

Representation Reference	Representer	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representer Comment	Representer Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-C-023	Bob Sharples		Reg19-C-023/001	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Yes	Yes						Yes	Sport England is supportive of the Policy BFN1 in general but in particular paragraphs 4 and 5. 5f. states: the re-provision of playing pitches at N13.SA3 Former East Ham Gas Works site allocation and the Lady Trowers Trust Playing Field, through bringing them back into public use, is supported by the playing pitch strategy which is one of the evidence base documents identified on page 11.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-011	Southern Housing		Reg19-E-011/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														We also welcome the emphasis placed on social infrastructure (policies BFN1 [and SI1]) [...]. It is also encouraging that these amendments have been made in response to comments received in response to the Regulation 18 consultation and that they are based on up to date evidence.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-013	Transport for London		Reg19-E-013/010	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.a.i											We welcome the amended wording in part 1ai in relation to the DLR extension.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-024	Home Builders Federation		Reg19-E-024/002	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														<p>BFN1: Spatial strategy</p> <p>HBF generally supports the aim of this policy which will see new housing supported in every part of the borough. It would be helpful, however, if the policy could indicate how many homes will be supported in the locations in part 1 a) iii) and part b).</p> <p>The plan aims to provide 47,600 homes over the period of time that the plan is in operation. Part 1 a) indicates that 45,000 of these will be provided in the neighbourhoods specified in Part 1, a) i) and ii). This suggests that these two other others may be expected to provide the remaining 2,600 homes, although one would have thought that they had the capacity to provide more.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the approach is justified. The site allocations include design principles for how sites should be optimised for housing as well as requirements for different types of use. Policy D3 provides guidance on how windfall sites, including small sites should optimise site capacity. Figures are only provided in parts i and ii to reflect work undertaken by the GLA through the development of Opportunity Area Planning Frameworks. Please note that the time frame of these documents is longer than for the Local Plan. Otherwise figures are provided in the Site Allocation and Housing Trajectory Methodology paper, which can be updated more regularly than the Local Plan. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p>
Reg19-E-024	Home Builders Federation		Reg19-E-024/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														It would be helpful if the plan made clear its intention to support the approach in the London Plan whereby all areas in London within 800m of a train station or boundary of a town centre or within PTALs 3-6 will be considered appropriate locations for residential development. This is important to encourage the supply of more housing on small sites (of a quarter hectare in size and less).		<p>A change in this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as in conformity with the London Plan 2021 policies BFN1.1 and BFN1.2, D3 and H1, supported by the neighbourhood policies and site allocations, ensures that housing delivery in sustainable locations, where not required for other priority uses, is supported in the Plan. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed change.</p>

Reg19-E-024	Home Builders Federation		Reg19-E-024/004	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			7			No	No					<p>Part 7 is unsound in part because it is contrary to national policy. It is also unlawful.</p> <p>Part 7 of the policy expects developers, including housebuilders, to support improvements to the borough’s strategic and utilities infrastructure while mitigating any negative impacts.</p> <p>The aim of this is unclear but it is not the role of developers to rectify general shortcomings with strategic and utilities infrastructure in the borough. The supply of electricity and water services is dealt with under a separate, parallel, statutory regime. The providers of utilities are expected to support the needs of the planning system. It is not the responsibility, nor can it be, for housebuilders to rectify problems within the utilities sector. If Thames Water, for example, is unable to guarantee that it can provide the connections required, meaning that dwellings cannot be built, then this is an issue that goes to the heart of the deliverability of Newham’s local plan.</p> <p>Newham Council will need to be clear in its plan that the utilities sector is able to provide the services and connections needed to support the development aims of the plan. If it is unable to secure that assurance, then the plan is undeliverable. Housebuilders cannot rectify those shortcomings. On the question of water, housebuilders pay connection charges to water companies – five billion pounds in total since 1991 – to ensure that the necessary investments are made to support the aims of the plan-led system. Water companies, by contrast, are under a statutory duty to plan and invest to support the development needs of local plans. They must produce, by law, a Water Resources Management Plan every five-years to demonstrate this to government.</p> <p>As part of this, water companies are required to engage with local authorities to ensure that they are able to provide the utilities connections necessary to enable development requirements in local plans to be met. The Government’s advice is set out in Section 6.3 of the Water Resources Planning Guidance. The duty to prepare and maintain a Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) is set out in sections 37A to 37D of the Water Industry Act 1991. Companies must prepare a plan at least every five years and review it annually. The Government guidance can be read here:</p> <p>Water resources planning guideline - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) [Hyperlink broken]</p> <p>The Government guidance states at Section 1.1 that these plans must forecast water supply and demand over at least the statutory minimum period of 25 years (see Section 1.1). If companies forecast a deficit they should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• supply-side options to increase the amount of water available to the water company• demand-side options which reduce the amount of water customers require <p>Section I states: I. Local authority plans</p>	<p>Part 7 should be deleted.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy is consistent with national policy and in conformity with the London Plan. The policy requires developments to protect and support improvements to infrastructure. This will include through the delivery of the agent of change policy as well as through the delivery of regulation 122 compliant planning obligations. It is important to note that this policy is also directed at development of infrastructure by infrastructure providers and is not solely directed at housing development. An amendment to this policy was made at regulation 19 stage following representations received from the Environment Agency on this point. Neither the policy nor the supporting text suggest that it is for developers to rectify shortcomings with strategic and utilities infrastructure in the borough. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>
-------------	--------------------------	--	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	--	--	---	--	--	----	----	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------	--

LB Newham Response																	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation
Representor Comment																	Local authority plans set out future development, such as housing. Your WRMP should reflect local growth ambitions and plan to meet the additional needs of new businesses and households. (See sub-section 6.3)
																	Section 6.3 states: Your planned property and population forecasts, and resulting supply, must not constrain planned growth. For companies supplying customers in England you should base your forecast population and property figures on local plans published by the local council or unitary authority. Local authorities will be at different stages of publication of their local plans.
Complies with Duty to Cooperate?																	
Consistent with the London Plan?																	
Consistent with the NPP?																	
Effective?																	
Justified?																	
Positively prepared?																	
Sound?																	
Legally Compliant?																	
Implementation text																	
Justification																	
Clause																	
Introduction																	
Site allocation																	
Policy																	
Chapter																	
Comment Reference																	
Agent																	
Representor																	
Representation Reference																	

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																					
Reg19-E-033	Thames Water		Reg19-E-033/007	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.7			Blank	No						Blank	Beckton Wastewater/Sewage Treatment Works (STW) is Thames Water’s largest sewage treatment works and a vital component of London’s infrastructure. Utilities infrastructure is mentioned generally in Policy BFN1.7, but we consider that there should be a separate policy covering Beckton STW. We therefore consider it essential that there is an associated development management policy regarding Beckton STW which supports future upgrades as there has been in previous Local Plans.	Reinstate development management policy regarding Beckton STW which supports future upgrades as there has been in previous Local Plans	<p>The comment you have provided has not resulted in a change. We did not consider this change to be necessary as Local Plan Policy W4 already explicitly supports the delivery of any utilities infrastructure upgrades and expansion which are needed to support growth and which are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is regularly updated, in consultation with infrastructure providers to understand infrastructure needs in the borough. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to minimise amenity impacts from the expansion or creation of new utilities infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is consistent with National Policy and in conformity with the London Plan, and has therefore made the following wording change to ensure a consistent approach on agent of change considerations throughout the whole Plan:</p> <p>W4.2: Projects set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will be supported in principle. All utilities infrastructure proposals (including upgrades and expansion will need to be expected to meet all requirements below: a. Align with growth requirements and support the creation of new neighbourhoods and economic opportunities. b. Utilities proposals must support the requirements set out in the Spatial Strategy and Neighbourhoods Policies in the Local Plan. c. Demonstrate that the spatial, visual, amenity, environmental and transport impacts of utilities infrastructure will be minimised and where feasible reduced. Projects set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will be supported in principle.</p> <p>W4.2 Implementation Text: The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out specific infrastructure improvement and delivery requirements to support the anticipated growth in the borough over the plan period. Utilities proposals including energy, telecommunications and digital connectivity infrastructure, and water infrastructure as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be supported subject to requirements in the Spatial Strategy and Neighbourhood Policies in the Local Plan. All infrastructure proposals will be assessed against agent of change requirements under Local Plan Policy D6 and requirements in other relevant parts of the Local Plan.</p> <p>which is included in the modification table.</p>
Reg19-E-033	Thames Water		Reg19-E-033/008	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.7			Blank	No						Blank	In relation to wastewater capacity at Beckton STW, the works has been significantly upgraded with an extension just to the north of the RDBROAPF in AMP5 (2010-2015) and is currently undergoing a further upgrade to the extension and inlet works during AMP7 (2020-2025). The AMP 7 growth upgrade has a design horizon of	It should also be acknowledged that most of the remaining unused areas of land at Beckton STW are covered by the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. It is likely that any future infrastructure upgrades on these areas are likely to require biodiversity replacement off site and this should be recognised in the new Local Plan.	The comment you have provided has not resulted in a change. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Local Plan is applied in the round. Policy GWS3: Biodiversity, urban greening, and access to nature addresses this point. Clause 6 sets out the mitigation hierarchy which should be applied to minimise development impact

