far as possible, both to future-proof and to improve scope for development.		
-----------	--	---	---	--	--

Social Infrastructure

Engagement Drawn Upon	Infrastructure (Social) Sub-theme	Stakeholder groups	Key Matters Raised	Take forward / Next Steps?	Reason
DSPDPD formal engagement and informal consultation; Mayors Show 2016, 2017; LPR Reg. 18 consultation; LPR Reg. 19 consultation.	Quality of community infrastructure	Development interests; public agencies; members; local residents; community group.	Improvements should be made to some facilities to maximise their potential and key Community Facilities need to be protected. Schools and other buildings that are currently single use should be made multi functional to make the most efficient use of the space. There is support for the provision of public toilets which are currently lacking in the borough.	See revised and consolidated INF8 (which absorbs INF10 drafted and adopted as part of the DSPDPD). Provides of protection, multi-functionality, definition including public toilets. See also INF5 re new provision of publicly accessible toilets. IDP will be updated as needs and projects evolve.	See Options Appraisal 2015 & 2018 plus IDP
DSPDPD formal engagement and informal consultation; LPR Reg. 18 Consultation; LPR Reg. 19 Consultation; stakeholder meetings; public agencies; Members Working Group	Education and training facilities	Local residents; members; Education Stakeholders	Has been an increased uptake of early years education in the borough. There is general support for the aims of site allocations related to education but need to demonstrate how site allocations will meet the needs of the borough. Schools should provide adequate playspace and be multi-functional spaces in order to increase the efficiency of the buildings. Critical need for school places including sixth forms - want the local plan to acknowledge lack of government funding and need to rationalise assets with site allocations.	See revised consolidated INF8, which includes site allocations to allow for this growth in need, and various acknowledgements of these space and funding pressures e.g. cross subsidy with residential. IDP will be keep updated with evolving needs/projects.	See Options Appraisal 2018 and IDP
DSPDPD formal engagement and informal consultation, Meetings with NCCG, Community Spaces Review group and education providers, Reg. 18 consultations; Reg. 19 consultations, Commissioned strategies	Changing strategic approach to community infrastructure provision	NCCG, Community Spaces Review group and education providers, Development interests and public agencies, consultants	In order to provide quality of service there is a need for certain organisations to rationalise their estates. A number of community facilities buildings are not fit for purpose for various reasons scale/condition/location. IDP discussions with various infrastructure providers have demonstrated that health care and education providers intend to rationalise and or re-configure their estates in order to provide a high quality service, while meeting the growing needs of the borough.	Yes, partly - INF10 (drafted and adopted as part of the DSPDPD) allows for the loss of community facilities where found to be surplus to requirements as part of a broader strategic approach to a change in the model of service provision. Consolidated INF8 in the Local nity facilities can be provided alongside other compatible and policy compliant uses - notably housing, and add consideration of other public providers' needs in asset disposal. In addition, policy allows for, and promotes, the use of innovative methods to deal with space constraints on sites through the use of shared facilities, meanwhile provision on Strategic Sites, off-site and multi-storey provision. IDP will be updated as issues/projects evolve.	See Options Appraisal 2015 and 2018 and IDP
Member	Town/ Local centre growth	Members;	Town centre boundaries & network: too much emphasis on moving Canning	Yes - site allocations aligned policy as set out	See Options Appraisal 2018 & Town Centre and Retail Study

engagement; Reg 18 consultation; Reg. 19 consultation	and development & boundaries	Development Interests	Town Centre to the south rather than focussing on developing the existing centre (members). Members also concerned about boundaries affecting scope to evolve in Forest Gate/not fitting with natural identity of the town centre (north south orientation more important than east-west) . Support for the development of a new local centre on Strategic Site 08 as part of a mixed use scheme. Support for continued discussions in relation to the creation of a new town centre in the proposed site "Beckton Riverside".	in INF5, alteration of FG town centre boundaries. Also see spatial policies	2016
DSPDPD formal engagement and informal consultation; Members Working Group; ongoing stakeholder liaison; LPR Reg. 18 consultation; Reg. 19 consultation.	Leisure, culture and entertainment facilities	Residents; Members; Cultural Stakeholders; 1 faith based charity.	Culture and night time economy is something that the borough should be looking to 'grab'. There is a growing interest from reputable cultural establishments in raising their profile in East London. Support for enhanced policy protection for pubs, also importance of faith based facilities (1 faith-based charity). Some suggestions overly restrictive on out of centre community use - restricting bottom up initiative.	INF10 (drafted and adopted as part of the DSPDPD) introduced out of centre 'exceptions' including CFOAs and small scale. In LPR see INF8 as consolidated and revised, (pubs, faith based facilities, spatial strategy) plus J1, INF5 and spatial policies in relation to town centres.	See Options Appraisal 2015, 2018

Infrastructure Delivery

Engagement Drawn Upon	Infrastructure Delivery Sub-theme	Stakeholder groups	Key Matters Raised	Take forward / Next Steps?	Reason
LPR I&O Consultation; S106 SPD consultation.	CIL/S106.	Developers, infrastructure providers.	Opposition to the requirement to make a contribution to social or physical infrastructure. Concern about viability impacts of S106 requirements, notably local employment contributions. Concern re limitations of CIL/S106 in providing for essential infrastructure.	See INF9 as revised, which clarifies that the requirement is to demonstrate infrastructure sufficiency rather than to make a contribution per se, though most will make a contribution through CIL; policy also acknowledges site specific physical and financial capacity in considering of infrastructure sufficiency, and the limitations of the CIL Reg. 123 list.	See Options Appraisal (2018) & Plan Viability Assessment (2017).
LPR I&O & Reg. 19 consultation.	Delivery priorities: housing mix, access to jobs, other infrastructure.	Community groups, ward members, local residents, developers, commissioners.	Residents and councillors support a balanced approach to homes and jobs- concern jobs being squeezed out by homes, though affordable housing remains an important priority for many, as is the sufficiency of infrastructure in relation to growth. Affordable housing and transport infrastructure high on the GLA agenda, and developers are keen to stress the role of housing in providing job opportunities/supporting economic growth. Some developers also suggest infrastructure should come first and then affordable housing and access to jobs.	See INF9 as revised which clarifies all are priorities which will need to be assessed on a case by case basis within the bounds of appropriate planning assessment (e.g. S106 must be necessary to make the proposal acceptable).	See Options Appraisal (2018) & Plan Viability Assessment (2017).
Liaison with DTC partners and infrastructure providers.	Infrastructure Planning and Delivery.	Infrastructure providers, GLAP, DtC bodies.	Updates on key projects, plans and processes, including spatial requirements, plus timescales, costs and constraints (e.g. legal obligations of statutory undertakers). Spatial requirements including new sites, modification of existing provision, cross subsidy through residential, desirability of co-location in some cases, and of disposal in others. Importance of IDP being embedded in the plan, and for regular updates.	See INF policies notably IN1, Inf4, INF6 & 7, INF8, spatial policies, site allocations and Idp; IDP is a 'living' document so will be revised at least once a year.	See Options Appraisal (2018).