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
																			<p>2036.</p> <p>In May 2023 we published our first Drainage and Wastewater Management Plans (DWMPs) which are a new long-term plans that will make sure we have a resilient and sustainable wastewater service for the next 25 years, and beyond. https://www.thameswater.co.uk/about-us/regulation/drainage-and-wastewater-management</p> <p>We have prepared a long term adaptive plan for growth at Beckton up to 2100 as part of our DWMP. The details of the Adaptive Plan can be found in Technical Appendix G Adaptive Pathway Planning. https://www.thameswater.co.uk/media-library/home/about-us/regulation/drainage-and-wastewater/appendix-g-adaptive-pathway-planning.pdf</p> <p>Please see Annex A for the specific Beckton STW example starting at page 67 and fig A.2 (pg.74) for the adaptive pathway figure [and copy below]. We will update and revise this in 5 years as part of future iterations of DWMP. The next DWMP will be a statutory requirement and pending finalisation of the DWMP guidance from Defra, we intend to refresh this long term adaptive plan and republish it every 5 years.</p> <p>It should also be acknowledged that most of the remaining unused areas of land at Beckton STW are covered by the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. It is likely that any future infrastructure upgrades on these areas are likely to require biodiversity replacement off site and this should be recognised in the new Local Plan.</p>		on Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-033	Thames Water		Reg19-E-033/010	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.7			Blank	No						Blank	<p>Thames Water are committed to reducing their greenhouse gas emissions and transforming the way they create and use energy. In 2022/23, Thames Water self-generated 536GWh of renewable energy (which is 27 per cent of their electricity needs) from renewable sources including sludge, wind and solar power.</p> <p>Most of the renewable electricity Thames Water self-generate comes from the treatment of sewage sludge via anaerobic digestion, but at Beckton there is also wind, solar and waste to energy. We are also exploring new opportunities such as heat recovery and these should be supported in accordance with the London Plan and NPPF 2023 which sets out at paragraph 148 that the planning system should support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.</p>		Comment noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/029	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN.1b											Support: The ability of site allocations throughout the borough to support new growth. It would be helpful if the policy could provide an indication as to how many homes could be supported in this location.		Support noted. A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the approach is justified. The site allocations include design principles for how sites should be optimised for housing. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/030	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.2											Support: The desire to make the best use of land. Support: Addition of delivering zero carbon, climate resilient and nature-friendly developments.	Suggested Change to wording: Policy as currently worded could restrict higher density development where current character and context would restrict this. 2. Development will make the best use of land and optimise sites by: a. applying a design-led approach to high density development across the boroughthat responds to the sites surrounding character and context. b. Supporting tall buildings in the borough’s Tall Building Zones; c. conserving the borough’s heritage assets and their settings.	This wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as in conformity with the London Plan, policy D3 it is considered important that all developments should be design-led and not just high density developments. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/031	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.5											Whilst we support the provision of high-quality recreational facilities, we Object to the policy as currently worded. Public Recreational use of Lady Trower Trust Playing Fields has long since ceased and the Site now comprises overgrown scrubland and grazing land, with no existing buildings present. The Site is currently not publicly accessible. The wording of this policy is therefore misleading. As a charity, Aston Mansfield would be unable to provide and maintain high quality recreational facilities upon the Site in perpetuity without some form of wider enabling development scheme to fund any improvements		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the requirement to protect the playing pitches, albeit currently disused, at Lady Trowers Trust Playing Field has been informed by Newham’s Playing Pitch Strategy, which is evidence to inform our policy approach to the borough’s playing fields and pitches. This evidence was produced in collaboration with Sport England. The Strategy has established that the Lady Trowers Playing Fields are a disused playing pitch site which is needed to be brought back into use to eradicate shortfalls in pitch provision. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/032	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.6											Support: The desire to create Low Traffic Neighbourhoods.		Support noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/033	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.7				No				No			Object: Contrary to National Guidance.		Unfortunately it was not clear what comment you were making on this part of the Plan. However a change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider a change to be necessary as the policy is consistent with national policy and in conformity with the London Plan. The policy requires developments to protect and support improvements to infrastructure. This will include through the delivery of the agent of change policy as well as through the delivery of regulation 122 compliant planning obligations. It is important to note that this policy is also directed at development of infrastructure by infrastructure providers and is not solely directed at housing development. An amendment to this policy was made at regulation 19 stage following representations received from the Environment Agency on this point. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-091	IQL Office LP	Quod	Reg19-E-091/010	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Blank	No						Blank	[Appendix 1 - Stratford Cross Comments on Draft Submission Local Plan Consultation (Regulation 19) Table 1 - Draft Submission Local Plan Consultataion (Regulation 19)] Overall, we support the general approach of the spatial strategy to direct growth to well-connected areas, including Stratford (Part 1) and the principle of making the best use of land and optimising sites but applying a design-led approach.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-091	IQL Office LP	Quod	Reg19-E-091/011	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Blank	No						Blank	[Appendix 1 - Stratford Cross Comments on Draft Submission Local Plan Consultation (Regulation 19) Table 1 - Draft Submission Local Plan Consultataion (Regulation 19)] However, this approach is not fully carried through other policies. For example, Tall Building Zones in Stratford and Stratford Cross are set below parameters in existing planning permissions (SC OPP and Plot S10 OPP) in Policy D4, even though these are supported by master planning approaches and townscape and visual impact assessments. This was carried through the LLDC’s Characterisation Study prepared in 2019 to support the LLDC Local Plan (July 2020).		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Council considers the Plan to be positively prepared and justified. Whilst we acknowledge that consents have been granted with tall elements at greater heights than the heights allowed within the tall building zone designation in the submission plan and that the sites can still benefit from these consents, these consents were permitted under the adopted LLDC Local Plan. More details on the methodology used to identify suitable locations for tall buildings can be found on the Tall Buildings Annex (2024) and the Tall Buildings Topic Paper (2025). The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-091	IQL Office LP	Quod	Reg19-E-091/012	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Blank	No						Blank	<p>[Appendix 1 - Stratford Cross Comments on Draft Submission Local Plan Consultation (Regulation 19)</p> <p>Table 1 - Draft Submission Local Plan Consultataion (Regulation 19)]</p> <p>Further conflicts with the design-led approach are identified with other overly prescriptive housing mix requirements set out in Policy H4 that will restrict the ability for developments to respond to local character and optimise highly-accessible brownfield sites through higher density developments to meet the borough’s needs.</p>		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Council considers the policy to be effective. The Council considers that we have adopted an appropriate balance between meeting our objectively assessed need for family housing, including larger family-homes, and ensuring deliverability. Where the family housing or affordable housing targets cannot be met, applicants will need to robustly justify this through the submission of a viability assessment. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-091	IQL Office LP	Quod	Reg19-E-091/013	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Blank	No						Blank	<p>[Appendix 1 - Stratford Cross Comments on Draft Submission Local Plan Consultation (Regulation 19)</p> <p>Table 1 - Draft Submission Local Plan Consultataion (Regulation 19)]</p> <p>Stratford Cross is the main commercial office district in Stratford and therefore, the focussing of major office floorspace in the Stratford Metropolitan Centre set out in Part 3 is supported to help establish and strengthen the strategic office hub in Stratford.</p>		Support noted.
Reg19-E-091	IQL Office LP	Quod	Reg19-E-091/014	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Blank	No						Blank	<p>[Appendix 1 - Stratford Cross Comments on Draft Submission Local Plan Consultation (Regulation 19)</p> <p>Table 1 - Draft Submission Local Plan Consultataion (Regulation 19)]</p> <p>We also suggest this could be extended to support research and development uses, which would also be appropriate within Stratford Metropolitan Centre, as well as continued support for high-density residential development.</p>		A response to this comment was provided in the Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation Report. This included a change to the policy approach to include research and development floorspace as a priority use in Stratford Town Centre. The Council’s response has not changed.
Reg19-E-095	Get Living Plc	Quod	Reg19-E-095/009	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Blank	No						Blank	<p>Appendix 2 - Representations Part 1</p> <p>Overall, GL support the spatial strategy to direct growth to well-connected areas, including Stratford (Part 1) and the principle of making the best use of land and optimising sites through a design-led approach.</p>		Support noted.
Reg19-E-095	Get Living Plc	Quod	Reg19-E-095/010	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Blank	No						Blank	<p>[Appendix 2 - Representations Part 1]</p> <p>[Overall, GL support the spatial strategy to direct growth to well-connected areas, including Stratford (Part 1) and the principle of making the best use of land and optimising sites through a design-led approach.] GL do however raise concerns with Part 2 of the approach which refers to Tall Building Zones as set out in Policy D4. These have been set below parameters which have been approved in recent and historic planning permissions (the recent permissions for Plot N18/19 and Plot N16 and the Stratford City Outline Planning Permission (SC OPP)). This is discussed in detail below.</p>		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Council considers the Plan to be positively prepared and justified. Whilst we acknowledge that consents have been granted with tall elements at greater heights than the heights allowed within the tall building zone designation in the submission plan and that the sites can still benefit from these consents, these consents were permitted under the adopted LLDC Local Plan. More details on the methodology used to identify suitable locations for tall buildings can be found on the Tall Buildings Annex (2024) and the Tall Buildings Topic Paper (2025). The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-112	SEGRO	Gerald Eve	Reg19-E-112/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			Part 3a			Blank	No						Blank	SEGRO supports the point set out in part 3(a) of this policy which seeks to protect and intensify the borough’s SIL and LILs for a diverse range of industrial and storage, logistics and distribution related uses as per our original representations to Regulation 18 of the Local Plan (point 2(a)) [see Appended – Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan SEGRO response] .		Support noted.
Reg19-E-112	SEGRO	Gerald Eve	Reg19-E-112/004	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			Part 3a			Blank	No						Blank	[SEGRO supports the point set out in part 3(a) of this policy which seeks to protect and intensify the borough’s SIL and LILs for a diverse range of industrial and storage, logistics and distribution related uses as per our original representations to Regulation 18 of the Local Plan (point 2(a)).] However, as set out in our representations made of the Regulation 18 version of the plan (point 2(a)) [see Appended – Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan SEGRO response] , it is important to recognise that some sites may face challenges with intensification.		Comment noted.
Reg19-E-112	SEGRO	Gerald Eve	Reg19-E-112/005	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			Part 3b			Blank	No						Blank	As set out in our previous representations, (point 2(a)) [see Appended – Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan SEGRO response] SEGRO continue to support part (b) of the policy.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-112	SEGRO	Gerald Eve	Reg19-E-112/006	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			Part 3e			Blank	No						Blank	SEGRO welcome the revisions to part (e) of the policy which removes specific site allocations for where new employment floorspace is to be located.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-112	SEGRO	Gerald Eve	Reg19-E-112/007	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			Part 3f			Blank	No						Blank	SEGRO welcome the revision to part (f) of the policy which seeks to support the location of industrial uses in out-of-centre retail and leisure parks, removing the reference to the need for ‘intensification’ of such uses in these areas.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-170	Berkeley Homes (South East London) Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-170/014	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			1			Blank	Blank						Blank	Draft Policy BFN1: Spatial Strategy Overall, the Berkeley Homes supports the proposed spatial strategy which seeks to direct development to all of Newham’s 16 neighbourhoods to distribute the benefits of growth (part 1) and to direct significant levels of growth including to N7 Three Mills neighbourhood, which forms part of the cross boundary Poplar Riverside Opportunity Area (part 1 (a) (ii)). We consider this to align with the spatial strategy set out in the adopted London Plan, which is welcomed.		Support noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-171	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority		Reg19-E-171/01	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.5 h	Justification text under paragraph 3.	BFN1.5		No							<p>The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (the Authority), in its previous responses to the consultation stages on the Local Plan had highlighted the important contribution that the Regional Park makes to the borough, particularly given the imminent return of planning powers back to Newham Council from the LLDC in 2024 and the fact that significant areas of the Regional Park will fall within the jurisdiction of the Local Plan. The Regional Park within Newham is a significant element of the Borough’s green and blue infrastructure and will provide valuable open and waterside spaces, leisure, sporting, and cultural facilities as well as access to nature, all within close proximity to existing neighbourhoods and new communities.</p> <p>The Authority supports the change to Policy BFN1.5 ‘Spatial Strategy’ which now includes policy support for the Lee Valley Regional Park and the Park Development Framework (PDF) under bullet point h. The additional justification text under paragraph 3.9 is also supported as this clarifies the Regional Park’s relationship to the neighbourhoods of Three Mills, Canning Town and Custom House and Stratford and Maryland. Implementation text also now references the Authority’s statutory consultee role in respect of the Lee Valley Regional Park Act 1966 (the Park Act) and this addition is supported.</p>		Support noted.
Reg19-E-171	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority		Reg19-E-171/02	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.5 h	Justification text under paragraph 3.9	BFN1.5		No							<p>However in order to ensure the Local Plan can be considered sound it is important that the policy text under BFN1.5h supports both the Regional Park and its remit i.e. as a statutory area set aside for leisure, recreation, sport and nature conservation, and the PDF Area 1 Proposals as they relate to Newham. Reference to the ‘vision of the PDF’ as set out under BFN1.5 h is confusing as it is not clear to what this refers. The Area 1 Proposals are not considered to present a vision as such, but represent the ‘plan of proposals for the future management and development of the Regional Park’ referenced under Section 14 (1) of the Park Act. A amendment is therefore needed to the wording of policy text under 1.5h.</p>	<p>As stated above reference to the ‘vision of the PDF’ as set out under BFN1.5 h is confusing as it is not clear to what this refers. The Area 1 Proposals represent the ‘plan of proposals for the future management and development of the Regional Park’, (in this case within the London Borough of Newham) referenced under Section 14 (1) of the Park Act. A change which is consider minor to the wording of policy text under 1.5h is needed and this has been set out below.</p> <p>BFN1.5: Spatial strategy 5. Development will protect and enhance existing parks and social infrastructure and support the creation of new parks and social infrastructure by requiring the delivery of: h. development that supports the vision of Lee Valley Regional Park, its remit and the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority’s Development Framework Area Proposals (Area 1) as they apply to the Park in Newham; and...</p>	<p>Comment noted. This comment has been subject to further discussion with Lee Valley Regional Park Authority which is set out in more detail in a Statement of Common Ground, included in the updated Duty to Cooperate Report.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan reflects the Lee Valley Regional Park Act 1966 (Park Act) and therefore proposes the following wording change which is included in the modification table:</p> <p>BFN1.5: Spatial strategy 5. Development will protect and enhance existing parks and social infrastructure and support the creation of new parks and social infrastructure by requiring the delivery of: h. development that supports the vision of Lee Valley Regional Park, its remit and the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority’s Development Framework Area Proposals (Area 1) as they apply to the Park in Newham; and</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-171	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority		Reg19-E-171/03	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.5 h	Justification text under paragraph 3.9	BFN1.5		No							<p>The new additional text added to the Justification and Implementation Sections (paras 3.9 and BFN1.5 respectively) is also noted and supported. Further amendments to the Justification text are proposed to ensure the Regional Park’s range of open spaces, sport and leisure venues are referenced as these make a significant contribution to recreational opportunities within the Neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>Further amendments to the Justification text are proposed to ensure the Regional Park’s range of open spaces, sport and leisure venues are referenced as these make a significant contribution to recreational opportunities within the Neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Justification text</p> <p>3.9 The borough’s quantity of publicly accessible open space for each person is low, and many areas lack good places for children to play. Despite this overarching deficit, significant areas of the Lee Valley Regional Park lie within the Three Mills, Canning Town and Custom House and Stratford and Maryland neighbourhoods. These include the Lee Valley VeloPark and land consisting of the northern Olympic parklands, the open spaces, film studios, natural play and important heritage contained within the Three Mills Island complex, part of the Greenway, and the Bow Creek Ecology Park. The strategy therefore seeks to make the most of our existing green assets, including the Lee Valley Regional Park, while reducing our spatial and absolute deficits.</p> <p>Further additional wording is proposed under the Implementation Section BFN5.1 to ensure the link back to the PDF Area Proposals is clear in relation to planning applications.</p> <p>Implementation Section – text added for BFN1.5. Created by the Lee Valley Regional Park Act in 1966, (the Park Act), the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) is a key stakeholder in the Borough. It has a statutory responsibility to either provide directly or work with partners to provide facilities for sport, recreation, leisure, entertainment and nature conservation throughout the Park.</p> <p>Within Newham the Regional Park makes a significant contribution to the Borough’s green infrastructure resource and its leisure and cultural amenity offering residents and visitors a combination of nationally and internationally important sporting venues, ecologically rich open spaces and local opportunities for recreation and healthy activity.</p> <p>Newham will consult the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) on planning applications which it considers could affect the Park. Under the terms of the Lee Valley Regional Park Act (1966), the LVRPA can refer any decisions by Newham to the Secretary of State if it is considered by the LVRPA that the decision taken materially conflicts with the proposals of the Authority for the development of the Park. The contents of the Lee Valley Park Development Framework, as adopted, is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This comment has been subject to further discussion with the LVRP and a satisfactory resolution regarding referencing the Park has been found. This is set out in more detail in a Statement of Common Ground, included in the updated Duty to Cooperate Report.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan reflects the qualities of the green spaces in the Lee Valley Regional Park and therefore proposes the following wording change which is included in the modification table:</p> <p>3.9 The borough’s quantity of publicly accessible open green space for each person is low, and many areas lack good places for children to play. Despite this overarching deficit, significant areas of the Lee Valley Regional Park lie within the Three Mills, Canning Town and Custom House and Stratford and Maryland neighbourhoods. These include the Lee Valley VeloPark and land consisting of the northern Olympic parklands, the open spaces and natural play at Three Mills Green and Riverside, part of the Greenway, and the Bow Creek Ecology Park. The strategy therefore seeks to make the most of our existing green assets, including the Lee Valley Regional Park, while reducing our spatial and absolute deficits.</p> <p>Glossary:</p> <p>Lee Valley Regional Park Authority: Created by the Lee Valley Regional Park Act in 1966, (the Park Act), the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) is a key stakeholder in the Borough. It has a statutory responsibility to either provide directly or work with partners to provide facilities for sport, recreation, leisure, entertainment and nature conservation throughout the Park.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-171	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority		Reg19-E-171/09	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.6			Yes	Yes							It is noted that the mapping of the opportunities to improve green and water connectivity for each of the Local Plan Neighbourhoods is included in the Green and Water Infrastructure Strategy (2024) which forms part of the evidence base to the Local Plan and this is welcomed.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-171	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority		Reg19-E-171/10	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.6			Yes	Yes							<p>The Authority supports Policy BFN1.6 which specifically mentions the need for bridges across the River Lea; as set out below. This addresses the Authority's previous comments about the need to have an overarching framework including mapping that identifies the areas where improved connections and bridge links are required, in particular along the River Lea.</p> <p>“6. Development must contribute to improving strategic and local connections and increasing active travel through improved local walking and cycling connections; the implementation of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods; new bridges over the River Lea, docks and other barriers; the extension of the Leaway Walk, Thames Path and Capital Ring; and by reducing the dominance of the borough’s road infrastructure to improve air quality and to enable better walking and cycling.”</p>		Support noted.
Reg19-E-176	Port of London Authority	Capita	Reg19-E-176/002	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>The PLA’s key interests are on the health and safe use of the river and to enable effective use of the Tidal network alongside any forthcoming development. The Local Plan vision, site allocations and draft policy BFN1 (Spatial Strategy) currently proposes that along the River Lea, new bridges and walkways will create better linkages to natural spaces, stations and neighbouring Tower Hamlets. It must be made clear that any proposed crossing situated over navigable waterways ensures that the public right of navigation is maintained, that safe navigation can continue and that the PLA are involved in the development of such proposals where these cross over areas of the PLA’s jurisdiction and / or landownership at an early stage, so that amongst other matters, the height of any proposed bridge can be understood. The need for this early engagement must be highlighted within the Local Plan, potentially in part 6 of policy BFN1 and the associated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Local Plan should be read as a whole and addresses the issues raised in the implementation text of policy T1.1. The council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/005	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			5.e			Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft. However, there are a number of strategic points which we wish to make so I have summarised these below for ease:]</p> <p><u>Open Space:</u></p> <p>The Spatial Strategy (BFN1) sets a minimum 2ha Local Parks on the majority of site allocations and there are a series of plans showing indicative locations and arrangement of these spaces. Whilst we accept that the Royal Docks requires more open space, our strong view is that setting arbitrary targets for the open space does not meet the requirements for masterplan-led development (as required in BFN2(1)) as well as creating a risk that the policy hinders a design-led approach. To set a borough-wide minimum without assessing the site specifics could undermine delivery.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the requirement publicly accessible green space in the Royal Docks area has been informed by Newham’s Green and Water Infrastructure Strategy. Increasing public access to green space across the neighbourhoods in the Royal Docks a key part of the Local Plan vision.</p> <p>Developments in the neighbourhood will be assessed against any site allocation requirements, the neighbourhood policy and against Local Plan policies GWS1, GWS2 and GWS3 which provide further detail on access to green space. Developments will be expected to provide onsite green space and play space provision in accordance with both the requirements of London Plan Policy 2021 Policy S4 and Local Plan Policies GWS5.</p> <p>It should be noted that clause 1 of GWS1 requires major development to demonstrate an integrated approach to green infrastructure in a Design and Access Statement. In addition, Policy BFN2 requires sites to be designed and developed comprehensively, with major applications undertaking co-designed masterplanning. As such, the Local Plan clearly advocates and supports a masterplan-led approach.</p> <p>The quantity and type of green space stipulated in the Local Plan’s site allocations has been informed by the Green and Water Infrastructure Strategy. The specific detail regarding how that green space is designed and delivered, across the site allocation, will be determined by a co-design masterplan-led approach ahead of and during the pre-application and application stage. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/007	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy					BFN1.8	Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft. However, there are a number of strategic points which we wish to make so I have summarised these below for ease:]</p> <p>Meanwhile Use: We suggest an alternative approach on large strategic sites. In those instances, supported by an appropriate strategy, we feel that meanwhile uses should be allowed for up to 10 years rather than 5 years. Our experience of large sites indicates that multi-phase schemes can provide longer meanwhile uses which could, with certainty over tenure, be better, larger, and have a greater impact with a 10-year planning consent. Meanwhile uses are challenging to make commercially viable and enabling a pay-back over a longer period will enable operators to more ambitious in their proposals and deliver better projects. In addition, a ten-year temporary consent could be renewed where the Council felt the landowner had a reasonable justification as to why there were delays in the main scheme coming forward.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy is already considered flexible enough to be effective. The policy enables longer meanwhile uses where they accord with the Plan's spatial strategy, in particular policies which support the vitality and viability of town centres and employment designations. Allowing meanwhile uses which would not comply with these policies for longer than 5 years risks undermining the delivery of the Plan's key objectives. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the deliverability of meeting BREEAM requirements in all meanwhile projects.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is flexible enough to be deliverable and that there may be circumstances where BREEAM excellent may not be feasible and therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to the implementation text for policy BFN1.8: BFN 1.8 Meanwhile uses must also comply with the Plan’s commitment to tackling the climate emergency, meet BREEAM excellent and consider how temporary new builds can reduce their environmental footprint via Modern Methods of Construction and the potential for reuse of temporary new builds in other locations. An exception to the requirement to meet BREEAM excellent may be made for temporary structures seeking permission for a shorter time period. Where this is allowed, extensions in time are unlikely to be granted to avoid long term poor quality development.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/010	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			5.c			Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft.]</p> <p>Detailed Comments Schedule: The consented scheme for Thameside West does not include a new health centre but a off site contribution to the Custom House health centre and this S106 commitment should be reflected in the Plan.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Council has worked collaboratively with NHS partners throughout the Local Plan Review to plan for future healthcare needs, in line with the requirements of the London Plan and the NPPF. In addition, we did not consider this change to be necessary as the Local Plan is applied in the round and policy SI2 allows for the provision of health contributions where onsite provision is not required.</p> <p>Information submitted by North East London ICB (formerly CCG) at each stage of the Local Plan consultation process has informed the development principles and infrastructure requirements in the draft site allocations, as set out in the Site Allocation and Housing Trajectory Methodology Note (2024).</p> <p>This work did not identify the need for site allocation N2.SA4 to provide a health centre.</p> <p>Site allocations do not include the details of existing S106 agreements. Extant planning permissions and any associated S106 commitments can, naturally, be subject to change over the Local Plan period (to 2038). As such, it would not be prudent or practical to publish this level detail for each site allocation.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/011	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			5.e			Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft.]</p> <p>Detailed Comments Schedule: The open space policy shouldn’t set an arbitrary minimum. It also fails to reflect the consented park within the Thameside West consent.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the requirement publicly accessible green space on this site has been informed by Newham’s Green and Water Infrastructure Strategy. Increasing public access to green space across the neighbourhoods in the Royal Docks a key part of the Local Plan vision. Developments will be expected to provide onsite green space and play space provision in accordance with both the requirements of London Plan Policy 2021 Policy S4 and Local Plan Policies GWS5.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements for each allocation set out the green, play and growing space that needs to be met on site and the site allocation map provides an illustrative representation of how this could be delivered.</p> <p>It should be noted that clause 1 of GWS1 requires major development to demonstrate an integrated approach to green infrastructure in a Design and Access Statement. In addition, Policy BFN2 requires sites to be designed and developed comprehensively, with major applications undertaking co-designed masterplanning. As such, the Local Plan clearly advocates and supports a masterplan-led approach.</p> <p>The quantity and type of green space stipulated in the Local Plan’s site allocations has been informed by the Green and Water Infrastructure Strategy. The specific detail regarding how that green space is designed and delivered, across the site allocation, will be determined by a co-design masterplan-led approach ahead of and during the pre-application and application stage.</p> <p>The scheme which has been permitted will still be able to be implemented and all future planning applications will be subject to case-by-case assessment during the development management process. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/012	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy					BFN1.7	Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft.]</p> <p>Detailed Comments Schedule: The Plan could directly reference here, as well as in the IDP, the options to replace, upgrade, and/or reinforce the utility infrastructure to support growth.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as utility infrastructure upgrades are subject to change and the IDP is able to be regularly updated ensuring that the latest position can be reflected in planning decisions and that the Plan can be effective. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/013	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy					BFN1.8	Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft.]</p> <p>Detailed Comments Schedule:</p> <p>We suggest that for Strategic Sites, there is a more flexible meanwhile use policy. Limiting meanwhile use to 5years is not appropriate for large, multi-phase sites where land could be used for at least 10 years whilst phased development occurs. This should be allowed to ensure that sites are appropriately used whilst development of early phases occurs. Longer consents for meanwhile uses will also enable more investment in their scale and quality thereby creating opportunities for better outcomes to be achieved. The policy could also clarify that energy performance requirements apply differently to the reuse of existing buildings.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy is already considered flexible enough to be effective. The policy enables longer meanwhile uses where they accord with the Plan's spatial strategy, in particular policies which support the vitality and viability of town centres and employment designations. Allowing meanwhile uses which would not comply with these policies for longer than 5 years risks undermining the delivery of the Plan's key objectives. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the deliverability of meeting BREEAM requirements in all meanwhile projects.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is flexible enough to be deliverable and that there may be circumstances where BREEAM excellent may not be feasible and therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to the implementation text for policy BFN1.8: BFN 1.8 Meanwhile uses must also comply with the Plan’s commitment to tackling the climate emergency, meet BREEAM excellent and consider how temporary new builds can reduce their environmental footprint via Modern Methods of Construction and the potential for reuse of temporary new builds in other locations. An exception to the requirement to meet BREEAM excellent may be made for temporary structures seeking permission for a shorter time period. Where this is allowed, extensions in time are unlikely to be granted to avoid long term poor quality development.</p>
Reg19-E-180	PEACH: The People's Empowerment Alliance for Custom House		Reg19-E-180/017	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Blank	Blank						Blank		<p>In relation to policy BFN1, there should be stronger policy protection of existing greenspaces, over re-providing or creating new green spaces post-development. This protects existing nature and environment, and means the community are not robbed of important outdoor leisure space during redevelopment.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as these requirements are informed by Newham’s Green and Water Infrastructure Strategy which is evidence to inform our policy approach to the borough’s green, water, access to nature, play and growing space needs. It has determined that the overall provision of publicly accessible green space in Newham is low, with a rate of just 0.72 hectares per 1,000 residents, far below neighbouring boroughs. The borough currently also experiences shortfalls in areas for community and food growing and play space. Green space is also unevenly distributed across the borough and residents can have very different experiences when trying to access open space where they live.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-184	Primark Stores Ltd	CBRE	Reg19-E-184/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Yes	Yes						Yes	Draft Policy BNF1 states that: “Development will be directed to all of Newham’s 17 neighbourhoods to distribute the benefits of growth, achieve Community Wealth Building outcomes and create a network of successful and well-connected neighbourhoods. This will be achieved through... supporting incremental change in...East Ham...neighbourhood through the enhancement of each neighbourhoods’ character and the delivery of site allocations. ...Development will meet the retail and leisure needs of residents, workers and visitors by...directing main town centre uses to the borough’s network of Metropolitan, Major, District and Local Centres and supporting their diversification and in some cases expansion....” Primark support the objectives of the Spatial Strategy, in particular the enhancement of the East Ham neighbourhood, and the delivery of site allocations, and meeting the retail needs of the Borough and its residents, workers and visitors. [an extract of the policies map is added in the rep, showing the site allocation in the context of the town centre designation; pg2]		Support noted.
Reg19-E-185	Hadley Property Group	Deloitte	Reg19-E-185/002	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														<i>Building a Fairer Newham</i> Policy BFN1: Spatial Strategy Hadley continues to support the spatial strategy of directing growth to the borough’s neighbourhoods and making the best use of land through optimising development, specifically the inclusion of the Stratford and Maryland neighbourhood as an area where significant levels of growth will be directed. This approach reflects Stratford’s position as a Metropolitan Centre, with the potential to be an International Centre. While Hadley supports LBN taking a strategic view on the provision of social infrastructure within the spatial strategy, given the requirements for the provision of a significant quantum of affordable housing required as part of the Legacy Communities Scheme (LCS) (ref. 11/90621/OUTODA) and the requirement for a school within the RRW LLDC site allocation, a dedicated sports facility cannot feasibility be provided on this constrained site. The Urban Design and Landscape Framework for RRW aims to deliver a target of 750 homes and a secondary school with sixth form. A more detailed response to this is set out below response to the site allocation.		Comment noted. A more detailed response in relation to Rick Roberts Way site allocation has been provided in response to your comments on that site.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-185	Hadley Property Group	Deloitte	Reg19-E-185/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy					BFN1.8									<p>Hadley is encouraged by the supportive stance for meanwhile uses and its inclusion within the spatial strategy. Hadley has an extensive meanwhile use strategy in place for the IQLN site which includes the reuse of a former marketing suite to provide a temporary community centre alongside a temporary community garden, community sauna, café kiosk and construction skills academy. Hadley does, however, suggest that the policy’s supporting text in paragraph BFN1.8 stating that meanwhile uses should last 5 years or fewer and a second temporary permission is rarely justifiable could lead to sites remaining vacant for long periods of time where market conditions have prevented the long-term redevelopment coming forward in the expected time. Hadley suggests additional wording should be added to clarify in which circumstances extensions to temporary permissions for meanwhile uses would be acceptable.</p> <p>Hadley opposes the supporting text stating that meanwhile use applications must meet BREEAM excellent and comply with climate emergency policies. While it is correct that uses with low environmental impact are encouraged, it is considered that these requirements are not appropriate to the scale of meanwhile uses and add unnecessary prerequisites to gaining planning permission for the temporary uses. Meanwhile uses should, in their temporary nature, be able to be dismantled easily and quickly to enable long-term development to commence on site. By their nature, meanwhile uses have a low environmental impact, so adding additional requirements to demonstrate this may result in beneficial meanwhile uses not coming forward.</p>		<p>A change to the policy approach regarding the length of time for meanwhile uses, has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy is already considered flexible enough to be effective. The policy enables longer meanwhile uses where they accord with the Plan's spatial strategy, in particular policies which support the vitality and viability of town centres and employment designations. Allowing meanwhile uses which would not comply with these policies for longer than 5 years risks undermining the delivery of the Plan's key objectives. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>In relation to environmental standards, the Council’s objective for this policy approach is to ensure that all development, including meanwhile development, in the borough is of high quality and makes a contribution to tackling the climate emergency. However, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is flexible enough to be deliverable and that there may be circumstances where BREEAM excellent may not be applicable (i.e. on some uses) or feasible due to the duration of the proposed use and has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to the implementation text for policy BFN1.8: BFN 1.8 Meanwhile uses must also comply with the Plan’s commitment to tackling the climate emergency, meet BREEAM excellent, as and where applicable to the proposed use, and consider how temporary new builds can reduce their environmental footprint via Modern Methods of Construction and the potential for reuse of temporary new builds in other locations. An exception to the requirement to meet BREEAM excellent may be made for temporary structures seeking permission for a shorter time period. Where this is allowed, extensions in time are unlikely to be granted to avoid long term poor quality development.</p>
Reg19-E-191	University College London	Deloitte	Reg19-E-191/002	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			Policy BFN1(1)(a)(iii)											<p>UCL is supportive of the overall aims set out in the spatial strategy. UCL is located within Neighbourhood N8 Stratford and Maryland, and UCL welcomes mention in draft Policy BFN1(1)(a)(iii) that LBN seeks to develop community and growth in Newham by “directing significant levels of growth to...the N8 Stratford and Maryland neighbourhood”, therefore recognising the key role of the area in which UCL East is located.</p>		<p>Support noted.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-191	University College London	Deloitte	Reg19-E-191/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1(4)(c											The Regulation 18 version of the draft Local Plan noted at draft Policy BFN1(4) how “development will meet the retail and leisure needs of residents, workers and visitors by...creating new Local Centres in the N8 Stratford and Maryland” neighbourhood, in addition to other listed neighbourhoods. As noted previously, UCL welcomed the inclusion of ‘N8 Stratford and Maryland’ as a listed new Local Centre, as it felt UCL East would contribute to these Local Centre aims. UCL is therefore disappointed to see that N8 Stratford and Maryland has in the Regulation 19 version been omitted from the areas where new Local Centres will be created, as listed in BFN1(4)(c). It is considered that this feels as odds with draft Policy BFN1 (1)(a)(iii) which, as outlined above, shows support for directing significant levels of growth to this area.		A change to this policy has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the locations of the proposed new local centres are justified through the Retail and Leisure Study (2022) and Town Centre Network Review Methodology papers. For note, there has been no policy change between the regulation 18 and regulation 19 position. The regulation 18 policy simply also included the name of the neighbourhood the site allocations which would deliver new local centres are located in. It was not an additional location. To simplify the policy and for consistency with the rest of the policy clauses, the Neighbourhood descriptors were removed at the regulation 19 stage. The policy is considered sound without this change.
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/012	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.1				Yes							Policy BFN1: Spatial strategy 3.2 St William remains supportive of the spatial strategy outlined in Policy BFN1 which directs development to all of Newham’s 17 neighbourhoods to distribute the benefits of growth (part 1) and to direct significant levels of growth to the six neighbourhoods in the Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area (part 1 (a) (i)) as well as the N7 Three Mills neighbourhood, which forms part of the cross boundary Poplar Riverside Opportunity Area (part 1 (a) (ii)). We consider this to align with the spatial strategy set out in the adopted London Plan, which is welcomed. 3.3 St William note that part 1 (a) (i) refers to growth within the Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area being unlocked by an extension to the DLR and the delivery of two new DLR stations. Whilst this is supported, the N17 Gallions Reach neighbourhood and associated site allocation for Beckton Riverside (N17.SA1) now acknowledges that this area will be transformed into a new neighbourhood either through the delivery of an extended DLR line and new DLR station or a similarly transformative (as confirmed by Transport for London) public transport intervention. 3.4 Whilst incremental change within neighbourhood N13 East Ham is supported in principle to enhance each neighbourhoods’ character and the delivery of site allocations we provide further comments on this specific site allocation later on (part 1 (b)).		This wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as an alternative modification has been made to the Plan to ensure it is up to date with the latest progress on the DLR project. While it was acknowledged at the point of drafting the Regulation 19 Plan, that as the DLR project was developed, other options may need to be considered to ensure best value use of public money, so the policy was changed to reflect this and ensure flexibility to enable deliverability. However, following the publication of the Regulation 19 Local Plan, TfL published the result of their consultation on the Beckton Riverside DLR extension which confirmed the DLR extension was their preferred option. This option is the only transport option now being actively pursued. To reflect this progress in the project, this flexibility is considered to no longer be required and the Council has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration: or a similarly transformative (as confirmed by Transport for London) public transport intervention Your proposed modification to align the spatial strategy with this wording is therefore now considered unnecessary.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/013	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.2				Yes							3.5 St William remains supportive of part 2 of this policy which seeks to ensure development will make the best use of land, optimise sites and deliver sustainable development by applying a design-led approach, supporting tall buildings in the designated Tall Building Zones and conserving the borough's heritage assets and settings is also supported and considered to align with the London Plan.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/014	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.4											3.6 Part 4 of this policy refers to the creation of a new District Centre on N17.SA1 Beckton Riverside site allocation although it should be noted that Policy HS1 also refers to the potential for a new major centre at Beckton Riverside. St William considers that the quantity and scale of uses consistent with a 'District Centre' is more appropriate for the Site.		Comment noted.
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/015a	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.5											3.7 St William is fully supportive of delivering new open space and providing public access to open space on site allocations in line with the requirements of part 5 (e) and (f). [However, with specific reference to site allocation N13.SA3 Former East Ham Gasworks site allocation it must be noted that both the creation of public access to the Metropolitan Open Land and the reprovision of playing pitches are dependent on the decontamination and remediation of the site and necessary enabling development. Further comments are provided on this to site allocation N13.SA3.]		Support for the approach to delivering new open space and providing public access to open space on site allocations is noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/015b	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.5											Appendix 12: General Policies – Suggested amendments	b. new schools on N2.SA1 Silvertown Quays, N2.SA3 Connaught Riverside, N2.SA4 Thameside West, N4.SA4 Royal Road, N8.SA7 Rick Roberts Way and N17.SA1 Beckton Riverside site allocations, subject to a needs based assessment at the time of delivery ; and	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Local Plan is applied in the round.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements for site allocations sets out the need to deliver education uses. The infrastructure requirement section in each of the site allocations duly direct the reader to Local Plan Policy SI4. Policy SI4 clause 1.a sets out that a sufficient supply of primary and secondary schools to meet local need, will be achieved through the delivery of new schools and childcare facilities on identified site allocations, of the scale required to meet the projected need for school places.</p> <p>The implementation text for Policy SI4 goes on to clarify that the planned delivery of primary and secondary schools on site allocations is based on the findings from the pupil forecast (Places for All, London Borough of Newham (2022)). These forecasts identify where facilities are needed based on increased levels of population resulting from residential developments and socio-economic trends.</p> <p>Clause 3 of Policy SI4 seeks to ensure the timely delivery of new education facilities to meet changing pupil place needs. This is clarified in the supporting implementation text. It sets out that the delivery of new education facilities should be flexible in terms of both timescale and design to meet fluctuating pupil place needs. The phasing of education facilities should take place in a timely and coherent manner, delivering the facility at an appropriate phase based on anticipated pupil demand as per the revised pupil forecast. Additionally, the delivery of new education facilities on identified site allocations should provide a long-term option, up to 2038, to bring forward the facility, to allow for changes in the pupil place planning profile.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/015c	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.5											[3.7 St William is fully supportive of delivering new open space and providing public access to open space on site allocations in line with the requirements of part 5 (e) and (f).]However, with specific reference to site allocation N13.SA3 Former East Ham Gasworks site allocation it must be noted that both the creation of public access to the Metropolitan Open Land and the reprovision of playing pitches are dependent on the decontamination and remediation of the site and necessary enabling development. Further comments are provided on this to site allocation N13.SA3.	Appendix 12: General Policies – Suggested amendments e. new open space on the majority of site allocations, with new Local Parks of at least 2ha required on the N2.SA1 Silvertown Quays, N2.SA4 Thameside West, N4.SA4 Limmo, N7.SA1 Abbey Mills, N7.SA2 Twelvetrees Park and Former Bromley By Bow Gasworks and N17.SA1 Beckton Riverside site allocations, the creation of public access to the Metropolitan Open Land at the N13.SA3 Former East Ham Gas Works site allocation and the enhancement of the open space at N10.SA3 Newham Leisure Centre to create a new Local Park; and	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Council’s objective for this policy approach is to improve access to green space. Over the Plan period, Newham’s population is projected to increase by just over 27 per cent. Assuming that publicly accessible green space provision remains the same (i.e. current provision is sustained and no new publicly accessible greenspace sites are added) publicly accessible greenspace in Newham will fall to 0.57 hectares per 1,000 residents in 2038. If Newham is to enjoy the same, or greater, level and quality of provision over the Plan period, we need to deliver more publicly accessible green space. Just to sustain provision at the 2023 standard we will need to create 61 hectares of additional publicly accessible green space. The Local Plan therefore seeks to protect all existing green space (including spaces not designated on the Policies Map), maintain the quality and distribution of spaces; improve accessibility to existing green space and create new space to meet the additional demand from new development. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/015d	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.5											Appendix 12: General Policies – Suggested amendments	i. a new leisure centre on N11.SA1 Beckton Town Centre or N17.SA1 Beckton Riverside, a new sports facility at N8.SA7 Rick Roberts Way, a new leisure centre in the N4 Canning Town neighbourhood and an upgraded and redeveloped Newham Leisure Centre (as part of site allocation N10.SA3), subject to a needs based assessment at the time of delivery .	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Local Plan is applied in the round. The Local Plan site allocations were informed by the Built Leisure Needs Assessment. The development principles section, for each of the site allocations which are required to deliver sporting facilities, duly direct the reader to Local Plan Policies SI2 and SI3. Policy SI3 clause 2 sets out that sufficient supply of sport and recreation facilities will be achieved through the delivery of new or re-provided sport or recreation facilities on identified site allocations, subject to a needs based assessment at the time of delivery. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-200	London City Airport		Reg19-E-200/033	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.7											Under the considerations for new open space, explicit consideration for aviation safeguarding should be included. Minor amendment is recommended to provision BFN1.7 to ensure that aviation safeguarding is considered.	Amend as follows: “BFN1.7 Newham is home to a significant number of strategic utilities and infrastructure facilities – including Beckton Sewage Treatment Works, transport depots, London City Airport , wharves and pylons.”	This wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as BFN1.7 refers to infrastructure and utilities that are necessary to support growth planned for within the Local Plan. It is not considered that the airport meets this criteria. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed change.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-202	The Silvertown Partnership LLP	DP9	Reg19-E-202/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														As with our representations at Regulation 18 Stage, TSP welcomes Draft Policy BFN1 which sets out the Spatial Strategy for the Borough. TSP agrees that a significant amount of growth should be directed to the Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area and fully supports the increase in the homes and jobs targets in this area when compared to the Regulation 18 Local Plan. The revised targets of 36,000 new homes (from 30,000) and 55,000 new jobs (from 41,500) up to 2041 are aligned to the GLA’s Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area Planning Framework (2023) and should be fully supported.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-202	The Silvertown Partnership LLP	DP9	Reg19-E-202/024	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														The draft policy is generally supported, and the hybrid planning application proposals have been developed in line with it. TSP agrees with the principle of development being directed to all of Newham’s 17 neighbourhoods, especially the six neighbourhoods in the Royal Docks.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-206	GLP (Land at Central Thameside West and Former Alnex site)	DP9	Reg19-E-206/01	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														<p>Support the continued designation of the Site as Strategic Industrial Location</p> <p>We welcome the continued approach to direct ‘significant levels of growth’ to the Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area in draft Policy BFN1 (Spatial Strategy) and the specific reference to the creation of 55,000 new jobs, which data centre development will contribute towards.</p> <p>As set out in the representations to the Regulation 18 consultation, the London data centre market has developed as a result of accessibility to key customers and sectors such as financial services, the proximity of fibre optic cables and the presence of skilled labour and businesses. The cluster is now internationally leading, but opportunities for expansion are limited, due to lack of areas with sufficient power supply, that are located near to key business locations, and have appropriate developable space.</p> <p>Following the GLA’s Digital Economy push Newham has prepared a report to support its own digital economy aspirations – titled “Newham Sparks” – which recognises and aims to unlock the value of data to benefit borough residents, including new jobs.</p> <p>Newham Sparks’ research with UCL estimates that the UK data economy could be worth almost 1 trillion by 2035 with over 980,000 data professionals in the UK. This equates to 5,500 new jobs in Newham alongside £104 million GVA in the local economy.</p>		Comment noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-206	GLP (Land at Central Thameside West and Former Alnex site)	DP9	Reg19-E-206/02	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			3(a)											We support the draft Plan’s objective to protect and intensify Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL’s) for “a diverse range of industrial and storage, logistics and distribution and related uses” (draft Policy BFN1(3a)) and the specific reference to digital and high technology uses for SIL.3 (Thameside West) in draft Policy J1.	Furthermore, we consider draft Policy BFN1 should be amended to include specific reference to data centre uses since Newham accept data centres as a wholly acceptable land use within SIL for consistency with Policy J1.	Support noted. However, the proposed wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as such an inclusion would be too detailed for a spatial strategy policy. Our policy is in conformity with the NPPF as the delivery of data and digital growth is already addressed in Policy W4, the Inclusive Economy chapter and relevant Neighbourhood Policies. Data centres are considered an employment use, and proposals will be subject to requirements as set out in the Inclusive Economy chapter, as well as any other relevant policies in the local plan. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-206	GLP (Land at Central Thameside West and Former Alnex site)	DP9	Reg19-E-206/04	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														Furthermore, London Plan Policy E4 recognises data centres in the supporting text (para 6.4.1) as being a use essential to the functioning of London’s economy. Paragraph 84 of the Draft NPPF requires planning policies to “identify strategic sites” for, amongst other things, data centres.		This wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as it is clear that our local plan should proceed based on the December 2023 NPPF following the transitional arrangements outline din the NPPF 2024. Our policy is consistent with the NPPF and in conformity with the London Plan as the delivery of data and digital growth is already addressed in Policy W4, the Inclusive Economy chapter and relevant Neighbourhood Policies. Data centres are considered an employment use, and proposals will be subject to requirements as set out in the Inclusive Economy chapter, as well as any other relevant policies in the local plan. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-206	GLP (Land at Central Thameside West and Former Alnex site)	DP9	Reg19-E-206/05	Inclusive Economy	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			3			No	No							Recommendation 1: Amend Policy BFN1(3a) to include reference to data centre uses specifically for the GLP site and for Policy J1(2a) to confirm that data centre uses fall within Use Class B8.	Suggested track changes to policies: BFN1: 3. Development will create new jobs and deliver a modern, greener and inclusive economy by: a. protecting and intensifying the borough’s Strategic Industrial Locations and Local Industrial Locations for a diverse range of industrial and storage, data centre , logistics and distribution and related uses	This wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as while data centres are currently widely accepted as Use Class B8, its use class classification is subject to wider scrutiny and may change over the plan period. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-218	IXDS	RPS	Reg19-E-218/001	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			3			Yes	No				No		Yes	<p>To ensure consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023) paragraphs 85, 86 and 87 and draft NPPF (2024) paragraphs 83, 84 and 85), the requirements of London Plan Policy SI6 and to reflect and recognise the ‘Critical National Infrastructure’ (CNI) classification that now applies to data centres in the UK (as per the press release [see hyperlink in representation form] from the Department for Science, Innovation and Technology on the 12th September 2024), digital infrastructure should benefit from being explicitly referenced and suitably emphasised within this policy to reflect the significant, overarching emphasis on the local, national and regional importance of such infrastructure, including data centres. This will ensure that the digital and data economy is properly planned for and that the importance of such infrastructure is afforded appropriate weight in the determination of planning applications.</p>	<p>”BFN1: Spatial Strategy ...</p> <p>3. Development will create new jobs and deliver a modern, greener and inclusive economy by:</p> <p>a. Protecting and intensifying the borough’s Strategic Industrial Locations and Local Industrial Locations for a diverse range of industrial and storage, logistics and distribution, digital and data and related uses; and</p> <p>b. directing employment and employment-led mixed-use development to the borough’s Local Mixed-Use Areas to deliver light industrial, small-scale office and workspace, digital and data development; and</p> <p>c. protecting and supporting low-cost workspace in the borough’s Micro Business Opportunity Areas; and. directing major office floorspace to Stratford Metropolitan Centre and smaller-scale offices to the Major and District Centres; and</p> <p>e. requiring new employment floorspace on identified site allocations; and</p> <p>f. supporting the location of industrial uses on out-of-centre retail and leisure parks; and</p> <p>g. supporting new workspaces in locations which complete a gap in the network of well-connected employment uses.</p> <p>4. Development will meet the retail and leisure needs of residents, workers and visitors by</p> <p>a. Directing main town centre uses to the borough’s network of Metropolitan, Major, District and Local Centres and supporting their diversification and in some cases expansion; and</p> <p>b. creating a new District Centre on N17.SA1 Beckton Riverside site allocation; and</p> <p>c. creating new Local Centres on N2.SA3 Connaught Riverside, N2.SA4 Thameside West, N7.SA2 Twelvetreets Park and Former Bromley By Bow Gasworks, N7.SA3 Sugar House Island and N8.SA9 Pudding Mill; and</p> <p>d. creating expanded Local Centres on N1.SA2 Rymill Street, N2.SA1 Silvertown Quays and N9.SA1 Plaistow North; and</p> <p>e. protecting and expanding the borough’s network of Neighbourhood Parades to ensure the delivery of a network of well connected neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>The wording change regarding digital and data use/development is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as this policy reflects Newham's spatial strategy to prioritise borough's most in needed industrial floorspace in Strategic Industrial Locations, Local Industrial Locations and Local Mixed Use Areas, while smaller scale office and workspace in Local Mixed Use Areas to support our local economy as informed by our Employment Land Review 2022. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>The need for clarification of the terminology 'employment-led' development is noted. This has been rectified by adding the following wording to Policy J1 and the Glossary:</p> <p>J1 Implementation Text: Employment-led development is required to first meet employment needs (including the viable operation of employment uses on the site and where relevant, adjacent sites) in any design, and then other uses such as residential can be fitted around it. Employment-led development can consist of employment only development but must still demonstrate that the employment needs at the site are being met.</p> <p>Glossary: Employment-led development: Employment-led development requires schemes to first meet employment needs (including the viable operation of employment generating uses on the site and where relevant, adjacent sites) in any design, and then other uses such as residential to be fitted around it. Employment-led development can consist of employment only development but must still demonstrate that the employment needs at the site are being met. which is included in the modification table.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-218	IXDS	RPS	Reg19-E-218/002	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy	N4.S A5 Canning Town Riverside					Yes	No				No		Yes	To ensure consistency with the draft NPPF (2024) (paragraphs 84 and 85), land for data centres should be identified (or safeguarded) through spatial designations within the Local Plan. As part of this, the Mayer Parry Wharf site (comprising the northern part of the N4.SA5 draft Canning Town Riverside Site Allocation which is the subject of planning application reference 24/00088/FUL for a data centre development) should be explicitly safeguarded in the Local Plan for digital and data economy uses and needs to benefit from appropriate policy requirements to guide this form of development which is seen as a catalyst and gateway development. The same should apply to the Former Paint Factory and Central Thameside West site where a data centre development was approved under planning application reference 23/01697/OUT.	"BFN1: Spatial Strategy ...] 5. Development that supports the delivery of Critical National Infrastructure, including the delivery of digital and data infrastructure, will be supported. This includes the delivery of: a. a new data centre facility on Site Allocation N4.SA5 Canning Town Riverside; and b. a new data centre facility at the Former Paint Factory and Central Thameside West site.	This wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as no specific uses or developments are referenced in this policy. Our policy is in conformity with the NPPF as the delivery of data and digital growth is already addressed in Local Plan Policy W4, the Inclusive Economy chapter and relevant Neighbourhood Policies. Data centres are considered an employment use, and proposals will be subject to requirements as set out in the Inclusive Economy chapter, as well as any other relevant policies in the local plan. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-218	IXDS	RPS	Reg19-E-218/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy	N2.S A4 Thameside West		5			Yes	No						Yes	[To ensure consistency with the draft NPPF (2024) (paragraphs 84 and 85), land for data centres should be identified (or safeguarded) through spatial designations within the Local Plan. As part of this, the Mayer Parry Wharf site (comprising the northern part of the N4.SA5 draft Canning Town Riverside Site Allocation which is the subject of planning application reference 24/00088/FUL for a data centre development) should be explicitly safeguarded in the Local Plan for digital and data economy uses and needs to benefit from appropriate policy requirements to guide this form of development which is seen as a catalyst and gateway development.] The same should apply to the Former Paint Factory and Central Thameside West site where a data centre development was approved under planning application reference 23/01697/OUT.	"BFN1: Spatial Strategy ...] 5. Development that supports the delivery of Critical National Infrastructure, including the delivery of digital and data infrastructure, will be supported. This includes the delivery of: a. a new data centre facility on Site Allocation N4.SA5 Canning Town Riverside; and b. a new data centre facility at the Former Paint Factory and Central Thameside West site.	This wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as such an inclusion would be too detailed for a spatial strategy policy. Our policy is in conformity with the NPPF as the delivery of data and digital growth is already addressed in Local Plan Policy W4, the Inclusive Economy chapter and relevant Neighbourhood Policies. Data centres are considered an employment use, and proposals will be subject to requirements as set out in the Inclusive Economy chapter, as well as any other relevant policies in the local plan. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-218	IXDS	RPS	Reg19-E-218/004	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			3.b			Yes	No						Yes	To ensure that Local Mixed Use Areas (LMUAs) are clearly identified as being suitable for development comprised solely of employment uses, Part 3.b. of Policy BFN1 should specify that both solely employment and employment-led mixed use developments can be directed to LMUAs. This is discussed in more detail in representations made by IXDS Ltd in relation to Policy J1 (Employment and Growth).		<p>The need for clarification of the terminology 'employment-led' development is noted. This has been rectified by adding the following wording to Local Plan Policy J1 and the Glossary:</p> <p>J1 Implementation Text: Employment-led development is required to first meet employment needs (including the viable operation of employment uses on the site and where relevant, adjacent sites) in any design, and then other uses such as residential can be fitted around it. Employment-led development can consist of employment only development but must still demonstrate that the employment needs at the site are being met.</p> <p>Glossary: Employment-led development: Employment-led development requires schemes to first meet employment needs (including the viable operation of employment generating uses on the site and where relevant, adjacent sites) in any design, and then other uses such as residential to be fitted around it. Employment-led development can consist of employment only development but must still demonstrate that the employment needs at the site are being met. which is included in the modification table.</p>
Reg19-E-218	IXDS	RPS	Reg19-E-218/005	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			5			Yes	No						Yes		"BFN1: Spatial Strategy ...] 5-6. Development will protect and enhance existing parks and social infrastructure and support the creation of new parks and social infrastructure by requiring the delivery of: ..."	This wording change is not needed as the proposed wording change which would result in new numbering is not considered necessary for soundness. Please see response to Reg19-E-218.
Reg19-E-222	Ballymore	Rolfe Judd	Reg19-E-222/03	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														Building a Fairer Newham Policy BFN1: Spatial Strategy As previously noted during the Regulation 18 representations, we support the recognition that the Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area is able to support significant levels of growth, with the potential to deliver a significant number of new homes and jobs. We note that the Regulation 19 plan is now reflective of the adopted version of the Royal Docks OAPF (as opposed to the previous draft) published by the Mayor of London on 25th March 2023 in terms of the capacity of the Opportunity Area, which appears consistent across the policy levels (i.e. OAPF figures include 36,300 new homes and 55,700 new jobs, whilst the Regulation 19 plan notes 36,000 new homes and 55,000 new jobs up to 2041). The Regulation 18 plan contained misalignment with the OAPF in terms of these figures – we support the updated information and reference to the adopted framework.		Support noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-225	London Borough of Greenwich		Reg19-E-225/005	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy						Blank	Blank							Beckton Riverside, DLR extension and Thamesmead 1.11 Paragraph 1.3 identifies that Newham contains three Opportunity Areas: the Olympic Legacy, Poplar Riverside and Royal Docks and Beckton. Paragraph i.13 of the consultation document notes that in May 2023 the Mayor of London published the Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) as London Plan guidance. BFN1 directs significant levels of growth to the six neighbourhoods in the Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area, noting that this area has the potential to deliver 36,000 new homes and 55,000 new jobs up to 2041, subject to this growth being unlocked by an extension to the DLR and the delivery of two new DLR stations. The London Plan details the indicative capacity for new homes and jobs within the Royal Docks and Beckton Riverside Opportunity Area as 30,000 and 41,500 respectively.		Comment noted.
Reg19-E-229	Dominus Stratford Limited	Knight Frank	Reg19-E-229/007	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.1											Draft Policy BFN1: Spatial Strategy Policy BFN1 sets out the Borough’s spatial strategy for meeting identified needs for new homes and jobs. The identification of Stratford and Maryland (Neighbourhood 8) as a location for directing significant levels of growth by BFN1 Part 1 a iii) is understood and supported; however, we question why this part of the policy does not identify an indicative number of new homes and jobs to be located there as per Parts a) i) and ii). The identification of a potential number of new homes and jobs will drive development towards measurable goals and therefore this should be added to the policy	To improve this policy we would like to see minimum targets installed into the policy wording, and phrases like “the council will seek to exceed...” or “as a minimum, the council will seek to deliver...” This would help the policy to be clear to its expectations and be drafted in a positive and pro-growth way.	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the inclusion of figures in parts ai) and ii) reflect adopted OA targets. The boundary of Stratford and Maryland neighbourhood does not fully align with the Olympic Legacy opportunity area and therefore deriving a figure for this area would not be evidenced. The Plan as a whole is positively prepared with targets set for different land uses in other policies. In addition, the site allocations include design principles for how sites should be optimised for housing as well as requirements for different types of use. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-229	Dominus Stratford Limited	Knight Frank	Reg19-E-229/008	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														Overall, we support the policy’s ambition (see BFN1 Part 2) to make the best use of land, optimise sites and deliver sustainable development in accordance with the London Plan (2021) by applying the design-led approach; identifying tall buildings zones; conserving and enhancing the borough’s heritage assets and settings; and delivering zero carbon, climate resilient and nature-friendly developments. This reflects our Client’s ambition at 302-312 Stratford High Street which would significantly contribute towards the goals of the Local Plan.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-229	Dominus Stratford Limited	Knight Frank	Reg19-E-229/009	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.2											It would also be a helpful addition to encourage growth if BFN1 Part 2 made clear its intention to support the approach in the London Plan, whereby all areas in London within 800m of a train station, or boundary of a town centre, or within PTALs 3-6 will be considered appropriate locations for residential development.		A change in this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as in conformity with the London Plan 2021 policies BFN1.1 and BFN1.2, D3 and H1, supported by the neighbourhood policies and site allocations, ensures that housing delivery in sustainable locations, where not required for other priority uses, is supported in the Plan. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed change.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-229	Dominus Stratford Limited	Knight Frank	Reg19-E-229/010	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.2											BFN1 Part 2 could also be improved by explicitly acknowledging the benefits of mixed use and mixed tenure developments. Para 69 of the draft NPPF encourages mixed tenure developments, specifically in the context of residential development. More broadly, mixed use development as supported by London Plan Policies GG2, SD1 and H1 should be encouraged as this is an essential way of optimising the use of land in sustainable locations.		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as there are a range of policies in the Plan which explicitly support mixed use development in appropriate locations and policy H4 supports mixed tenure developments. As the Plan should be read as a whole, it is not considered necessary to make this addition to BFN1. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed change.
Reg19-E-229	Dominus Stratford Limited	Knight Frank	Reg19-E-229/011	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														It would also be useful and positive to clarify that the term “residential” includes all forms of residential formats such as PBSA, co-living, Build to Rent, later living, and so on. As acknowledged in the London Plan at para 4.1.9 PBSA contributes towards housing supply on a 2.5:1 basis, and co-living contributes on a similar 1.8:1 basis. Such housing types are essential to the successful functioning of the London Housing Market and should be encouraged. Given that the Newham Strategic Housing Market Assessment (June 2022) identifies a significant need for PBSA to be delivered over the plan period, it is important that this need is recognised through the policies and sub-text of the Local Plan.		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the plan is effective. The site allocations only identify the priority land use needs, namely the need to deliver general needs housing as reflected in Policy H1.3. The wording of the site allocation would not preclude housing other than general needs housing being delivered; however, the acceptability of these types of housing on site allocations will be dependent on whether they meet the policy requirements set out in the relevant Local Plan policies. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.

Reg19-E-233	RAD CHP Ltd	CBRE	Reg19-E-233/004	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy							Blank	No		No			Blank	<p>Draft Policy BFN1: Spatial Strategy [and HS1: Newham’s Town Centres]</p> <p>The Spatial Strategy (part 4) states that: “Development will meet the retail and leisure needs of residents, workers and visitors by a. Directing main town centre uses to the borough’s network of Metropolitan, Major, District and Local Centres and supporting their diversification and in some cases expansion; and b. creating a new District Centre on N17.SA1 Beckton Riverside site allocation; and c. creating new Local Centres on N2.SA3 Connaught Riverside, N2.SA4 Thameside West, N7.SA2 Twelvetrees Park and Former Bromley By Bow Gasworks, N7.SA3 Sugar House Island and N8.SA9 Pudding Mill; and d. creating expanded Local Centres on N1.SA2 Rymill Street, N2.SA1 Silvertown Quays and N9.SA1 Plaistow North; and e. protecting and expanding the borough’s network of Neighbourhood Parades to ensure the delivery of a network of well-connected neighbourhoods”.</p> <p>During discussions with LB Newham Planning and Policy Officers, RAD CHP Ltd. has been met with significant resistance to the proposed provision of active, ground floor, public-facing Class E units within the Phase 1 buildings at RAD, despite the already consented provision as a result of the historic ABP planning hybrid permission, which permitted circa. 5,000 sq.m GEA of retail and leisure space in detail, and 10,000 sq.m GEA in outline.</p> <p>There are currently very limited convenience facilities in the site vicinity, for example chemists, food/convenience stores. All exceed 15 minutes-walk from the site (and 400m catchment). Those to the south are across the marina so not accessible. [Figure 1] below shows the existing facilities available.</p> <p>The RAD site is not within the catchment for any designated existing District, Local or Town centre. The nearest existing designated centres to the site are East Beckton District Centre (which has an Asda, a Lidl and small comparison retail) and East Ham Manor Way Local Shopping Parade (LSP10) to the east of the Site (which contains a Fish Bar, Off Licence and Pharmacy). The site is outside of the catchment (400m) of these centres and the Shopping Parade is very limited in its offering.</p> <p>The Regulation 19 Local Plan Policies Map includes a new ‘Neighbourhood Parade’, at the eastern edge of the RAD Phase 1 site. [Figure 2] below shows the draft Policies Map extract for the site vicinity and [Figure 3] shows the site allocation outlined in red specifically, and its proposed ‘Neighbourhood Parade’.</p> <p>Whilst RAD CHP Ltd. support the modest new ‘Neighbourhood Parade’ that is proposed, this alone will not meet the need of the future population intended to occupy this strategic, opportunity area site. It is not proportionate to the quantum of residential and commercial development intended to come forward on the RAD site and wider</p>	<p>The Councils objective for the Royal Albert Quay Neighbourhood Parade designation is to address a known gap in the network. The location and scale of this designation is supported by the methodology and assessment undertaken in the Town Centre Network Review Methodology Paper Update 2024.</p> <p>The parade was delivered as part of the first phase of development on the Royal Albert North site allocation, and remains significantly vacant. Therefore, the Council does not consider there is evidence to support delivery of a larger scale designation at this location.</p> <p>However, policy HS1 intends to provide further flexibility in meeting needs in areas not within 400m radius of an existing or planned town or local centre or neighbourhood parade, by allowing for the masterplanned delivery of small scale frontages serving localised need. The Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear in its intended application, and has therefore made the following wording change to policy HS1.1 and its respective implementation text, which are included in the modifications table.</p> <p>HS1.1.1. [...]The network will be managed and supported to service the needs of residents, workers and visitors, and includes: [...] f. The creation of new small scale frontages serving localised need including new Neighbourhood Parades at N17.SA1 Beckton Riverside, N2.SA2 Lyle Park West and N8.SA3 Greater Carpenters District; and g. The creation of new small scale frontages serving localised need in areas not within 400m radius of an existing or planned town or local centre or neighbourhood parade.</p> <p>[HS1.1 Implementation] New Small scale shopping frontages It is not possible to fully address all 400m catchment gaps in the network at this time due to lack of available, suitable and deliverable sites. To provide additional flexibility to address this through windfall sites, the policy allows for small scale shopping frontages to be delivered, of a similar function to the designated neighbourhood parades, and which will be considered towards designation as a neighbourhood parade as part of future reviews of the Local Plan.</p> <p>In determining if a proposed new un-designated shopping small scale frontage is appropriate, the applicant should submit a gap analysis to demonstrate: • Proximity criteria: A 400 metre radius around the proposed shopping small scale frontage overlaps by less than 50 per cent with any other 400 metre radius of a designated area in the network (existing and future). The radius is measured from the perimeter of the proposed shopping small scale frontage and the boundary of relevant designated parts of Newham’s High Streets network. And • Network density criteria: The proposed shopping small scale frontage location helps achieve the aspiration for at least two high street destinations within a 15 minute</p>
-------------	-------------	------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------	----	--	----	--	--	-------	--	--

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
																			<p>allocation, which is linear and extends a significant way westwards (beyond 400m).</p> <p>There is potential for almost 2,000 workers under office employment densities for the existing eastern linear blocks within Phase 1 alone (alongside the 628 student rooms with Resolution to Grant).</p> <p>If the Neighbourhood Parade is the only portion of the strategic site specifically designated for town centre uses, it needs to be recognised and clearly expressed within the emerging Site Allocation that whilst this parade is a focus, town centre uses will not be precluded across the wider allocation and a masterplan-led approach will be taken to the mix of land uses.</p> <p>Draft Policy HS1 states that “all homes” in Newham should be within a maximum 400m radius of at least one designated centre or parade, or be within a 15 minute walking distance of at least two designated centres or parades. This statement substantiates the need for a masterplan-led approach to provision of retail, services and community uses at RAD, beyond the proposed designated Neighbourhood Parade, provided they are demonstrated to not result in significant impact on existing trade draw patterns.</p> <p>The completed RAD Phase 1 development and the wider future masterplan requires an element of retail, restaurants and other such uses to create a successful place with facilities that can serve the future residents, students and workers on the site as well as the wider surrounding area where there is a gap in provision. There will be opportunities for such facilities to open out into the public realm and along the waterside and this should be utilized and encouraged within the completed development and the future masterplan. Limiting the ground floor active uses to the envisaged Neighbourhood Parade would be detrimental to achieving the masterplan objectives and creating a sense of place across the wider site.</p> <p>We therefore consider that as drafted, this element of the emerging Local Plan is unsound, and unjustified. We cannot see a sufficient evidence base to justify the scale of the Neighbourhood Parade or its location in the strategic site. If policy officers continue to resist any active ground floor uses outside of the Neighbourhood Parade, the convenience needs of the incoming population will be unmet.</p>		<p>walking area. This should reflect a detailed understanding of the actual walking conditions for a range of different users) of the site (e.g. accessibility conditions for people with movement impairments, women-friendly routes). The most accessible area should be chosen, accounting for any proposed enhancements as part of the development or known programmed Highways works.</p> <p>In limited circumstances where site allocations are expected to deliver new centres/parades, the above criteria may be used to justify the split of the provision of retail and leisure uses across parts of the site, thereby generating one or more new shopping small scale frontages alongside the necessary centre/parade. A clear justification will be required for the benefits of this approach compared to clustering of uses in the centre designation only, and should not result in additional retail or leisure floorspace being provided on site (i.e. the cumulative site-wide quantity is justified by local catchment need, through the Impact Assessment). Further expansion of main town centre use floorspace for ground floor frontage activation will normally not be supported.</p> <p>Where acceptable in principle, new small scale frontages should also meet the criteria set out in part 4 of this Policy. The Newham Characterisation Study (2024) Borough-wide Design Principles chapter includes further design recommendations (primarily under section 9.2.1 ‘Provide Local Uses That Support 15 Minute Neighbourhoods’) that should be imbedded in the design brief when new shopping small scale frontages are proposed.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-238	Environment Agency		Reg19-E-238/009	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														BFN1: Spatial strategy We are pleased to see that the plan now makes references to the declared climate emergency in the implementation section. We are also pleased to see that the importance of development to be net zero, designed to mitigate the impacts of a changing climate and deliver spaces for biodiversity is recognised. Recognising the importance of these matters should help the council tackle the twin challenges of the climate change and biodiversity emergencies. It is also good to see that these matters are now covered by policy in this section of the local plan.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-238	Environment Agency		Reg19-E-238/010	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy			BFN1.7											In our Reg 18 response we recommend this policy is strengthened to encourage the improvement of essential infrastructure, and not just protection. We are pleased to see that Point 7 of this policy has been amended so that development is now required to not only protect but to also support improvements to the borough's strategic and utilities infrastructure.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-238	Environment Agency		Reg19-E-238/011	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy					BFN1.1									The Implementation section from BFN1.1. refers to development being required to comply with 'site specific development and design principles'. We previously recommended that the LPA clarifies what this means and recommended that this is anchored to the Local Plan's design policies, and the London Plan's design guidance (in reference implementation section D1.1.). We can see that the council has provided clarity on this matter and anchored it onto the Plan's site allocations. This makes it even more important to incorporate design principles which protect and enhance the environment in the site allocations. Please see attached Excel sheet which contains a list of aspirational ecological improvements (known as mitigation measures) for the Tidal Thames along the banks through the London Borough of Newham [Attachment [LB Newham Tidal MMs]] . In addition to this we have included further comments in the site allocations section of this response.		Comment noted. This comment has been subject to further discussion with Environment Agency and a satisfactory resolution has been found. This is set out in more detail in a Statement of Common Ground, included in the updated Duty to Cooperate Report. We did not consider this change to be necessary as unfortunately the list of aspirational ecological improvements for the Tidal Thames were provided to us too late to add this into the site allocations, as the list has not been part of an adopted document that has been consulted upon, so is untested. The council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-240	West Ham United Football Club	PMV Planning	Reg19-E-240/007	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN1 Spatial Strategy														WHUFC would welcome discussions with the Council about [...] and how development could be delivered whilst supporting the identified Spatial Strategy (Policy BFN1) and the aspirations for the Stratford and Maryland neighbourhood supported by a redesigned Stratford Station.		Comment noted. The Council did try to meet with you in Summer 2023, but this opportunity was not taken up.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-C-002	Ronnie Ray		Reg19-C-002/001	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning						No	No						No	The Carpenters Newham ballot excluded private tenants and landowners, but gave representation to residents of affordable housing who were leaving the area. According to BFN2.2, landowners needed to be involved in the ballot and the planning process. We were not. Furthermore, private resident tenants are allowed to participate in General Elections, but not in this ballot.	Perform a new ballot to include all stakeholders including landowners and private tenants, and exclude residents of affordable housing who are leaving the area.	As you have identified, the Local Plan addresses the need for resident involvement in planning applications in policy BFN2. However it cannot deliver the change you have requested. Resident ballots are a requirement made by the GLA when they fund estate regeneration schemes. It is not linked to the planning process. Further information regarding ballots are available here: https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/housing-and-land/homes-londoners/estate-regeneration
Reg19-C-002	Ronnie Ray		Reg19-C-002/002	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning						Yes	No						No	In BFN2 it states that low rise apartments should be built on carpenters estate. It would It would be cheaper and preserve the neighbourhood if existing properties are upgraded instead. The Carpenters estate ballot excluded landowners who should have been involved in shaping the Local plan according to BFN2.2. The ballot should have included resident private tenants who are eligible to vote in General Elections. It should not have involved tenants of affordable housing who are in the process of vacating the area.	Re-do the Carpenters Estate ballot.	As you have identified, the Local Plan addresses the need for resident involvement in planning applications in policy BFN2. However it cannot deliver the change you have requested. Resident ballots are a requirement made by the GLA when they fund estate regeneration schemes. It is not linked to the planning process. Further information regarding ballots are available here: https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/housing-and-land/homes-londoners/estate-regeneration
Reg19-C-023	Bob Sharples		Reg19-C-023/002	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning						Yes	Yes						No	Sport England is pleased to see that LBN is promoting Active Design in BNF2.3		Support noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response	
Reg19-E-007	David Gilles		Reg19-E-007/007	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.3			Blank	Blank							Blank	Comments on the Text of the R19D 6 BFN 2.3 P35 says “Ensuring that developments meet the needs of and do not exclude or displace existing, and especially disadvantaged, local communities is also key to achieving this objective”. This is an improved text could usefully be amplified with a statement at an appropriate point to the effect that this is not so much about community facilities, but eg the Council using its own powers, as well as resources such as money land and buildings, to provide and support the provision of services and facilities for existing disadvantaged communities and leverage in that support from third parties		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as it is not considered that the wording currently suggests this is linked to community facilities. The proposed wording also references the wider work of the Council, which while vital in shaping the Local Plan, is not the primary purpose of the Local Plan. Other Council documents will provide details on how the Council delivers an inclusive borough. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding an insufficient consideration of whole life carbon.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises that while this is not a new policy requirement in the Plan, it is important to ensure the Plan is clear and that this could usefully be highlighted as a masterplanning consideration. As such we consider the implementation text of this policy could usefully reference whole life carbon considerations and a consideration of retrofit and has therefore made the following wording change: Masterplans should consider how a changing climate will be managed within their development, such as through layouts to reduce overheating, provisions of cool zones, sustainable urban drainage systems and/or flood prevention measures. In addition, whole life carbon considerations should be factored into masterplanning, by considering the possibility for, and benefits of, retrofitting existing buildings and the reuse of any existing materials on site. which is included in the modification table.</p>
Reg19-E-013	Transport for London		Reg19-E-013/011	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning					BFN2.2									We welcome the new wording in the implementation text of BFN2.2.		Support noted.	
Reg19-E-024	Home Builders Federation		Reg19-E-024/005	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			2.f				No							BFN2: Co-designed masterplanning Part 2 f) is unsound because it is contrary to national policy. Part 2 f) expects biodiversity net gain (BNG) to be provider on-site. National policy does allow the requirement to be provided off-site, if necessary.	The Council should amend the policy to allow this. Providing BNG offsite can help contribute to more cohesive local nature recovery strategies.	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as clause 4 of policy GWS3 clearly sets out the hierarchy which should be applied to the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The hierarchy includes the delivery of BNG off-site. This policy is supported by Natural England. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.	

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-024	Home Builders Federation		Reg19-E-024/006	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			5				No							<p>Part 5 is unsound because it is unjustified.</p> <p>Part 5 requires applicants on all allocations to undertake post-occupancy surveys. This is very difficult to achieve as most traditional housebuilders no longer retain any interest in a site once it has been constructed and dwellings sold. Also, it is unclear what would happen if the applicant was unable to secure a minimum 40 per cent response. Housebuilders cannot force residents to respond, and rightly so.</p>		<p>The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to provide a useful tool in monitoring how successful the Plan has been at delivering its objectives. As such ensuring a robust methodology and response rate is key. It is noted that the standard response rate required for travel plan surveys is 30% and that recent GLA examples have a response rate of 50%. In relation to the concern regarding the ability of 'traditional housebuilders' to meet such a requirement as they may not retain an interest in a site post completion, it is considered that the longstanding success of travel plan surveying (required up to 5 years post completion) demonstrates that there is no substance to this concern.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises that this may not be possible in all circumstances and indeed that some developments may require a large sample size to ensure statistical significance. As such the following wording change is proposed: Surveys should be completed more than 12 months and less than 24 months after full occupancy of the phase. It is expected that the survey should be conducted by an independent third party and achieve a proportionate response rate have a response rate of at least 40 per cent to ensure sufficient data quality and anonymity.</p> <p>which is included in the modification table.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-045	Beckton Developme nt Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-045/018	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterpl anning														<p>We note that in relation to draft Policy BFN2 (Co-designed masterplanning), in comparison to adopted Policy S1 (Spatial Strategy and Strategic Framework) there is the introduction of delivering sustainable travel connections as well as exploring how biodiversity net gain can be delivered on site. Of particular relevance is the policy resistance towards ‘piecemeal delivery’ of sites, found in paragraph 1 of Policy BFN2: “Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.”</p> <p>Whilst our client advocates for a collaborative redevelopment programme, it is considered that in order for the most viable and appropriate development schemes to come forward, there should be an allowance of flexibility in piecemeal delivery.</p> <p>In the case of the Site at Beckton Arms a standalone application will be required. Co-designing and masterplanning Canning Town will be complex in nature owing to the different land owners/stakeholders. As part of the formal pre-application written response received from LBN dated 30th July 2024, states that the proposed scheme should include “engagement with surrounding land owners to demonstrate a comprehensive approach to development across the Strategic Site”. In the context of the draft local plan, engagement with the surrounding landowners can take place without the need for ‘piecemeal delivery’ as suggested. Successful collaboration can occur through multiple standalone applications.</p>	<p>As such, we recommend the policy is amended as follows: "Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively where possible. Piecemeal delivery will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure. Standalone application will be considered acceptable where engagement with surrounding land owners has taken place to demonstrate a comprehensive approach to the development within the context of the Strategic Site allocation."We believe that greater flexibility should be awarded to the wording of this part of the policy allowing for a more flexible approach to be taken towards piecemeal delivery. This will ensure there is sufficient flexibility and that the Site is deliverable, and would therefore be effective</p>	<p>The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to ensure coordination, prevent developments from prejudicing each other and secure the optimum use of land. The objective and broad policy wording are retained from the current adopted policy S1. This policy is regularly used in pre-application discussions and development management decisions to secure the delivery of key Plan objectives. It does not prevent parcels of land owned by different landowners coming forward for development on their own timescales.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and has therefore made the following wording change to policy BFN2 and it's implementation text: 1. Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery development will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p> <p>Implementation text BFN2.1 Developments of all scales should be designed and developed comprehensively. Masterplanning enables this by establishing an agreed site or scheme design which considers an optimum approach to address all the factors outlined in part 2.</p> <p>For small sites (developments of under 0.25 ha), it is expected that when multiple small sites form part of an applicant’s pipeline and are due to be developed in close proximity to each other and within a similar timeframe, these should be considered comprehensively. Submission documents should demonstrate a coherent design, amenity and delivery strategy. This is particularly the case when undertaking multiple infills on a single housing estate.</p> <p>For major applications and site allocations, compliance with this part of the policy will, in part, be demonstrated by a successful masterplan which delivers against the criteria in parts 2 and 3, including how this relates to any proposed phasing of the site. Where relevant, sites should be supported by a realistic phasing plan.</p> <p>Which is included in the modification table.</p>

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																					
Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-045	Beckton Developme nt Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-045/021	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.2											Paragraph 2 of Policy BFN2 states that “All Major Applications and applications on site allocations must undertake co-designed site masterplanning”. We consider the wording of this policy would lessen the importance of individual sites design considerations based upon a proposals design merits	A such, we request the following change to be made to Policy BFN2 (the additions are show underlined): "Where appropriate, All Major Applications and applications on site allocations must undertake co-designedsite masterplanning"Making this change would provide flexibility and it will ensure that the draft Local Plan and site allocation can be effective in its delivery.	<p>The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to ensure coordination, prevent developments from prejudicing each other and secure the optimum use of land. The objective and broad policy wording are retained from the current adopted policy S1. This policy is regularly used in pre-application discussions and development management decisions to secure the delivery of key Plan objectives. It does not prevent parcels of land owned by different landowners coming forward for development on their own timescales.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and has therefore made the following wording change to policy BFN2 and it's implementation text: 1. Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery development will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p> <p>Implementation text BFN2.1 Developments of all scales should be designed and developed comprehensively. Masterplanning enables this by establishing an agreed site or scheme design which considers an optimum approach to address all the factors outlined in part 2.</p> <p>For small sites (developments of under 0.25 ha), it is expected that when multiple small sites form part of an applicant’s pipeline and are due to be developed in close proximity to each other and within a similar timeframe, these should be considered comprehensively. Submission documents should demonstrate a coherent design, amenity and delivery strategy. This is particularly the case when undertaking multiple infills on a single housing estate.</p> <p>For major applications and site allocations, compliance with this part of the policy will, in part, be demonstrated by a successful masterplan which delivers against the criteria in parts 2 and 3, including how this relates to any proposed phasing of the site. Where relevant, sites should be supported by a realistic phasing plan.</p> <p>Which is included in the modification table.</p>
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/034	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.1											Support and recognise the importance of comprehensive masterplanning.		Support noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/035	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.2											Whilst the desire to engage with the varied social groups within the borough is recognised and supported, we Object to this policy as currently worded, which remains too broad within its requirements, does not set out how co-designed masterplanning will work in practice, particularly for larger sites and how this is evidenced as part of the application process	Suggested change to wording: 2. All major applications and applications on site allocations must engage with undertake co-designed site Masterplanning as underpinned by the engagement principles contained within the Newham Statement of Community Involvement. 3) Masterplanning must consider all of the following: a. how the required land uses and infrastructure provision on the site will be delivered. (Cont.)	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the reference to the Statement of Community Involvement is already made in the implementation text. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/036	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.3											Support the desire for masterplans to provide for social interaction, mixed, balanced, and stable communities, and young people, and to demonstrate Community Wealth building.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/037	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.3											Object to the policy as currently worded with a lack of clarity to explain how these aims will be evidenced within the application process. The policy also requires clarity as to the size of scheme for which its requirements apply.	Suggested change to wording: 3. All masterplans major applications and applications on site allocations should demonstrate how the site will support the delivery of all of the following objectives: a. increased opportunities for social interaction through the provision of community space. b. mixed, balanced, and stable communities through incorporating an appropriate range of tenures and sizes of homes c. environments which support good physical and mental health through the provision of well-designed homes and outdoor spaces. d. spaces young people can thrive in. e. zero carbon, climate resilient neighbourhoods. f. Inclusive design, with buildings and public spaces whose use and design reflects and meets the needs of Newham’s diverse population; and g. Community Wealth Building.	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as it would reduce the flexibility and deliverability of the Plan. This policy is currently worded so it can apply to a range of land uses. Further guidance on how these objectives can be delivered is then provided in the implementation text. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes. However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding an insufficient consideration of whole life carbon. In light of these comments, the Council recognises that while this is not a new policy requirement in the Plan, it is important to ensure the Plan is clear and that this could usefully be highlighted as a masterplanning consideration. As such we consider the implementation text of this policy could usefully reference whole life carbon considerations and a consideration of retrofit and has therefore made the following wording change: Masterplans should consider how a changing climate will be managed within their development, such as through layouts to reduce overheating, provisions of cool zones, sustainable urban drainage systems and/or flood prevention measures. In addition, whole life carbon considerations should be factored into masterplanning, by considering the possibility for, and benefits of, retrofitting existing buildings and the reuse of any existing materials on site. which is included in the modification table.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-093	Bellway Homes (Thames Gateway) Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-093/007	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning						Yes	No						Yes	<p>[Design Principles</p> <p>The draft allocation still states that the site should be designed and developed in accordance with Local Plan Policy BFN2.]</p> <p>Policy BFN2 requires all applications on site allocations to undertake co-designed site masterplanning. This is an onerous requirement and should not be a prerequisite that could stifle development coming forward in a timely manner. We previously commented on this in our Regulation 18 consultation representations.</p>		<p>In order to improve the clarity of the policy wording, the Council has updated its response to this comment. The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to ensure coordination, prevent developments from prejudicing each other and secure the optimum use of land. The objective and broad policy wording are retained from the current adopted policy S1. This policy is regularly used in pre-application discussions and development management decisions to secure the delivery of key Plan objectives. It does not prevent parcels of land owned by different landowners coming forward for development on their own timescales.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and has therefore made the following wording change to policy BFN2 and it's implementation text: 1. Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery development will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p> <p>Implementation text BFN2.1</p> <p>Developments of all scales should be designed and developed comprehensively. Masterplanning enables this by establishing an agreed site or scheme design which considers an optimum approach to address all the factors outlined in part 2.</p> <p>For small sites (developments of under 0.25 ha), it is expected that when multiple small sites form part of an applicant’s pipeline and are due to be developed in close proximity to each other and within a similar timeframe, these should be considered comprehensively. Submission documents should demonstrate a coherent design, amenity and delivery strategy. This is particularly the case when undertaking multiple infills on a single housing estate.</p> <p>For major applications and site allocations, compliance with this part of the policy will, in part, be demonstrated by a successful masterplan which delivers against the criteria in parts 2 and 3, including how this relates to any proposed phasing of the site. Where relevant, sites should be supported by a realistic phasing plan.</p> <p>Which is included in the modification table.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-096	Redefine Hotels Portfolio IV Ltd	Savills	Reg19-E-096/021	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning														<p>The draft site allocation sets out that “the site should be designed and developed comprehensively in accordance with Local Plan Policy BFN2”. Emerging policy BFN2 (Co-designed masterplanning) sets out that “sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the [inter alia] site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure”. It also sets out that “all major applications and applications on site allocations must undertake co-designed masterplanning, through engagement with different stakeholders”, which should consider the various criteria detailed in the draft policy.</p> <p>We understand the need for holistic and comprehensive development across site allocations to ensure development works positively within their site constraints and delivers the design and development principles set out in the allocation. We are supportive of this aspiration, but note it is important to ensure site allocations are effective and deliverable, in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 36. Officers will be aware that there are various land owners across site allocation N5.SA3 ‘Canning Town Holiday Inn’, each working to different timescales. There are therefore challenges with delivering the North site on the same timeframes as development at the Holiday Inn Express, and this is outside of our client’s control.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, our client and the project team have been exchanging with the North site project team to coordinate the emerging proposals and ensure they do not prejudice each other. This includes consideration of the cumulative impact of the development process, which will be assessed by Officers through the development management process for both applications. Our project team are seeking to ensure that the north site remains futureproofed to allow development to come forward at a later stage (if this would be required).</p>	<p>On this basis, we would advocate for the above policies to be amended to require a coordinated approach rather than schemes that are comprehensively co designed. This will ensure the schemes respond positively to one another and the local context, whilst also ensuring they are not beholden to one another and the aspirations within the site allocation can be delivered in the immediate term.</p>	<p>The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to ensure coordination, prevent developments from prejudicing each other and secure the optimum use of land. The objective and broad policy wording are retained from the current adopted policy S1. This policy is regularly used in pre-application discussions and development management decisions to secure the delivery of key Plan objectives. It does not prevent parcels of land owned by different landowners coming forward for development on their own timescales.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and has therefore made the following wording change to policy BFN2 and it’s implementation text: 1. Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery development will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p> <p>Implementation text BFN2.1 Developments of all scales should be designed and developed comprehensively. Masterplanning enables this by establishing an agreed site or scheme design which considers an optimum approach to address all the factors outlined in part 2.</p> <p>For small sites (developments of under 0.25 ha), it is expected that when multiple small sites form part of an applicant’s pipeline and are due to be developed in close proximity to each other and within a similar timeframe, these should be considered comprehensively. Submission documents should demonstrate a coherent design, amenity and delivery strategy. This is particularly the case when undertaking multiple infills on a single housing estate.</p> <p>For major applications and site allocations, compliance with this part of the policy will, in part, be demonstrated by a successful masterplan which delivers against the criteria in parts 2 and 3, including how this relates to any proposed phasing of the site. Where relevant, sites should be supported by a realistic phasing plan.</p> <p>Which is included in the modification table.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-096	Redefine Hotels Portfolio IV Ltd	Savills	Reg19-E-096/038	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.2												2. All major applications and applications on site allocations must take a coordinated approach to the delivery of development undertake co-designed site masterplanning, through engagement with different stakeholders. This masterplanning must consider all of the following:	This wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as a masterplan is key to demonstrating that the relevant policies in the Plan can be delivered across the site allocation, allowing decision makers to have confidence that permitting smaller parcels of the site won't result in sub-optimal and piecemeal development. This will then be secured through the development management process. The draft Plan does provide a greater level of detail on site allocations, than the adopted Plan, which will support, but doesn't replace the need for, master planning. Co-design is key to delivering the Council's objective of a People powered Newham and widening participation in the life of the borough and the work that the Council does. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-112	SEGRO	Gerald Eve	Reg19-E-112/008	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			Part 2			Blank	No						Blank	SEGRO reiterate the representations made to the Regulation 18 version of the Local Plan, specifically points 3(a) of the representations [see Appended – Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan SEGRO response] which raise concerns over the requirements set out in draft policy BFN2 which apply to all major developments, noting that these are not necessarily appropriate for industrial and logistics.		A response to this comment was provided in the Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation Report. This included a change to the policy implementation wording of BFN2.2 and BFN2.3 to clarify that the aspects or objectives listed in the policy are broad enough principles to be adapted to any site and use specific contexts. The Council's response has not changed.

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																					
Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-170	Berkeley Homes (South East London) Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-170/015	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			1			Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>Draft Policy BFN2: Co-Designed Masterplanning</p> <p>The benefits of comprehensive masterplanning and development are acknowledged, however Berkeley Homes has a number of concerns with the implementation of proposed policy BFN2, as were raised within the Regulation 18 representation. The principle of piecemeal delivery is understood however it is not clear what LBN mean by piecemeal development in the context of this policy. A number of strategic site allocations within the Local Plan are either subject to multiple site ownerships or by virtue of their size and would typically come forward as phased developments.</p> <p>TwelveTrees Park and Bromley by Bow Gasworks are an example of a site (allocation) that is in two separate ownerships where one part of the Site was ready to come forward for redevelopment several years before the remaining part of the Site.</p>	<p>Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to ensure coordination, prevent developments from prejudicing each other and secure the optimum use of land. The objective and broad policy wording are retained from the current adopted policy S1. This policy is regularly used in pre-application discussions and development management decisions to secure the delivery of key Plan objectives. It does not prevent parcels of land owned by different landowners coming forward for development on their own timescales.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and has therefore made the following wording change to policy BFN2 and it's implementation text: 1. Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery development will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p> <p>Implementation text BFN2.1 Developments of all scales should be designed and developed comprehensively. Masterplanning enables this by establishing an agreed site or scheme design which considers an optimum approach to address all the factors outlined in part 2.</p> <p>For small sites (developments of under 0.25 ha), it is expected that when multiple small sites form part of an applicant’s pipeline and are due to be developed in close proximity to each other and within a similar timeframe, these should be considered comprehensively. Submission documents should demonstrate a coherent design, amenity and delivery strategy. This is particularly the case when undertaking multiple infills on a single housing estate.</p> <p>For major applications and site allocations, compliance with this part of the policy will, in part, be demonstrated by a successful masterplan which delivers against the criteria in parts 2 and 3, including how this relates to any proposed phasing of the site. Where relevant, sites should be supported by a realistic phasing plan.</p> <p>Which is included in the modification table.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-170	Berkeley Homes (South East London) Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-170/016	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			2			Blank	Blank						Blank	[Draft Policy BFN2: Co-Designed Masterplanning] With regard to part 2 and Part 4, we suggest that a design led approach can still be followed, without precluding development coming forward at different times by different land owners. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is merit in a joint up approach to masterplanning, we are concerned about the implementation of this policy and the prescriptive nature in which developers would need to engage which in turn may result in undue delays to the delivery of homes.	All major applications and applications on site allocations must undertake co-designed site masterplanning, through engagement with different stakeholders. This masterplanning must could consider all of the following: a. how the required land uses and infrastructure provision on the site will could be delivered; b. relevant neighbourhood and/or site allocation design principles; c. integration of the scheme with its wider surroundings, including any effects on the historic environment; d. delivery of key walking and cycling connections within the site and to and from key local facilities; e. layout of the site to ensure neighbourliness; and f. how Biodiversity Net Gain will be delivered on site, natural features will could be incorporated and appropriate mitigation for environmental harm made.	This wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as a masterplan is key to demonstrating that the relevant policies in the Plan can be delivered across the site allocation, allowing decision makers to have confidence that permitting smaller parcels of the site won't result in sub-optimal and piecemeal development. This will then be secured through the development management process. The draft Plan does provide a greater level of detail on site allocations, than the adopted Plan, which will support, but doesn't replace the need for, master planning. Co-design is key to delivering the Council's objective of a People Powered Newham and widening participation in the life of the borough and the work that the Council does. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-170	Berkeley Homes (South East London) Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-170/017	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			4			Blank	Blank						Blank	[Draft Policy BFN2: Co-Designed Masterplanning] [With regard to part 2 and Part 4, we suggest that a design led approach can still be followed, without precluding development coming forward at different times by different land owners. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is merit in a joint up approach to masterplanning, we are concerned about the implementation of this policy and the prescriptive nature in which developers would need to engage which in turn may result in undue delays to the delivery of homes.]	4. All phased sites, where parts of the site will remain vacant or underused for more than three years, must submit a Meanwhile Use Strategy which will outline how vacant and underused plots will be activated, where site specific circumstances allow .	A response to this comment was provided in the Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation Report. This included a change to the policy approach to clarify that delivering meanwhile uses should not prevent work required to deliver the final scheme. However we consider that all phased schemes should consider what meanwhile uses could be delivered on their sites through a meanwhile strategy. The Council's response has not changed.
Reg19-E-170	Berkeley Homes (South East London) Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-170/018	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning						No	No						Blank	[Draft Policy BFN2: Co-Designed Masterplanning] Berkeley Homes consider this policy as drafted is not justified. The application of draft Policy BNF2 is likely to discourage development and unduly restrict LBN's ability to deliver the wider objectives of the DSLP. The policy as drafted is also therefore not effective. Berkeley Homes consider that the proposed changes set out above would fix these issues and ensure full compliance with national policy and ensure the policy is effective and sound.		Comment noted.

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																					
Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-173	L&Q		Reg19-E-173/010	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.1				No							<p>Draft Policy BNF2 states that ‘Piecemeal delivery will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure’. It also states that ‘All major applications and applications on site allocations must undertake co designed site masterplanning, through engagement with different stakeholders.’</p> <p>Whilst we support the Council’s aspiration to ensure sites are comprehensively designed and fully integrated into areas, using the co-design site masterplanning approach, we do have reservations about how the draft policy is currently worded. For various reasons, neighbouring sites will come forward for development at different timescales; particularly on commercially sensitive sites, adjoining landowners may be unwilling to engage in a masterplanning process. Given the pressing need for housing, it is important that the Council determine any planning application which is submitted to it on its own merits. It would be perverse for the Council to refuse policy compliant schemes which would help to deliver the development needs of the borough simply because these are brought forward in isolation from adjoining sites (something which is out of the applicant’s control). However, this is how the policy is currently worded.</p> <p>In our view, the policy as drafted would be ineffective and flexibility is required in order to make the policy sound.</p>	<p>Suggested amended wording:</p> <p>1. ‘Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery of sites in strategic development areas will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.’</p> <p>2. ‘Applicants for all A major applications and applications on site allocations must seek to undertake co-designed site masterplanning, through engagement with different stakeholders.</p>	<p>The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to ensure coordination, prevent developments from prejudicing each other and secure the optimum use of land. The objective and broad policy wording are retained from the current adopted policy S1. This policy is regularly used in pre-application discussions and development management decisions to secure the delivery of key Plan objectives. It does not prevent parcels of land owned by different landowners coming forward for development on their own timescales.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and has therefore made the following wording change to policy BFN2 and it's implementation text: 1. Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery development will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p> <p>Implementation text BFN2.1 Developments of all scales should be designed and developed comprehensively. Masterplanning enables this by establishing an agreed site or scheme design which considers an optimum approach to address all the factors outlined in part 2.</p> <p>For small sites (developments of under 0.25 ha), it is expected that when multiple small sites form part of an applicant’s pipeline and are due to be developed in close proximity to each other and within a similar timeframe, these should be considered comprehensively. Submission documents should demonstrate a coherent design, amenity and delivery strategy. This is particularly the case when undertaking multiple infills on a single housing estate.</p> <p>For major applications and site allocations, compliance with this part of the policy will, in part, be demonstrated by a successful masterplan which delivers against the criteria in parts 2 and 3, including how this relates to any proposed phasing of the site. Where relevant, sites should be supported by a realistic phasing plan.</p> <p>Which is included in the modification table.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/014	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning					BFN2.2	Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft.]</p> <p>Detailed Comments Schedule: We support the requirement for co-design and would suggest that this is reinforced by a clearer definition of the extent of the process to enable applicants to better understand the Council’s intentions and requirements in this regard. This will also provide clarity to stakeholders and the community about what to expect as well as ensuring a consistent approach.</p>		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be appropriate as such guidance would be too detailed for the Local Plan policy. The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is the correct document to provide that detail. The Council will review the SCI following the Local Plan adoption to add further detail on co-design in planning and development. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/015	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning					BFN2.4	Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft.]</p> <p>Detailed Comments Schedule: See comments above on meanwhile uses. This policy requires proposals for land vacant for more than three years but limits proposals to five years. This should be adjusted for larger sites.</p>		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy is already considered flexible enough to be effective. The policy enables longer meanwhile uses where they accord with the Plan’s spatial strategy, in particular policies which support the vitality and viability of town centres and employment designations. Allowing meanwhile uses which would not comply with these policies for longer than 5 years risks undermining the delivery of the Plan’s key objectives. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/016	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning					BFN2.5	Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft.]</p> <p><u>Detailed Comments Schedule:</u> We support Post Occupancy Evaluation and have worked with LLDC to explore how this can be applied to GLA funded affordable housing. We are happy to share the output of this work. However, we struggle to see how developers are going to be able to oblige 40% of their tenants and residents to respond.</p>		<p>The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to provide a useful tool in monitoring how successful the Plan has been at delivering its objectives. As such ensuring a robust methodology and response rate is key. It is noted that the standard response rate required for travel plan surveys is 30% and that recent GLA examples have a response rate of 50%.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises that this may not be possible in all circumstances and indeed that some developments may require a larger sample size to ensure statistical significance. As such the following wording change is proposed: Surveys should be completed more than 12 months and less than 24 months after full occupancy of the phase. It is expected that the survey should be conducted by an independent third party and achieve a proportionate response rate have a response rate of at least 40 per cent to ensure sufficient data quality and anonymity.</p> <p>which is included in the modification table.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-180	PEACH: The People's Empowerment Alliance for Custom House		Reg19-E-180/014	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning						Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>Co-designing in masterplanning</p> <p>In relation to policy BFN2. We believe it is integral for masterplanning to also be required to support and consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- How to ensure the existing community on a site stays intact and isn't displaced by development, including any outstanding disrepair issues.- That existing residents should not be decanted from properties unless a) planning permission has been granted which affects their home and b)that building work is due to begin on their home in no more than 6 months.- All phased sites, where parts of the site will remain vacant or underused for more than one year, must submit a Meanwhile Use Strategy which will outline how vacant and underused plots will be activated.- Local housing need including for larger family council rent units of 3,4,5 bedroom.- How to ensure that there are no restrictions on use of communal areas/facilities for any residents (e.g. social rent tenants excluded from areas available to private households). In addition that there are no 'rich door/poor doors' and that residents are mixed in each block of housing.- We support that participants in the engagement and co-design process should include residents in the surrounding area, local community organisations, local businesses, and prospective users. <p>[...]</p> <p>Designs should consistently align with the existing character of the area, including its socio-economic context.</p>	<p>[Co-designing in masterplanning</p> <p>In relation to policy BFN2. We believe it is integral for masterplanning to also be required to support and consider:]</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>- We believe co-designing must begin prior to any presumption in favour of demolition and that retrofitting and refurbishment must be the presumed method of masterplanning unless buildings are found to be structurally unsound.</p> <p>[...]</p>	<p>The Council's objective for this policy approach is to ensure that masterplans deliver the key Local Plan objectives but the policy will also work alongside other policies in the Plan, as the Plan has to be read a whole. In relation to the additional objectives you have listed:</p> <p>Policy H1, part a requires all affordable housing to be replaced at the same quantity of floorspace and rent level. Allocations, the decant process and the maintenance of homes are not matters for the Local Plan as they do not require planning permission to take place.</p> <p>One year is considered too short a timeframe for meanwhile uses to be able to gain permission, be delivered and then dismantled.</p> <p>Local housing need is already addressed under part 3b of policy BFN2.</p> <p>Policy H11, part 6 addresses these concerns around equal access to facilities and the location of entrances for different tenures. Support is also noted for the parts highlighted.</p> <p>In relation to a presumption in favour of retrofit, policy CE3 requires developers to consider whole life carbon impacts, which does promote considering retrofit before other options and this is considered aligned with part 3e of policy BFN2.</p> <p>So while this is not a new policy requirement, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and that this could usefully be highlighted as a masterplanning consideration. As such we consider the implementation text of this policy could usefully reference whole life carbon considerations and a consideration of retrofit and has therefore made the following wording change: Masterplans should consider how a changing climate will be managed within their development, such as through layouts to reduce overheating, provisions of cool zones, sustainable urban drainage systems and/or flood prevention measures. In addition, whole life carbon considerations should be factored into masterplanning, by considering the possibility for, and benefits of, retrofitting existing buildings and the reuse of any existing materials on site. which is included in the modification table.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-184	Primark Stores Ltd	CBRE	Reg19-E-184/004	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning						Yes	Yes						Yes	<p>BFN2: Co-designed masterplanning</p> <p>Draft Policy BNF2 states that:</p> <p>“1. Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p> <p>2. All major applications and applications on site allocations must undertake co-designed site masterplanning, through engagement with different stakeholders. This masterplanning must consider all of the following:</p> <p>a. how the required land uses and infrastructure provision on the site will be delivered;</p> <p>b. relevant neighbourhood and/or site allocation design principles;</p> <p>c. integration of the scheme with its wider surroundings, including any effects on the historic environment;</p> <p>d. delivery of key walking and cycling connections within the site and to and from key local facilities;</p> <p>e. layout of the site to ensure neighbourliness; and</p> <p>f. how Biodiversity Net Gain will be delivered on site, natural features will be incorporated and appropriate mitigation for environmental harm made.</p> <p>3. All masterplans should demonstrate how the site will support the delivery of all of the following objectives:</p> <p>a. increased opportunities for social interaction.</p> <p>b. mixed, inclusive and stable communities.</p> <p>c. environments which support good physical and mental health.</p> <p>d. spaces young people can thrive in.</p> <p>e. zero carbon, climate resilient neighbourhoods.</p> <p>f. Inclusive design, with buildings and public spaces whose use and design reflects and meets the needs of Newham’s diverse population; and</p> <p>g. Community Wealth Building.</p> <p>4. All phased sites, where parts of the site will remain vacant or underused for more than three years, must submit a Meanwhile Use Strategy which will outline how vacant and underused plots will be activated.</p> <p>5. All developments on site allocations are expected to undertake post occupancy surveys and share the results with the Council”.</p> <p>Primark support LBN’s objectives for co-designed masterplanning of sites.</p>		Support noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-185	Hadley Property Group	Deloitte	Reg19-E-185/004a	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning														<i>Policy BFN2: Co-designed masterplanning</i> Hadley supports the approach of Policy BFN2.2 to “undertake co-designed masterplanning”. However, it suggests that the wording is too broad and does not set out best practice and the Council’s expectation as to which processes should be followed to best include local stakeholders in the design of developments.		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be appropriate as such guidance would be too detailed for the Local Plan policy. The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is the correct document to provide that detail. The Council will review the SCI following the Local Plan adoption to add further detail on co-design in planning and development. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-185	Hadley Property Group	Deloitte	Reg19-E-185/004b	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning														<i>Policy BFN2: Co-designed masterplanning</i> Hadley requests that further clarification is provided within the supporting text of BFN2.5 on what types of questions will be asked through the post-occupancy surveys and how the results will be used.		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we continue to consider post occupancy surveys to be a useful tool in monitoring how successful the Plan has been at delivering its objectives. It is not considered that providing further detail in the implementation text would be appropriate as such guidance would be too detailed for the Local Plan policy. The implementation text for BFN2.5 already includes a commitment for the Council to develop a series of standard questions. We note there are a number of existing guidance documents, including by RIBA and the GLA which will be used to inform this list. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the suitable survey response rate.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises that this may not be possible in all circumstances and indeed that some developments may require a larger sample size to ensure statistical significance. As such the following wording change is proposed: Surveys should be completed more than 12 months and less than 24 months after full occupancy of the phase. It is expected that the survey should be conducted by an independent third party and achieve a proportionate response rate have a response rate of at least 40 per cent to ensure sufficient data quality and anonymity.</p> <p>which is included in the modification table.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-191	University College London	Deloitte	Reg19-E-191/004	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			Policy BFN2(4)											<p>Draft Policy BFN2(4) states that, “all phased sites, where parts of the site will remain vacant or underused for more than three years, must submit a Meanwhile Use Strategy which will outline how vacant and underused plots will be activated”. UCL remains supportive of this policy aim and recognises the value in meanwhile uses in temporarily activating otherwise-vacant plots.</p> <p>Since the representations submitted with respect to the Regulation 18 consultation, UCL’s Interim Uses Strategy required as part of the S106 requirements for Phase 1 of the UCL East development, has been approved by LLDC on 7 July 2023 under LLDC ref. 22/00181/106. Elements of this strategy have already been implemented in the form of the City Mill Skate development, located in the north-east portion of the Pool Street East plot. In addition, it is proposed that temporary laboratory space and life sciences research facilities will utilise the southwest half of the same plot for a period of 7.5 years. These proposals are subject to a planning application which is currently being determined by LLDC (ref. 24/00313/FUL).</p>		Comment noted.

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																													
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/016	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.1																					
					<p>Policy BFN2: Co-designed masterplanning</p> <p>3.8 Whilst the benefits of comprehensive masterplanning and development are acknowledged, St William remain concerned with the implementation of proposed Policy BFN2. Part 1 of this policy refers to piecemeal delivery which will be resisted particularly where it might prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, policy, site allocation development or design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure. It is not clear what is meant by piecemeal development in the context of this policy.</p> <p>3.9 A number of strategic site allocations within the Local Plan and in particular almost all of St William’s sites are subject to a wider site allocation within which there are multiple site ownerships i.e. site allocation N7.SA2 comprises of the TwelveTrees Park development site and the former Bromley by Bow Gasworks. TwelveTrees Park secured planning permission for development in 2018 and the Bromley by Bow Gasworks only just receiving resolution to grant for development. The same scenario applies to the Beckton Riverside (Gallions Reach) site allocation N17.SA1 which is subject to multiple land ownerships and owing to the size of the site and dependency on transformative transport measures such as the proposed DLR extension or other transport capacity improvements, it may not be possible to deliver the Site comprehensively and will inevitably be delivered over a long period of time. The policy as currently drafted would not offer the necessary policy support to enable these complex but vital strategic sites to come forward.</p> <p>3.10 It is pertinent to note that an application has been approved for the TwelveTrees Park site, which is delivering the eastern parcel of the N7.SA2 allocation. Bromley by Bow Gasworks is located on the western parcel of the same site allocation and current has a resolution to grant planning permission. Both sites are subject to their own constraints, including the controls related to the sequencing of refurbishing the Gasholders at Bromley by Bow. In both cases the phasing is managed effectively by s106 obligations and planning conditions to provide a structured delivery programme with supporting infrastructure. In this context (where phased development has been approved) it is assumed that the policy would not be applied.</p> <p>3.11 If it were, then the policy would serve to work against the delivery of development on these sites stifling housing delivery and the delivery of new jobs as well. It is considered that explicit clarification on the difference between phased delivery and piecemeal is required within the policy. To this end we do not consider this policy to be positively prepared, justified or effective and therefore does not meet the tests of soundness as set out in the NPPF. As noted in the Regulation 18 representations a more proportionate approach should be taken and resistance to piecemeal development removed. In these circumstances a masterplan (with associated Design Code), design led approach can still</p>															<p>Appendix 12: General Policies – Suggested amendments</p> <p>4. Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p>					<p>The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to ensure coordination, prevent developments from prejudicing each other and secure the optimum use of land. The objective and broad policy wording are retained from the current adopted policy S1. This policy is regularly used in pre-application discussions and development management decisions to secure the delivery of key Plan objectives. It does not prevent parcels of land owned by different landowners coming forward for development on their own timescales.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and has therefore made the following wording change to policy BFN2 and it’s implementation text: 1. Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery development will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p> <p>Implementation text BFN2.1 Developments of all scales should be designed and developed comprehensively. Masterplanning enables this by establishing an agreed site or scheme design which considers an optimum approach to address all the factors outlined in part 2.</p> <p>For small sites (developments of under 0.25 ha), it is expected that when multiple small sites form part of an applicant’s pipeline and are due to be developed in close proximity to each other and within a similar timeframe, these should be considered comprehensively. Submission documents should demonstrate a coherent design, amenity and delivery strategy. This is particularly the case when undertaking multiple infills on a single housing estate.</p> <p>For major applications and site allocations, compliance with this part of the policy will, in part, be demonstrated by a successful masterplan which delivers against the criteria in parts 2 and 3, including how this relates to any proposed phasing of the site. Where relevant, sites should be supported by a realistic phasing plan.</p> <p>Which is included in the modification table.</p>				

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
																			be followed, without precluding development coming forward at different times by different land owners. 3.12 All suggested amendments to the wording of proposed policies can be found at Appendix 12 .		
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/017	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.2											3.13 In line with the above comments, it may not be possible to achieve all of the requirements of part 2 of the draft policy because of site ownerships and other constraints. On this basis, it is not considered appropriate to have this as an explicit policy requirement. The site allocations themselves, the Local Plan design policies, as well as strategic policy documents such as OAPF’s adequately ensure that masterplans and designs are co-ordinated; further to this, the need to ensure a site contributes to the wider context and neighbourhood can be secured via the planning application process and is not explicitly needed to be set out in the Local Plan.	[Appendix 12: General Policies – Suggested amendments] 2. All major applications and applications on site allocations must undertake co-designed site masterplanning , demonstrate through engagement with different stakeholders that their . This masterplanning must has considered all of the following: a. how the required land uses and infrastructure provision on the site will be delivered; b. relevant neighbourhood and/or site allocation design principles; c. integration of the scheme with its wider surroundings, including any effects on the historic environment; d. delivery of key walking and cycling connections within the site and to and from key local facilities; e. layout of the site to ensure neighbourliness; and f. how Biodiversity Net Gain will be delivered on site, natural features will be incorporated and appropriate mitigation for environmental harm made.	This wording change is not supported. We did not consider this change to be necessary as a masterplan is key to demonstrating that the relevant policies in the Plan can be delivered across the site allocation, allowing decision makers to have confidence that permitting smaller parcels of the site won't result in sub-optimal and piecemeal development. This will then be secured through the development management process. The draft Plan does provide a greater level of detail on site allocations, than the adopted Plan, which will support, but doesn't replace the need for, master planning. Co-design is key to delivering the Council's objective of a People powered Newham and widening participation in the life of the borough and the work that the Council does. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/018	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.4											3.14 St William remains supportive of the principle of activating vacant land through the use of meanwhile uses as set out in part 4 but previously noted that the nature of former gasworks sites, which are typically heavily contaminated, can prohibit the ability to activate and specifically provide public access to vacant or underused parts of these sites. This can include for health and safety reasons caused by the presence of contamination or the need to use vacant parts of the Site for other purposes such as storage of gasholders during the refurbishment process. Access to gasworks sites are also often in relatively isolated locations that require significant upfront investment to open them up for development, which would not be feasible for meanwhile use only. To that end, and as previously noted the requirement for a Meanwhile Use Strategy should have the ability to acknowledge site specific circumstances of sites.	[Appendix 12: General Policies – Suggested amendments] 4. All phased sites, where parts of the site will remain vacant or underused for more than three years, must submit a Meanwhile Use Strategy which will outline how vacant and underused plots will be activated, where site specific circumstances allow . 5. All developments on site allocations are expected to undertake post occupancy surveys and share the results with the Council.	A response to this comment was provided in the Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation Report. This included a change to the policy approach to clarify that delivering meanwhile uses should not prevent work required to deliver the final scheme. However we consider that all phased schemes should consider what meanwhile uses could be delivered on their sites through a meanwhile strategy. The Council’s response has not changed. However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the deliverability of meeting BREEAM requirements in all meanwhile projects.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-202	The Silvertown Partnership LLP	DP9	Reg19-E-202/025a	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning														The draft policy is generally supported, and the hybrid planning application proposals have been developed in line with it. It does, however, seek additional requirements which are queried: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clarification is required in relation to the need for a Meanwhile Use Strategy. TSP will proactively seek to deliver meanwhile uses where possible, but does not see the need for a specific strategy to be submitted for approval by LBN. Rather than direct resources to assessing such strategies, LBN should consider how its own planning application determination processes can be focused to support the delivery of timely permissions for meanwhile uses.		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy is considered to be effective in delivering the Council's objectives. We welcome TSP's commitment to activating their site, but we have a number of vacant sites across the borough where this opportunity has not been used. This policy will ensure that residents can benefit from the efficient use of all land in the borough. The Council is confident it is able to delivery timely permissions for meanwhile uses. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-202	The Silvertown Partnership LLP	DP9	Reg19-E-202/025b	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning														[The draft policy is generally supported, and the hybrid planning application proposals have been developed in line with it. It does, however, seek additional requirements which are queried:] <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clarification is required in relation to post-occupancy surveys. LBN should explain the envisaged scope of these surveys and should assess whether requiring such surveys would deliver a benefit that would outweigh the administrative burden on its development management officers, who would have to register submissions and presumably assess surveys. Any burden on occupiers also needs to be understood.		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we continue to consider post occupancy surveys to be a useful tool in monitoring how successful the Plan has been at delivering its objectives. It is not considered that providing further detail in the implementation text would be appropriate as such guidance would be too detailed for the Local Plan policy. The implementation text for BFN2.5 already includes a commitment for the Council to develop a series of standard questions. We note there are a number of existing guidance documents, including by RIBA and the GLA which will be used to inform this list. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the suitable survey response rate.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises that this may not be possible in all circumstances and indeed that some developments may require a larger sample size to ensure statistical significance. As such the following wording change is proposed: Surveys should be completed more than 12 months and less than 24 months after full occupancy of the phase. It is expected that the survey should be conducted by an independent third party and achieve a proportionate response rate have a response rate of at least 40 per cent to ensure sufficient data quality and anonymity.</p> <p>which is included in the modification table.</p>

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																		
Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?
Reg19-E-203	GLP (International Business Park, Rick Roberts Way)	Quod	Reg19-E-203/015	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning													
			<p>Representor Comment</p> <p>[Please see Appendix 2 of representation] The representations noted that the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan acknowledged the benefits of comprehensive masterplanning and development. However, Policy BFN2: Co-designed masterplanning overlooked the fact that a number of strategic site allocations and designated sites within the Local Plan were either subject to multiple site ownerships, leaseholders or, by virtue of their size, would more typically come forward as phased developments.</p>															
			<p>Representor Proposed modifications and explanation</p> <p>[Please see Appendix 2 of representation] We recommended a more proportionate approach should be taken, requiring development to not prejudice surrounding sites, and that the resistance to piecemeal development in the policy wording removed.</p>															
			<p>LB Newham Response</p> <p>In order to improve the clarity of the policy wording, the Council has updated its response to this comment. The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to ensure coordination, prevent developments from prejudicing each other and secure the optimum use of land. The objective and broad policy wording are retained from the current adopted policy S1. This policy is regularly used in pre-application discussions and development management decisions to secure the delivery of key Plan objectives. It does not prevent parcels of land owned by different landowners coming forward for development on their own timescales.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and has therefore made the following wording change to policy BFN2 and it's implementation text: 1. Sites should be designed and developed comprehensively. Piecemeal delivery development will be resisted, particularly where it would prejudice the realisation of the relevant neighbourhood vision, neighbourhood policy, site allocation development principles and/or site allocation design principles or where the timing of delivery would be unsupported by infrastructure.</p> <p>Implementation text BFN2.1 Developments of all scales should be designed and developed comprehensively. Masterplanning enables this by establishing an agreed site or scheme design which considers an optimum approach to address all the factors outlined in part 2.</p> <p>For small sites (developments of under 0.25 ha), it is expected that when multiple small sites form part of an applicant’s pipeline and are due to be developed in close proximity to each other and within a similar timeframe, these should be considered comprehensively. Submission documents should demonstrate a coherent design, amenity and delivery strategy. This is particularly the case when undertaking multiple infills on a single housing estate.</p> <p>For major applications and site allocations, compliance with this part of the policy will, in part, be demonstrated by a successful masterplan which delivers against the criteria in parts 2 and 3, including how this relates to any proposed phasing of the site. Where relevant, sites should be supported by a realistic phasing plan.</p> <p>Which is included in the modification table.</p>															

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-233	RAD CHP Ltd	CBRE	Reg19-E-233/006a	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			Part 2			Blank	No						Blank	<p>Draft Policy BFN1: Spatial Strategy & BFN2: Co-designed masterplanning</p> <p>Both draft Policy BFN1 and BFN2 reference meanwhile uses, and their ability to activate strategic sites where development will be delivered over several years and phases.</p> <p>The ambition to secure long-term social value by supporting job-creation for, and training of, the local community is strongly supported. RAD CHP Ltd. is currently utilising part of a largely vacant building known as ‘Block 8B / Royal Albert Quay EAST’ for apprenticeship training as part of the contractor’s construction academy programme, which has been strongly supported by Our Newham Work as the Council’s employment and skills-building initiative.</p> <p>RAD CHP Ltd. has acted quickly to secure planning permission for PBSA on the strategic site (submission of planning application in February 2024, and Resolution to Grant at Planning Committee on 18 June 2024</p> <p>– LPA ref. 24/00440/FUL), and is currently seeking two further permissions to enable business and education occupiers as part of the vision to create a new Educational Campus.</p> <p>RAD CHP Ltd. strongly support the emerging policy position referenced in BFN2, that all phased sites, where parts of the site will remain vacant or underused for more than three years, must submit a Meanwhile Use Strategy which will outline how vacant and underused plots will be activated. Outside of Phase 1, the wider strategic site will require effective meanwhile uses to bring activity and economic vibrancy ahead of full redevelopment and occupancy, which is 10+ years in the future.</p> <p>The principle of ‘post occupancy surveys’ being required for all developments on site allocations, as referenced in BNF2 is generally supported, however the specifics of this requirement and how it would function in practicality are currently lacking detail in the supporting text and further information on this emerging requirement is required for developers to understand the scope of the information they would be required to collect and share.</p>		Support noted.

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																					
Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-233	RAD CHP Ltd	CBRE	Reg19-E-233/006b	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			Part 5			Blank	No							The principle of ‘post occupancy surveys’ being required for all developments on site allocations, as referenced in BNF2 is generally supported, however the specifics of this requirement and how it would function in practicality are currently lacking detail in the supporting text and further information on this emerging requirement is required for developers to understand the scope of the information they would be required to collect and share.		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we continue to consider post occupancy surveys to be a useful tool in monitoring how successful the Plan has been at delivering its objectives. It is not considered that providing further detail in the implementation text would be appropriate as such guidance would be too detailed for the Local Plan policy. The implementation text for BFN2.5 already includes a commitment for the Council to develop a series of standard questions. We note there are a number of existing guidance documents, including by RIBA and the GLA which will be used to inform this list. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the suitable survey response rate.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises that this may not be possible in all circumstances and indeed that some developments may require a larger sample size to ensure statistical significance. As such the following wording change is proposed: Surveys should be completed more than 12 months and less than 24 months after full occupancy of the phase. It is expected that the survey should be conducted by an independent third party and achieve a proportionate response rate have a response rate of at least 40 per cent to ensure sufficient data quality and anonymity.</p> <p>which is included in the modification table.</p>
Reg19-E-238	Environment Agency		Reg19-E-238/012	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning			BFN2.2											BFN2: Co-designed masterplanning It is positive to see that Point 2 requires all major applications and applications on site allocations to undertake co-designed site masterplanning, through engagement with different stakeholders.		Comment noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-EC-003	Muhammad Uddin		Reg19-EC-003/004	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN2 Co-designed masterplanning						Yes	Yes						Yes	n/a	<p>[I am writing to provide feedback and suggestions for the ongoing consultation of the Newham Local Plan. I commend the Council's efforts to address the diverse needs of Newham's communities, and I hope the following recommendations will further enhance the inclusivity and effectiveness of the plan.]</p> <p>4. Community-Led Design and Planning</p> <p>I propose that the Council adopts a more participatory approach by involving diverse range of community representatives directly in the planning and design of relevant facilities especially at the strategic level. This collaboration will ensure that the facilities created are truly reflective of and responsive to the needs of the communities they are intended to serve.</p>	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the new Local Plan is seeking to embed such a new participatory approach, through the co-produced masterplan approach outlined in policy BFN2.

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																				
Reg19-E-017	Bonny Downs Community Association		Reg19-E-017/004	Social Infrastructure	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														<p>The Social Value and Health Impact Assessment is helpful in focussing community groups on desired outcomes but it needs to be reconfigured to encourage, rather than stifle growth.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the policy to be positively prepared because Policy BFN3 addresses the need to achieve sustainable development, as set out in the IIA. It is considered that the policy takes a proportionate approach to the need to undertake a Social Value-Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA).</p> <p>The objective of the SV-HIA tool is support the delivery of a built and natural environment that delivers social value for Newham residents and supports their good physical and mental health, and social wellbeing.</p> <p>The purpose of a SV-HIA is to act as a critical friend, to ascertain whether the impact on social value and health of a particular development proposal is acceptable or not. It assists decision-makers by giving them better information, but it does not make the decision for them.</p> <p>The accompanying Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Guidance Note and Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool set out a proportionate approach to the size, location and type of development that is required to undertake a SV-HIA. Please note Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) includes an update to address a representation not related to your comment. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to consider the impact a development may have on an existing or a new internal or external permanent market. In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is positively prepared and has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to BFN3.2 implementation text:</p> <p>The following developments will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Major development ii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspace iii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shops iv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space v. Development impacting an existing or creating a new internal or external permanent market <p>Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) and Checklist (2025) include an update to address the modification to the implementation text for Policy BFN3.2.</p>
Reg19-E-017	Bonny Downs Community Association		Reg19-E-017/008	Social Infrastructure	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														<p>Should charities relinquish use of council community buildings a lost opportunity cost should be factored into the Social Value assessment.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Local Plan addresses this topic through Policy BFN3 which requires a SV-HIA if there is a loss, gain or reconfiguration of a social infrastructure use</p>

LB Newham Response		through a planning application. However, it cannot deliver the change you have requested as lease agreements are not subject to planning permission. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.
Representor Proposed modifications and explanation		
Representor Comment		
Complies with Duty to Cooperate?		
Consistent with the London Plan?		
Consistent with the NPPF?		
Effective?		
Justified?		
Positively prepared?		
Sound?		
Legally Compliant?		
Implementation text		
Justification		
Clause		
Introduction		
Site allocation		
Policy		
Chapter		
Comment Reference		
Agent		
Representor		
Representation Reference		

Reg19-E-024	Home Builders Federation		Reg19-E-024/007	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA			2				No		No			<p>BFN3: Social Value and Health Impact Assessment - delivering social value, health and wellbeing</p> <p>The policy is unsound because it is unjustified.</p> <p>Part 2 of the policy requires:</p> <p>Major development, and proposals where potential health or social value issues are likely to arise, must undertake a screening assessment as early as possible in the development process, to determine whether a Social Value and Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA) is required.</p> <p>The policy is unnecessary and ignores the valuable contribution that housebuilding already makes to public good and public health. Social and health outcomes in London would be so much worse if too few homes are built. Housebuilding, not only provides homes people need thereby assisting health outcomes as good housing is the most important determinant of good health, it contributes also specifically to the supply of affordable housing supply, it provides employment, it generates tax revenues to pay for public services, and it provides planning obligations to provide for schools, hospitals and libraries etc (e.g. draft policy S12), it aims to improve the access to green space, it aims to improve the public realm, it aims to improve access to public transport and encourage active travel, it provides a net improvement in biodiversity, it is required to provide water fountains, public toilets and baby changing / nursing facilities (e.g. draft Policy HS2) and cultural and sports facilities (e.g. draft policy S13).</p> <p>The Council also has many specific policies including ones relating to design and improvements to green space and the public realm. It is unclear what else housebuilders can do.</p> <p>The proposal that housebuilders should have to undertake an exercise to demonstrate to the Council its social and health value is unnecessary and a further planning obstacle to delivering the homes so desperately needed in London.</p> <p>Housing delivery in London is falling short, by a significant degree, of the London Plan requirement. The government's recently concluded review of the London Plan – see the London Plan Review: Report of Expert Advisers, 15 January 2024 – identifies a major shortfall in housing delivery compared to the London Plan target, to the extent that, as a whole, London will now need to deliver 62,300 homes on average each year until 2028/29 rather than 52,300 if the full London Plan housing requirement is to be provided by the end of the plan period (see para. 3 of the Executive Summary and para. 2.16).</p> <p>According to the government's 2022 Housing Delivery Test, 84 per cent of the housing requirement for Newham has been provided and the Council is now obliged to apply the 20 per cent buffer to help improve supply.</p>	<p>We advise that this policy is deleted to help improve supply.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the policy to be justified because Policy BFN3 addresses the need to achieve sustainable development, as set out in the IIA. The policy aligns with London Plan Policy GG3 Creating a healthy city. It is considered that the policy takes a proportionate approach to the need to undertake a Social Value-Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA).</p> <p>The objective of the SV-HIA tool is support the delivery of a built and natural environment that delivers social value for Newham residents and supports their good physical and mental health, and social wellbeing.</p> <p>The purpose of a SV-HIA is to act as a critical friend, to ascertain whether the impact on social value and health of a particular development proposal is acceptable or not. It assists decision-makers by giving them better information, but it does not make the decision for them.</p> <p>The accompanying Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Guidance Note and Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool set out a proportionate approach to the size, location and type of development that is required to undertake a SV-HIA. Please note Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) includes an update to address a representation not related to your comment.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to consider the impact a development may have on an existing or a new internal or external permanent market. In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is positively prepared and has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to BFN3.2 implementation text:</p> <p>The following developments will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <p>i. Major development</p> <p>ii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspace</p> <p>iii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shops</p> <p>iv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space</p> <p>v. Development impacting an existing or creating a new internal or external permanent market</p> <p>Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) and Checklist (2025) include an update to address the modification to the implementation text for Policy BFN3.2.</p>
-------------	--------------------------	--	-----------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	--	----	--	----	--	--	---	--	--

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-045	Beckton Developme nt Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-045/022	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														Draft Policy BFN3 states that with regard to major development and proposals, where potential health or social value issues are likely to arise, a screening assessment must be undertaken, to determine whether a Social Value - Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA) is required. Where a screening assessment rationalises the need for a SV-HIA, the policy requires the scope to be agreed with the Council’s Planning and Public Health departments before it is undertaken, and prepare a proportion SV-HIA as early as possible in the development process to allow the scheme to deliver the maximum potential social and health gains and to mitigate any potential negative impacts.		Comment noted.
Reg19-E-045	Beckton Developme nt Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-045/023	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														We understand that the policy seeks to optimise the health and social value of a scheme by providing a policy that combines the planning process, with that of the operational ESG requirements. In principle, we agree, and often link our HIA teams at the regulatory planning stage with that of our Social Value Team proactively working on the ESG component. By bridging the two, it is possible to engage with delivery partners to better understand local circumstance, priority and needs, and address and optimise this during planning. We do however, keep the reporting separate, as the Health Impact Assessment outputs are designed to meet regulatory planning requirements, while the ESG is governed by a separate decision making process.		Comment noted.

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																			
Reg19-E-045	Beckton Development Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-045/024	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														
																		<p>It is therefore requested that Social Value and Health Impact Assessments are kept separate. This removes the requirement for one document to meet the needs of two different decision making processes which could provide further complexities. A far more effective approach would to take the Newham 50 steps, and define them as part of the HIA appraisal criteria. In so doing, Newham would be setting bespoke HIA appraisal criteria that would help inform and test bespoke health and social value priorities during the planning process, and could be further applied by Planning Officers in their deliberation of weight to be placed in the planning balance.</p> <p>Projects that can evidence how they have considered, addressed and supported these bespoke health and social value priorities would be afforded positive weight, while those that don't, wont. This would still prompt the bridging between HIA and Social Value, would provide a better transition and delivery between planning and operation, but also facilitates greater consistency with the enhanced health focus in the emerging NPPF, and the efforts of IEMA in their HIA guidance and competency requirements.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the policy to be positively prepared because Policy BFN3 addresses the need to achieve sustainable development, as set out in the IIA. It is considered that the policy takes a proportionate approach to the need to undertake a Social Value-Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA).</p> <p>The SV-HIA combines a traditional Health Impact Assessment (HIA) with additional criteria specifically looking at the social value. There is a clear cross over between the delivery of social value and the criteria addressed in a HIA. It is for this reason Newham is bringing together the two measures in one assessment tool.</p> <p>The objective of the SV-HIA tool is support the delivery of a built and natural environment that delivers social value for Newham residents and supports their good physical and mental health, and social wellbeing. The purpose of a SV-HIA is to act as a critical friend, to ascertain whether the impact on social value and health of a particular development proposal is acceptable or not. It assists decision-makers by giving them better information, but it does not make the decision for them.</p> <p>The accompanying Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Guidance Note and Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool set out a proportionate approach to the size, location and type of development that is required to undertake a SV-HIA. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to consider the impact a development may have on an existing or a new internal or external permanent market. In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is positively prepared and has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to BFN3.2 implementation text:</p> <p>The following developments will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Major development ii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspace iii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shops iv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space v. Development impacting an existing or creating a new internal or external permanent market <p>Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) and Checklist (2025) include an update to address the modification to the implementation text for Policy BFN3.2.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-045	Beckton Developme nt Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-045/025	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														Beckton Developments supports the principles of draft Policy BFN3 which seeks to ensure that all development makes consideration to maximise social value in order to positively contribute to the health and wellbeing of the surrounding community.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-082	NHS Property Services		Reg19-E-082/001	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA						Yes	Yes						Yes	<p>Draft Policy BFN3 requires major development, and proposals where potential health or social value issues are likely to arise, to undertake a screening assessment as early as possible in the development process, to determine whether a Social Value and Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA) is required.</p> <p>NHSPS welcomes and supports the inclusion of policies that support healthy lifestyles, and the requirement for the SV-HIA screening and assessment.</p> <p>There is a well-established connection between planning and health, and the planning system has an important role in creating healthy communities. The planning system is critical not only to the provision of improved health services and infrastructure by enabling health providers to meet changing healthcare needs, but also to addressing the wider determinants of health.</p> <p>NHSPS therefore considers Policy BFN3 positively prepared and effective, and therefore sound.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>NHSPS considers Policy BFN3 sound as currently drafted.</p>	Support noted.
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/038	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														Support the aims and aspirations of the policy. The provision of new recreational facilities upon the Site as part of a wider residential led scheme would contribute to the aims of this policy.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-170	Berkeley Homes (South East London) Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-170/019a	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA			2			Blank	No						Blank	<p>Draft Policy BFN3: Social Value and Health Impact Assessment – delivery social value, health and wellbeing</p> <p>Berkeley Homes welcomes LBN’s recognition of the importance of Social Value, putting health, happiness and wellbeing at the heart of LBN’s work. Draft Policy BNF3 states: Major development, and proposals where potential health or social value issues are likely to arise, must undertake a screening assessment as early as possible in the development process, to determine whether a Social Value and Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA) is required.</p>		Support noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-170	Berkeley Homes (South East London) Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-170/019b	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA			2			Blank	No						Blank	<p>Whilst Berkeley Homes are supportive of the principle of incorporating Social Value into schemes, we consider the requirement to provide a Social Value and Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA) through a screening assessment to be provided to be overly prescriptive. We consider that this information will already be captured within various parts of the planning application including EIA, S106 obligations, Statement of Conformity, Design and Access Statement etc.</p> <p>It is considered that adding an additional assessment [SV-HIA] will cause more complications to the preparation of planning applications which in turn has a knock on impact on cost. Given the information will already be provided as part of validation requirements, we cannot see how this proposal will add any added value over and above what is already provided. As made clear in the new Government’s draft NPPF, Labour are seeking to simplify and avoid unnecessary complexity to ensure the delivery of homes can come forward quicker than in recent years. We therefore do not consider this policy to be effective and is inconsistent with the drive to effectively deliver new homes at pace.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the policy to be positively prepared because Policy BFN3 addresses the need to achieve sustainable development, as set out in the IIA. The policy takes a proportionate approach to the need to undertake a Social Value-Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA).</p> <p>The objective of the SV-HIA tool is support the delivery of a built and natural environment that delivers social value for Newham residents and supports their good physical and mental health, and social wellbeing. The purpose of a SV-HIA is to act as a critical friend, to ascertain whether the impact on social value and health of a particular development proposal is acceptable or not. It assists decision-makers by giving them better information, but it does not make the decision for them.</p> <p>The accompanying Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Guidance Note and Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool set out a proportionate approach to the size, location and type of development that is required to undertake a SV-HIA. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to consider the impact a development may have on an existing or a new internal or external permanent market. In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is positively prepared and has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to BFN3.2 implementation text:</p> <p>The following developments will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <p>i. Major development</p> <p>ii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspace</p> <p>iii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shops</p> <p>iv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space</p> <p>v. Development impacting an existing or creating a new internal or external permanent market</p> <p>Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) and Checklist (2025) include an update to address the modification to the implementation text for Policy BFN3.2.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-180	PEACH: The People's Empowerment Alliance for Custom House		Reg19-E-180/015	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA						Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>Social Value and Health Impact Assessment - delivering social value, health and wellbeing</p> <p>In relation to policy BFN3: Impact on those with low incomes (London Living wage and below) must be considered in any Assessments. This is not clear in the current draft plan.</p> <p>Social Value and Health Impact Assessment must be delivered at the Options Appraisals stage in order for co-design participants to understand the different social value and health impacts of each option.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the policy to be positively prepared because the Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Checklist Tool, which accompanies the policy, requires an applicant to consider the potential for adverse or positive impacts on the local population. It sets out that relevant population subgroups, should be considered against each relevant question, as well as any other social value-related considerations of relevance to the development. The checklist definition of population sub-groups includes: key population groups locally such as people suffering from socioeconomic deprivation. Please note Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Checklist Tool (2025) includes an update to address a representation not related to your comment. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to consider the impact a development may have on an existing or a new internal or external permanent market. In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is positively prepared has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to BFN3.2 implementation text:</p> <p>The following developments will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <p>i. Major development</p> <p>ii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspace</p> <p>iii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shops</p> <p>iv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space</p> <p>v. Development impacting an existing or creating a new internal or external permanent market</p> <p>Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) and Checklist (2025) include an update to address the modification to the implementation text for Policy BFN3.2.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-184	Primark Stores Ltd	CBRE	Reg19-E-184/005	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA						Yes	Yes						Yes	BFN3: Social Value and Health Impact Assessment - delivering social value, health and wellbeing Draft Policy BFN3 states that: “All developments in Newham should maximise social value and to make a positive contribution to the health and wellbeing of our communities....”. Primark support LBN’s objectives of maximising social value for the East Ham neighbourhood and wider community.		Support noted.

Reg19-E-185	Hadley Property Group	Deloitte	Reg19-E-185/005	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														<p><i>BFN3: Social Value and Health Impact Assessment – delivering social value, health and wellbeing</i></p> <p>Hadley is committed to ensuring that its developments deliver social value by empowering communities and delivering sustainable places. Hadley is supportive of the policy approach to maximise social value and make a positive contribution to the health and wellbeing of communities.</p> <p>Hadley is, however, concerned by the requirements for a Social Value-Health Impact Assessment ('SV-HIA') and how this will be applied to planning applications. While policy identifies specific development types that may require an SV-HIA, the current supporting text in paragraph BFN13:3 goes on to suggest that any development type could require an SV-HIA and this may be required at “any stage” of the planning application process. Hadley requests further clarification to this policy on the criteria for when an SV-HIA is required, including the scale and type of development proposed, as well as a clearer timeframe for requiring an SV-HIA.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the policy to be positively prepared because Policy BFN3 addresses the need to achieve sustainable development, as set out in the IIA. It is considered that the policy takes a proportionate approach to the need to undertake a Social Value-Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA).</p> <p>The objective of the SV-HIA tool is to support the delivery of a built and natural environment that delivers social value for Newham residents and supports their good physical and mental health, and social wellbeing.</p> <p>The purpose of a SV-HIA is to act as a critical friend, to ascertain whether the impact on social value and health of a particular development proposal is acceptable or not. It assists decision-makers by giving them better information, but it does not make the decision for them.</p> <p>The accompanying Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Guidance Note and Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool set out a proportionate approach to the size, location and type of development that is required to undertake a SV-HIA. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to consider the impact a development may have on an existing or a new internal or external permanent market. In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is positively prepared and has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to BFN3.2 implementation text:</p> <p>The following developments will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <p>i. Major development</p> <p>ii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspace</p> <p>iii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shops</p> <p>iv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space</p> <p>v. Development impacting an existing or creating a new internal or external permanent market</p> <p>Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) and Checklist (2025) include an update to address the modification to the implementation text for Policy BFN3.2.</p>
Reg19-E-197	NHS HUDU		Reg19-E-197/003a	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA						Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>BFN3 – Social Value and Health Impact Assessment</p> <p>HUDU welcomes the amendment to the wording of criterion 1 of policy BFN3. We maintain that the policy should be updated to provide further details around the type and scale of development which should always be subject to a full HIA. Please see below HUDU comments submitted as part of the Reg 18 consultation:</p>		<p>Support noted. A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the policy adequately sets out which scale, type and location of development is required to undertake a SV-HIA screening assessment.</p> <p>Policy BFN3 sets out that major development, and proposals where potential health or social value issues are</p>

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																	<p>We also note the draft requirement for screening of certain development proposals for HIAs. We support Newham’s intention to encourage developers to consider at the pre-app stage what the health impacts of their proposals might be. However, we suggest that this policy is updated to reflect that some types of development proposals, such as major development over 100 dwellings, should always require the production of a full HIA. Smaller development, such as the development of certain sui generis uses could still be screened for the potential need for an HIA. We therefore recommend Newham update the policy to indicate what types of developments will always need a full HIA and what types of smaller scale development may require a HIA as a result of screening.</p>	<p>likely to arise, must undertake a screening assessment as early as possible in the development process, to determine whether a Social Value and Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA) is required.</p> <p>The implementation text to support the policy states that the following developments types of development will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <p>i. Major development ii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspace iii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shops iv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space</p> <p>Alongside the publication of the Local Plan, we published and consulted on the following documents which are referred to in the implementation text which supports clause BFN3.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Guidance Note 2024 (PDF)• Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Appendix 1 Screening Tool (PDF)• Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Appendix 2 Checklist Tool (PDF) <p>The Council considers it to be more appropriate to set the type and scale of development, which may require a SV-HIA, in the SV-HIA Screening Tool. This will allow officers to monitor the volume of applications we receive, the effectiveness of the policy and make amendments, as required, over the Local Plan period to ensure the effectiveness of the policy. Note that, as drafted, the following applications would be required to undertake a SV-HIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• GLA referable development• Development located on a site allocation and meet one of the following criteria:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• a major development• in or neighbouring an Area of Significant Deprivation• Proposal for a ‘major development’ and includes one of the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space• loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floor space• for a non industrial use next to a Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) or Local Industrial Location (LIL)• located in an Area of Significant Deprivation <p>The SV-HIA Screening Tool also lists a number of other development types / scales which may require a SV-HIA. The type of SV-HIA required will be determined by the nature and scale of the proposal and the timescales involved. The SV-HIA Guidance Note sets out the different scales of SV-HIA and that for the majority of development coming forward in Newham, it is considered likely that a desktop or rapid SV-HIA will be most suitable. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed</p>									
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
																					<p>changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to consider the impact a development may have on an existing or a new internal or external permanent market. In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is positively prepared and has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to BFN3.2 implementation text:</p> <p>The following developments will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <p>i. Major development</p> <p>ii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspace</p> <p>iii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shops</p> <p>iv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space</p> <p>v. Development impacting an existing or creating a new internal or external permanent market</p> <p>Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) and Checklist (2025) include an update to address the modification to the implementation text for Policy BFN3.2.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-197	NHS HUDU		Reg19-E-197/003b	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA						Blank	Blank						Blank	Furthermore, in our previous response we illustrated our support for the Council’s intention to monitor HIAs but recommend the Council provide further details regarding how this will be undertaken.	[Furthermore, in our previous response we illustrated our support for the Council’s intention to monitor HIAs but recommend the Council provide further details regarding how this will be undertaken.] We note that the intention to monitor HIAs has been removed from the latest iteration of the Draft Local Plan and we would suggest that this is something that is included and/or still considered by the Council.	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Local Plan sets out a clear monitoring framework, in which SV-HIAs will be monitored. Please see Key performance indicator 5. In addition, the SV-HIA Guidance Note sets out, at Stage 6, the approach to monitoring of a development and the effectiveness of the policy.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to consider the impact a development may have on an existing or a new internal or external permanent market. In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is positively prepared and has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to BFN3.2 implementation text:</p> <p>The following developments will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <p>i. Major development</p> <p>ii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspace</p> <p>iii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shops</p> <p>iv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space</p> <p>v. Development impacting an existing or creating a new internal or external permanent market</p> <p>Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) and Checklist (2025) include an update to address the modification to the implementation text for Policy BFN3.2.</p>
Reg19-E-202	The Silvertown Partnership LLP	DP9	Reg19-E-202/026a	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														The draft policy is generally supported – development in Newham should maximise social value and make positive contributions to the health and wellbeing of the community.		Support noted.

Reg19-E-202	The Silvertown Partnership LLP	DP9	Reg19-E-202/026b	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														TSP has not submitted a SV-HIA as part of the current HPA and considers that one should not be required. This is because of a concern about whether the benefits of providing such a statement outweigh the impact reviewing it will have on LBN Development Management resourcing, with another submission document to consider, and the ability to determine planning applications in a timely manner aligned to statutory determination periods which is already routinely not achieved. LBN should be seeking to adopt a Local Plan which supports the Development Management team’s ability to process planning applications for positive, sustainable development in a timely manner, rather than to burden the team with additional reports on top of the significant number that is already required.		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the policy to be positively prepared because Policy BFN3 addresses the need to achieve sustainable development, as set out in the IIA. The policy takes a proportionate approach to the need to undertake a Social Value-Health Impact Assessment (SV-HIA).</p> <p>The objective of the SV-HIA tool is support the delivery of a built and natural environment that delivers social value for Newham residents and supports their good physical and mental health, and social wellbeing.</p> <p>The purpose of a SV-HIA is to act as a critical friend, to ascertain whether the impact on social value and health of a particular development proposal is acceptable or not. It assists decision-makers by giving them better information, but it does not make the decision for them.</p> <p>The accompanying Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Guidance Note and Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool set out a proportionate approach to the size, location and type of development that is required to undertake a SV-HIA. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to consider the impact a development may have on an existing or a new internal or external permanent market. In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is positively prepared and has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to BFN3.2 implementation text:</p> <p>The following developments will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <p>i. Major development</p> <p>ii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspace</p> <p>iii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shops</p> <p>iv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green space</p> <p>v. Development impacting an existing or creating a new internal or external permanent market</p> <p>Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) and Checklist (2025) include an update to address the modification to the implementation text for Policy BFN3.2.</p>
Reg19-E-226	NHS North East London		Reg19-E-226/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA						Blank	Blank						Blank	We particularly welcome that the first objective of the Local Plan is putting health front and centre to the overall ambition of ‘building a fairer Newham’. It is therefore imperative that healthcare infrastructure is supported considering the projected population change within the borough during the plan period.		Support noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-226	NHS North East London		Reg19-E-226/005	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA						Blank	Blank						Blank	In light of the current financial climate, it is therefore critical that the Local Plan also supports the population of LBN to make healthier life choices to support the plan ambitions of economic growth and improved health outcomes for existing residents. We welcome that the Local Plan addresses health through the ‘health in all policies’ approach. NHS NEL hope that this translates in particular to more active travel initiatives and green infrastructure as these areas have a significant contribution to make in terms of prevention from a public health perspective.		Support noted.
Reg19-E-229	Dominus Stratford Limited	Knight Frank	Reg19-E-229/012	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														Draft Policy BFN3: Social Value and Health Impact Assessment - delivering social value, health and wellbeing The ambition of draft Policy BFN3 Part 1 states that all developments in Newham should maximise social value and make a positive contribution to the health and wellbeing of communities. This is fully supported by our Client. The Client shares these values and embeds these into the developments which they bring forward including their aspirations for development at 302-312 Stratford High Street		Support noted.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-229	Dominus Stratford Limited	Knight Frank	Reg19-E-229/013	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN3 Social Value and HIA														Consideration within the draft policy of protected characteristics is also supported. The list of protected characteristics set out at BFN3:3 'Implementation' on page 42 should include Care Leavers, which we recommend is added. More broadly we consider that the list of protected characteristics set out at BFN3:3 should be included elsewhere in the draft plan rather than singularly under the supporting text of this specific part of a policy. Doing so would more clearly demonstrate the range of protected characterises that planning has a statutory duty to give due regard to in decision-making under the Equality Act 2010. This should either be set out in a footer, within the policy justification, or perhaps a defined term in the Glossary.		<p>The comment you have provided has not resulted in a change. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the implementation text to Policy BFN3 sets out the protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010 in the UK. However, it is noted that in May 2024 Newham Council has agreed to give more support to some of its most vulnerable young people by recognising care experience as a protected characteristic. The Council recognises the importance of ensuring this policy is reflective of the needs of our community and therefore proposes to make reference to those with care experience in the following suite of documents, which seek to support the delivery of this policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Guidance Note- Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Appendix 1 Screening Tool- Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Appendix 2 Checklist Tool <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the need to consider the impact a development may have on an existing or a new internal or external permanent market. In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is positively prepared has therefore drafted the following modification, which will be presented to the Inspector for their consideration, to BFN3.2 implementation text:</p> <p>The following developments will be expected to submit a Health and Social Value Impact screening assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Major developmentii. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of social infrastructure floorspaceiii. New takeaways, water pipe smoking and other kinds of smoking leisure activities, gambling premises and payday loan shopsiv. Loss, gain or reconfiguration of publicly accessible green spacev. Development impacting an existing or creating a new internal or external permanent market <p>Newham's Social Value-Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool (2025) and Checklist (2025) include an update to address the modification to the implementation text for Policy BFN3.2.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-007	David Gilles		Reg19-E-007/008	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>7 BFN 4 P42: Justification P42/3 says “The purpose of the Vacant Building Credit is to incentivise development on brownfield land. The nature of the land available in Newham and the housing market means that it is not considered that such an incentive is required. Newham has a local housing need of over 60 per cent genuinely affordable housing and as such should be optimising all opportunities to deliver genuinely affordable homes. For these reasons, the Affordable Housing and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance (Greater London Authority, 2017) concludes that the application of Vacant Building Credit is unlikely to be suitable in London.”</p> <p>It should be explicitly clarified that this includes Newham.</p>		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the location of Newham within London and applicability of GLA guidance to Newham is made numerous times within the Local Plan. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-007	David Gilles		Reg19-E-007/009	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>8 BFN 4 P42 and subsequently Developer Contributions and Habitable Rooms or Units. The R19D uses units as a measurement for density rather than habitable rooms.</p> <p>We should change units here and throughout to Habitable Rooms and set the number accordingly, subject to the mix requirements stated elsewhere in the R19D for a scheme or schemes. This will also make it easier to enforce the R19D requirement for a large proportion of family homes, rather than studios and one or two bed flats.</p>		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as a scheme achieves a greater proportion of family and affordable housing by using targets based on units rather than habitable rooms, thereby helping to ensure the policies are effective and positively prepared. Policy H4 also sets out limitations on the proportion of studio and one bedroom dwellings a scheme should provide. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-007	David Gilles		Reg19-E-007/012	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			BFN4.2			Blank	Blank						Blank	9 BFN 4.2 P43/4 Amount paid for land. This should be rewritten to say that the policy requirements are such because they are what Newham needs. Developers should give more than what the NPPF/London Plan currently say because of the levels of need in Newham and the revised justifications for meeting this level of need in the R19D as further amended. The third sentence of para 1 “In line with Government guidance, the amount paid for land is not considered to be an exceptional reason to justify provision of site-specific viability” is not wholly clear and should be redrafted to say more clearly that land price is not a reason to avoid the requirements of the Plan.		<p>The Council’s objective for this policy approach is to seek the delivery of the full range of policy requirements, in particular for social rent homes, while ensuring, as required by national policy (NPPF paragraph 36) that the Plan is effective and deliverable. The viability assessment demonstrates that not all sites can meet the policy requirements. Therefore some sites will need to provide viability assessments which justify a deviation from policy. The policy is clear that the price paid for land would not be considered suitable justification.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and uses the same wording as national planning guidance on viability and has therefore made the following wording change: Applicants are expected to deliver all policy requirements and related obligations outlined in the Plan. In exceptional cases, a shortfall of contributions towards the provision of infrastructure or affordable housing (including, but is not limited to, schemes which do not deliver the 60% affordable housing requirement) may be justified on viability grounds. In line with Government guidance, the amount paid for land is not considered to be an exceptional reason to justify not meeting all policy requirements on viability grounds. provision of site specific viability. which is included in the modification table.</p>
Reg19-E-007	David Gilles		Reg19-E-007/013	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			BFN4.3			Blank	Blank						Blank	10 BFN 4.3 P44: This section in particular should specify social and affordable homes. Please clarify what the last sentence means.		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy's implementation text makes it clear that the Council's priority, as evidenced by our objectively assessed need, is for social rent homes. The final sentence means that the Council will support applicants to identify and source funding for infrastructure, such as from central government. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-013	Transport for London		Reg19-E-013/012	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			BFN1.b		BFN4.1		No								Although there have been some amendments to the wording in the implementation text of BFN4.3, this is not sufficient to ensure consistency with London Plan DF1D which specifically identifies necessary public transport improvements as a priority alongside affordable housing.We recommend that part 1b is amended to read ‘as necessary, enter into section 106 agreements to provide affordable housing, necessary public transport improvements and any other requirements to mitigate impacts arising’ and part 3a is amended to read ‘affordable and family housing and necessary public transport improvements’. In the implementation section the second paragraph of BFN4.1 should be amended to read: ‘Section 106 planning obligations will be sought for affordable housing, necessary public transport improvements and additional contributions...’ This amendment is necessary to ensure soundness and consistency with the London Plan.	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Plan is already considered sufficiently flexible to enable to delivery of infrastructure, with the implementation text of policy BFN4.3 already allowing for site level flexibility when the provision of infrastructure is required by the site allocation and/or an infrastructure provider. This prioritisation approach is also in Newham’s adopted Local Plan (2018) and Newham do not consider there to be any examples where required transport infrastructure has not been delivered as a result of the existing policy. The flexibility for site-specific context to lead to changes in the prioritisation of contributions could be used where a piece of transport infrastructure is required for a site to come forward. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes. Further discussion on this point is set out in the Statement of Common Ground included in the updated Duty to Cooperate Statement.
Reg19-E-015	Greater London Authority		Reg19-E-015/026	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			3											Viability Policy BFN4 sets out the borough’s proposed priorities in situations where developments are unable to meet all policy requirements. Part 3 of the policy sets out the borough’s priorities in the following order - affordable and family housing, local access to employment and training and the delivery of required infrastructure. The approach is not aligned with the approach set out in Policy DF1 part D of the LP2021, which makes it clear that in such situations priority should firstly be given to affordable housing and necessary public transport improvements. The policy should be amended accordingly so that it is aligned with Policy DF1 of the LP2021.		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Plan is already considered sufficiently flexible to enable to delivery of infrastructure, with the implementation text of policy BFN4.3 already allowing for site level flexibility when the provision of infrastructure is required by the site allocation and/or an infrastructure provider. This prioritisation approach is also in Newham’s adopted Local Plan (2018) and Newham do not consider there to be any examples where required transport infrastructure has not been delivered as a result of the existing policy. The flexibility for site-specific context to lead to changes in the prioritisation of contributions could be used where a piece of transport infrastructure is required for a site to come forward. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-018	Metropolitan Police Service	Knight Frank LLP	Reg19-E-018/001	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Yes	No						Yes	Introduction We consider it helpful that LB Newham has introduced some additional wording to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (‘IDP’) which states that the Council will work with the MPS regarding key elements of proposed infrastructure including Section 106 charging. We welcome the inclusion of this wording.		Support noted.

Reg19-E-018	Metropolitan Police Service	Knight Frank LLP	Reg19-E-018/002	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Yes	No					Yes	<p>Notwithstanding, the Plan proposes a significant volume of development which has an impact on policing in the Borough that needs to be mitigated.</p> <p>We do not consider the Plan to be sound as it does not make it clear what the Section 106 requirements are in respect to the MPS. Therefore, to be sound and fully compliant, the Plan must fully explain and provide clarity on the Section 106 infrastructure requirements for policing. This is also important to developers and MPS who require clarity on the Section 106 requirements in LB Newham.</p> <p>Ideally the MPS infrastructure requirements would be included within the Plan itself, the existing structure referencing the IDP is acceptable.</p> <p>The Housing section of the consultation document notes that the plan proposes the delivery of at least 51,425 and 53,784 new residential units in LB Newham between 2023 and 2038 new homes between 2018 and 2033. There would also be growth in commercial floorspace. This will give rise to the need for additional policing infrastructure which will need to be funded. MPS believe that section 106 contributions should be levied for this purpose and that the Local Plan should acknowledge this, together with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and any Section 106 Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p>	<p>Section 106 Contributions Sought</p> <p>We are seeking Section 106 charges to offset the cost of policing infrastructure, based on a charging methodology used widely by other police forces and already tested at appeal and in the courts. A calculator has been produced which assesses these charges, based on the standard methodology. Section 106 contributions have been agreed in other London Boroughs based on this approach. We recommend that the below wording should be included within the IDP as its own subsection within the “What?” subtitle under the “Emergency Services: Metropolitan Police Service” section, as recommended in our previous IDP Representations in April 2024. The wording we seek to be added to the IDP is set out below.:</p> <p><u>Section 106 Contributions</u></p> <p>The MPS have formulated a section 106 charging methodology, for larger scale planning applications involving 150 or more dwellings. This seeks financial contributions to mitigate the impact of such developments in relation to policing infrastructure. MPS uses a standard methodology, already used widely by other police forces across the country. A number of London Boroughs have already applied these charges to development proposals. The charges cover the following policing infrastructure requirements arising from new developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff set-up costs.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Uniformso Radioso Workstation / Office equipment.o Training.• Vehicles.o Patrol Vehicles.o Police community support officers (PCSO) vehicles.o Bicycles.• Mobile IT: The provision of mobile IT capacity to enable officers to undertake tasks while out of the office in order to maintain a visible presence.• CCTV technologies: Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras to detect crime related vehicle movements.• Police National Database (PND): Telephony, licenses, IT, monitoring and the expansion of capacity to cater for additional calls.• The provision and maintenance of police office accommodation. <p>These charges are necessary to ensure that the infrastructure to support additional police officers is available to support the requirements arising from new development.</p> <p>End of proposed wording.</p> <p>Ideally the MPS infrastructure requirements would be included within the Plan itself, however we consider the existing structure referencing the IDP is acceptable should the above be included.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we are not currently consulting on the IDP and are not currently proposing to make any changes to it. In addition we consider the plan to already be sufficiently clear on the section 106 requirements for crime and safety mitigations. These are set out in the planning obligations sections of D1 and HS6 and will relate the scheme specific impacts. The obligations identified in the Plan are in line with the Council's priorities and the Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>
Reg19-E-018	Metropolitan Police Service	Knight Frank LLP	Reg19-E-018/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Yes	No					Yes	<p>Acceptance of Policing Infrastructure as a Legitimate S106 Charging Item</p> <p>It is widely accepted and documented that policing infrastructure represents a legitimate item for inclusion within Section 106 agreements. A number of policing authorities have sought legal advice on this issue and received confirmation of this. The advice also confirms that S106 infrastructure is not limited to buildings and could include equipment such as</p>		<p>Comment noted.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
																			<p>There is an extensive array of Secretary of State and Planning Inspectorate decisions that compellingly support the above conclusions, including two in July 2017.</p> <p>The MPS has successfully secured contributions from other London Boroughs based on the approach set out in these Representations. Policing infrastructure therefore represents a widely recognised infrastructure requirement across London planning authorities.</p>		
Reg19-E-024	Home Builders Federation		Reg19-E-024/008	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			4				No							<p>BFN4: Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery</p> <p>Part 4 is unsound because it is unjustified.</p> <p>Part 4 requires that applications for developments at, or over, 250 units/hectare density or for major developments on site allocations should produce an Infrastructure Sufficiency Statement. This represents a shift in responsibility away from the plan maker to the applicant. It is the role of the local authority to demonstrate through the preparation of its Infrastructure Plan whether there is adequate infrastructure capacity to deliver the development requirements of the plan, or, at least, the prospect that these will be provided at the appropriate point during the life of the plan. If the Council is saying that it is uncertain that there is sufficient infrastructure, then this raises a question about the soundness of the local plan and its deliverability. This is a very important matter.</p> <p>The Council should be clear what the infrastructure barriers are, and how this may affect the delivery of allocated sites, or those locations whether windfall is anticipated. If the infrastructure within the borough is inadequate to support the proposed level of residential building then this needs to be highlighted and resolved before the local plan is submitted for examination. Housebuilders are very limited in terms of what they can do to resolve any such deficiencies.</p>		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as this policy wording is in conformity with London Plan policy D2. The development scale thresholds relate to the scale of development we consider to be high density (see policy D3 in the Submission Local Plan) and the important relationship between master planning and consideration of infrastructure capacity. The Local Plan is supported by a significant amount of evidence considering the delivery of the infrastructure required to ensure sustainable development. This is inevitably based on assumptions regarding development density. To ensure the effectiveness and flexibility of the Plan, in cases where density increases above such levels, it is vital that developments demonstrate their development is still supported by suitable infrastructure, in line with paragraph 11 and footnote 39 of the NPPF. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-024	Home Builders Federation		Reg19-E-024/009	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			5				No							<p>Part 5 is unsound because it is contrary to national policy.</p> <p>Part 5 seeks to suspend the application of the Vacant Building Credit. The Vacant Building Credit was introduced by the government in 2014 to support the delivery of homes on previously developed land. In view of the serious shortfall in the supply of housing in London relative to the requirement this suspension is unjustified.</p> <p>Housing delivery in London is falling short, by a significant degree, of the London Plan requirement. The government’s recently concluded review of the London Plan – see the London Plan Review: Report of Expert Advisers, 15 January 2024 – identifies a major shortfall in housing delivery compared to the London Plan target, to the extent that, as a whole, London will now need to deliver 62,300 homes on average each year until 2028/29 rather than 52,300 if the full London Plan housing requirement is to be provided by the end of the plan period (see para. 3 of the Executive Summary and para. 2.16).</p> <p>Delivery is also faltering to a degree in Newham. According to the government’s 2022 Housing Delivery Test, 84 per cent of the housing requirement for Newham has been provided and the Council is now obliged to apply the 20 per cent buffer to help improve supply.</p> <p>In this context, the suspension of the Vacant Building Credit is unjustified. Nor should its application be made conditional.</p>	<p>This part of the policy should be deleted from the Plan.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be appropriate as it is clear that this incentive is not required for development in Newham, as no site in Newham has sought to apply vacant building credit to date.</p>
Reg19-E-024	Home Builders Federation		Reg19-E-024/027	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery							No							<p>We note also, with some alarm, that the viability modelling has also excluded the effect of the employment and training contributions (see page 54). Appendix 7 does model these costs, but does so separately from other policies and infrastructure costs. The cost of this should be included as part of the modelling of the cumulative impact of policies, not modelled separately and in isolation from all the other policies. Even so, even in isolation, the effect of these contributions is sobering. As the report observes at paragraph 6.31:</p> <p><i>Although the impact of the contributions is relatively modest, the percentage increase can be significantly higher where starting residual land values are low. The variable impact of this policy indicates that the Council should retain its flexible approach, with the targets used as a starting point for negotiations and applied on a ‘subject to viability’ basis.</i></p> <p>One can only wonder what the effect on viability might be if these costs are added to the modelling for all policies.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach and the viability testing has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the employment and training contributions have been considered as part of the cumulative testing.</p> <p>The testing referred to on page 54 is designed to test the impact of that specific policy. This is the only place where the typologies are modelled excluding the employment and training contributions, as this relates to a specific policy.</p> <p>Elsewhere, the appraisals incorporate employment and training contributions as a baseline position. The only policies that are not included in the baseline residual land values in tables 6.60.1 to 6.60.6 are those specifically identified in the tables (i.e. Envac, BNG, accessibility, carbon low and carbon high). All other policies are reflected in the baseline. This is explained in para 6.59.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the plan and supporting viability testing is sound without the proposed changes.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-082	NHS Property Services		Reg19-E-082/002	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Yes	Yes						Yes	<p>Draft Policy BNF4 states that development will be required to as necessary, enter into Section 106 agreements to provide affordable housing and any other requirements to mitigate impacts arising.</p> <p>Whilst we consider Policy BNF4 to be sound as currently drafted, we request that the Council continue its engagement with the NHS ICB to further refine the identified healthcare needs and proposed solutions to support the level of growth proposed by the Local Plan, as identified in the IDP, prior to submission. Further comments on IDP are provided below.</p> <p>Healthcare providers should have flexibility in determining the most appropriate means of meeting the relevant healthcare needs arising from a new development. Where new developments create a demand for health services that cannot be supported by incremental extension or internal modification of existing facilities, this means the provision of new purpose-built healthcare infrastructure will be required to provide sustainable health services. Options should enable financial contributions, new-on-site healthcare infrastructure, free land/infrastructure/property, or a combination of these. It should be clarified that the NHS and its partners will need to work with the council in the formulation of appropriate mitigation measures.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>NHSPS considers Policy BFN4 sound as currently drafted.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This comment has been subject to further discussion with NHS NEL, on behalf of NHS bodies in Newham, and a satisfactory resolution regarding future engagement has been found. This is set out in more detail in a Statement of Common Ground, included in the updated Duty to Cooperate Report.</p>
Reg19-E-082	NHS Property Services		Reg19-E-082/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Yes	Yes						Yes	<p>Comments on the IDP</p> <p>The provision of adequate healthcare infrastructure is in our view critical to the delivery of sustainable development. A sound IDP must include sufficient detail to provide clarity around the healthcare infrastructure required to the level of growth proposed by the Plan, and to ensure that both planning obligations and the capital allocation process for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) effectively support and result in capital funding towards delivery of the required infrastructure.</p> <p>We welcome identification in the IDP of major health facilities projects.</p>		<p>Support noted.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-082	NHS Property Services		Reg19-E-082/004	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Yes	Yes						Yes	<p>[Comments on the IDP]</p> <p>We recommend that the Council add further detail to the approach regarding primary healthcare provision to ensure that the assessment of existing healthcare infrastructure is robust, and the mitigation options secured align with NHS requirements.</p>	<p>We suggest the following process (set out in red text below) for determining the appropriate form of contribution for the provision of healthcare infrastructure associated with new development is included in the IDP:</p> <p>The requirement for a contribution towards healthcare infrastructure from new development will be determined by working with the ICB and other key stakeholders as appropriate, in accordance with the following process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessing the level and type of demand generated by the proposal.• Working with the ICB to understand the capacity of existing healthcare infrastructure and the likely impact of the proposals on healthcare infrastructure capacity in the locality.• Identifying appropriate options to increase capacity to accommodate the additional service requirements and the associated capital costs of delivery.• Identifying the appropriate form of developer contributions.	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we are not currently consulting on the IDP and are not currently proposing to make any changes to it. In addition, policy SI1 already includes text regarding applicants engaging with a range of NHS bodies and policy BFN4's requirement for Infrastructure Sufficiency Statements will require a site level assessment of health infrastructure provision. The NHS, as consultees on planning applications, will also have the opportunity to comment on schemes. This is set out in more detail in a Statement of Common Ground, included in the updated Duty to Cooperate Report. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without this change.</p>
Reg19-E-083	Aston Mansfield	Savills	Reg19-E-083/092	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery														No comment.		Comment noted.

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																					
Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-170	Berkeley Homes (South East London) Limited	Savills	Reg19-E-170/020	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			2			Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>Draft Policy BNF4: Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery</p> <p>Draft Policy BNF4 seeks to secure development contributions and infrastructure delivery. It is important to recognise that to ensure the delivery of a scheme, a balance needs to be struck between the various factors that can sway the viability of a development (CIL, S106 obligations, affordable housing delivery, infrastructure etc.). As acknowledged in Part 3 of this policy, there are circumstances where substantiated financial viability constraints need to be accepted and a balance struck to ensure a scheme is deliverable. Notwithstanding this, we we have provided comments on this policy to ensure developers are able to continue to deliver within the borough. Draft Policy BNF4 part 2 states:</p> <p>Where a site is not proposing to meet all policy requirements or related obligations on viability grounds, applicants must:</p> <p>a. explore all available options (including review mechanisms, flexible trigger points or phased payment of contributions) to reduce the viability gap and secure much needed contributions; and</p> <p>b. submit a financial viability assessment. This assessment will be made public and subject to independent scrutiny at the applicant’s cost.</p> <p>Berkeley Homes considers that this policy is not consistent with London Plan Policy H5. London Plan Policy H5 secures the Viability Tested Route which assess the maximum level of affordable housing that a scheme can deliver in cases where the threshold level of affordable housing cannot be met and where fixed or minimum affordable housing requirements are not in place. This policy is specific to affordable housing only and ensures that where policy compliant levels of affordable housing are not provided, there is a review mechanism in place and how this should be applied. The approach proposed in BNF4 is inconsistent with H5 through the requirement for a viability assessment where ‘a site is not proposing to meet all policy requirements or related obligations on viability grounds’.</p> <p>In our view, the Development Management process should determine the most appropriate form for individual sites and to determine where policy requirements or related obligations may deviate from the complaint position. The Development Plan must be applied through a Development Management framework to allow for the delivery of new homes and affordable homes.</p>		<p>This wording change has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as viability review mechanisms are required by national (paragraph 009 Viability PPG) and regional policy (London Plan Policy H5) to strengthen local authorities’ ability to seek compliance with relevant policies over the lifetime of the project. London Plan policy H5, part c3 and paragraph 4.5.9 explicitly states that the fast track route not only applies where the scheme does not meet affordable housing requirements but also if it does not meet other relevant policy requirements and obligations to the satisfaction of the borough and the Mayor where relevant. If the fast track route does not apply, then boroughs are able to seek both viability assessments and review mechanisms. This policy is in compliance with the London Plan and the Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the clarity of when a viability assessment would be required.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and uses the same wording as national planning guidance on viability and has therefore made the following wording change: Applicants are expected to deliver all policy requirements and related obligations outlined in the Plan. In exceptional cases, a shortfall of contributions towards the provision of infrastructure or affordable housing (including, but is not limited to, schemes which do not deliver the 60% affordable housing requirement) may be justified on viability grounds. In line with Government guidance, the amount paid for land is not considered to be an exceptional reason to justify not meeting all policy requirements on viability grounds. provision of site specific viability. which is included in the modification table.</p>

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/017	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			3			Blank	Blank						Blank	<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft.]</p> <p>Detailed Comments Schedule: Given the points above about Affordable Housing, it may be appropriate to prioritise infrastructure if that infrastructure is essential to unlocking the development of the site. This is particularly the case on strategic sites where there are often large sums required for contributions to highways upgrades or DLR station improvements. We suggest that the policy includes some flexibility for the Council to adjust the priorities on a site-specific basis. This could be linked to the Infrastructure Sufficiency Statement.</p>		A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Plan is already considered sufficiently flexible to enable to delivery of infrastructure, with the implementation text of policy BFN4.3 already allowing for site level flexibility when the provision of infrastructure is required by the site allocation and/or an infrastructure provider. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.
Reg19-E-178	Royal Docks		Reg19-E-178/018	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery					BFN4.2	Blank	Blank						Blank		<p>[The comments below and in the attached schedule set out some areas where we feel amendments or additions to the Plan could further support the Council and the RDT’s work.</p> <p>In the attached schedule are a series of specific changes which we have organised with reference to the pages and policies of the draft.]</p> <p>Detailed Comments Schedule: The use of the word “exceptional” to describe the requirement for viability testing should be removed since it is likely that all sites will be unable to meet all the policy requirements of the Plan. The use of the word “exceptional” is therefore misleading. As set out above, the viability testing process must be properly resourced to avoid delays.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the approach to be deliverable. While the viability assessment that supports the plan shows viability challenges in meeting this target, the testing was undertaken in a particularly challenging viability context, with construction costs and interest rates being abnormally high. We consider that as economic circumstances improve, the policy will become easier to deliver over the plan period. The policy also allows for the submission of a viability assessment in circumstances where developments are unable to achieve the policy target, thereby ensuring the plan remains effective and deliverable.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p>

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																					
Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-180	PEACH: The People's Empowerment Alliance for Custom House		Reg19-E-180/002	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Blank	Blank						Blank	Financial Viability Assessments ('FVA') It is widely known that Developers use Financial Viability Assessments as a loophole to get out of policy requirements, particularly when it comes to providing affordable housing. This has not been adequately tackled in this local plan draft, with the loophole available to Developers in all major planning areas.	<p>We believe that if this plan is to hold weight and address the housing emergency, it is integral that Newham creates a specific policy regarding how it deals with Financial Viability Assessments to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The council will always produce its own FVA and will employ industry specialists to do so, so it holds weight next to Developer's own FVA's created by well-resourced financial teams.- All material related to FVA's including negotiations should be made publicly available and not redacted, prior to planning committee meetings.- The council should not permit developments where a Developer's own FVA is materially different from the council's FVA.- Developers should not be allowed to renegotiate the s106 terms of affordable housing/tenures/number of units after planning permission is granted on the basis that their profits may not be as high as expected.	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as this Local Plan and current practice by Newham's planning team already address the points requested. The Council employs industry specialists to scrutinise viability assessments. In line with National Planning Guidance these valuations are published. The Council does refuse schemes where our own assessment indicates the scheme can deliver more value to the community than is being proposed. Developers are able to submit applications which seek to vary their original permission but these are scrutinised as robustly as the original permission. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the clarity of when a viability assessment would be required.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and uses the same wording as national planning guidance on viability and has therefore made the following wording change: Applicants are expected to deliver all policy requirements and related obligations outlined in the Plan. In exceptional cases, a shortfall of contributions towards the provision of infrastructure or affordable housing (including, but is not limited to, schemes which do not deliver the 60% affordable housing requirement) may be justified on viability grounds. In line with Government guidance, the amount paid for land is not considered to be an exceptional reason to justify not meeting all policy requirements on viability grounds. provision of site specific viability. which is included in the modification table.</p>
Reg19-E-180	PEACH: The People's Empowerment Alliance for Custom House		Reg19-E-180/003	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Blank	Blank						Blank	Vacant Building Credits: We strongly oppose any opportunity for Developers to avoid building council/social/affordable rent housing which VBC is used for. As this Lichfield blog on VBC states: "Vacant building credit can do one of two things; remove any affordable housing contribution or reduce it."	Planning permission should require that council, social, and affordable rent housing levels remain unaffected by VBC.	Support noted. For these reasons, the policy acts as a presumption against the use of Vacant Building Credit.

Building a Fairer Newham Comments to the full Regulation 19 Representations																		
Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?
Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation																	
LB Newham Response																		
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/019	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			BFN4.2										
<p>Policy BFN4: Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery</p> <p>3.15 Part 2 (a) requires sites that are not proposing to meet all s106 requirements on viability grounds to explore all available options to reduce the viability gap, this includes review mechanisms, with part (b) requiring an FVA to be submitted in the public domain. This approach is inconsistent with the London Plan where the requirement for a review mechanism (Policy H5) only relates to affordable housing and the Viability Tested Route (4.4.3 London Plan). National guidance recognises the wider role of review mechanisms but they should be applied proportionately and should not be applied where they would compromise the delivery of new development..</p>																		
<p>[Appendix 12: General Policies – Suggested amendments]</p> <p>2. Where a site is not proposing to meet all policy requirements or related obligations the target level of affordable housing on viability grounds, applicants must:</p> <p>a. explore all available options (including review mechanisms, flexible trigger points or phased payment of contributions) to reduce the viability gap and secure much needed contributions; and</p> <p>b. submit a financial viability assessment. This assessment will be made public and subject to independent scrutiny at the applicant’s cost.</p>																		
<p>This wording change has not been made.</p> <p>We did not consider this change to be necessary as viability review mechanisms are required by national (paragraph 009 Viability PPG) and regional policy (London Plan Policy H5) to strengthen local authorities’ ability to seek compliance with relevant policies over the lifetime of the project. London Plan policy H5, part c3 and paragraph 4.5.9 explicitly states that the fast track route not only applies where the scheme does not meet affordable housing requirements but also if it does not meet other relevant policy requirements and obligations to the satisfaction of the borough and the Mayor where relevant. If the fast track route does not apply, then boroughs are able to seek both viability assessments and review mechanisms. This policy is in compliance with the London Plan and the Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However this policy approach also received comments which raised concerns regarding the clarity of when a viability assessment would be required.</p> <p>In light of these comments, the Council recognises the importance of ensuring the Plan is clear and uses the same wording as national planning guidance on viability and has therefore made the following wording change: Applicants are expected to deliver all policy requirements and related obligations outlined in the Plan. In exceptional cases, a shortfall of contributions towards the provision of infrastructure or affordable housing (including, but is not limited to, schemes which do not deliver the 60% affordable housing requirement) may be justified on viability grounds. In line with Government guidance, the amount paid for land is not considered to be an exceptional reason to justify not meeting all policy requirements on viability grounds. provision of site specific viability which is included in the modification table.</p>																		

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/020	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			BFN4.3											3.16 We previously stated that we did not have any particular comments on the priority order of the Plan's objectives set out in part 3 of Policy BFN4 but requested that the policy provides some scope to acknowledge individual site circumstances which may impact the ability to achieve the proposed order of priority for plan objectives. In the case of the Bromley by Bow Gasworks, for example, which contains seven no. Grade II listed gasholders (the only kind in the world) the proposals for the Site include the retention and reuse of these seven listed gasholders. The cost for both remediating the site and refurbishing the seven listed gasholders are significant abnormal costs that through the financial viability appraisal process has demonstrated to have quite significant and exceptional implications on the delivery of affordable housing on this site. Similarly, the unique nature of all of the gasworks sites means that they would all be subject to remediation in order to bring the site(s) forward for redevelopment which is subject to exceptional abnormal costs that need to be factored into the viability of the development and may influence the priority order set out in Policy BNF4.	[Appendix 12: General Policies – Suggested amendments] 3. Where substantiated financial viability constraints remain, applicants should deliver the maximum viable level of obligations, and it is expected that the Plan's objectives will be prioritised as follows, unless specific site circumstances determine otherwise: a. affordable and family housing b. local access to employment and training c. delivery of required infrastructure.	This wording change has not been made. We did not consider this change to be appropriate as the retention of the gasholders and the remediation of contaminated land are not planning obligations, which relate to the nature of the proposed scheme being delivered. The retention of the gasholders and the remediation of contaminated land are costs associated with the land and would be required irrespective of the nature of the scheme being brought forward. As such, inline with paragraph 14 of the Viability PPG, such costs should be reflected in both the Benchmark Land Value and Residual Land Value. In addition, the policy and implementation text already provides sufficient flexibility for viability constraints to be considered and for site specific factors to be considered. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed change.
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/021	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery			BFN4.4											3.17 Part 4 of this policy requires an Infrastructure Sufficiency Statement from applications for development at, or over, 250 units/hectare density or for major developments on site allocations intended to demonstrate there is sufficient infrastructure. This is considered to be a duplication in requirements and it is considered that major applications already achieve this either through Environmental Impact Assessments or through standard application documents and proposal assessments i.e. the Transport Assessment. It is not clear what an Infrastructure Sufficiency Statement would seek to set out over and above a normal planning application assessment therefore this is not justified. This duplication of assessments provides no purpose and is contrary to the Government's aims of simplifying the planning process.	[Appendix 12: General Policies – Suggested amendments] 4. Applications for developments at, or over, 250 units/hectare density or for major developments on site allocations will be required to demonstrate there is sufficient infrastructure to support the proposed scale of development, through the provision of an Infrastructure Sufficiency Statement.	A response to this comment was provided in the Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation Report. The Council's response has not changed.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response	
Reg19-E-197	NHS HUDU		Reg19-E-197/004	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Blank	Blank							Blank	BFN4 - Developer contributions and Infrastructure Delivery HUDU maintains its position that the prioritisation hierarchy outlined in clause 3 of policy BFN4 should be amended as below: [HUDU maintains its position that the prioritisation hierarchy outlined in clause 3 of policy BFN4 should be amended as below:] Clause 3. Where financial viability concerns are substantiated, it is expected that the Plan’s objectives will be prioritised as follows: a. affordable and family housing b. health and community infrastructure b. c. local access to employment and training c. d. delivery of other required infrastructure Clause 4. Developments at or over 250 units/hectare density or on site allocations or proposals comprising of 100 + homes ; a scale referable to the Mayor of London will be required to demonstrate there is sufficient infrastructure to support the proposed scale of development. This amendment would ensure that the policy is more reflective of the draft plan’s vision and objectives as well as the Council’s wider priorities. As previously outlined, Newham’s health outcomes are consistently significantly lower than both the London and England averages, whilst economic activity level remain in line or above comparable averages. We also recommend that reference is made to HUDU’s developer contributions model in the policies supporting text in line with an increasing number of other London authorities.	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Local Plan’s planning obligations hierarchy was established to be in line with the wider Council’s objectives and political commitments. While it is not possible for Newham to amend the hierarchy to be more favourable for health and community infrastructure, the new Local Plan provides a clearer approach to meeting healthcare need than the adopted Local Plan, including identifying where facilities are required and outlining the use of the HUDU model to collect funds for sites which are not providing healthcare facilities. In addition, the Regulation 19 Local Plan has introduced a change to policy BFN4 to allow for flexibility in the application of this hierarchy, where required for infrastructure delivery. This will require the Council or infrastructure provider to provide representations regarding evidenced need through the application process. This will ensure the right infrastructure is delivered in the right locations. The Council is satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.	
Reg19-E-202	The Silvertown Partnership LLP	DP9	Reg19-E-202/027a	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery															For clarity, the policy (or supporting text) should list which “Section 106 requirements” require adherence to avoid the need for viability testing so these costs can be appropriately factored into viability assessments. This is in line with Planning Practice Guidance which sets out that planning obligations should be clearly set out in plans and subject to examination. It is acknowledged that the Section 106 requirements are discussed elsewhere in the draft, however, a single list will help to avoid any ambiguity around when viability assessments are, and are not, required. It is important to note, however, that viability assessments will not require updates on a continuous basis as Section 106 Agreements are negotiated.		A response to this comment was provided in the Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation Report. The Council’s response has not changed.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-202	The Silvertown Partnership LLP	DP9	Reg19-E-202/027b	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery														In terms of point 4, in terms of submitting an infrastructure sufficiency statement, it is not clear what the benefit of such a report is when infrastructure sufficiency will already be tested in a range of technical reports, including EIAs for schemes of scale, and this relates back to a concern about whether the benefits of providing such a statement outweigh the impact reviewing it will have on LBN Development Management resourcing, with another submission document to consider, and the ability to determine planning applications in a timely manner aligned to statutory determination periods which is already routinely not achieved. LBN should be seeking to adopt a Local Plan which supports the Development Management team's ability to process planning applications for positive, sustainable development in a timely manner, rather than to burden the team with additional reports on top of the significant number that is already required. If LBN is to require infrastructure sufficiency statements, supporting guidance should be clear about the methodology to be used in assessing the need for all types of infrastructure.		Comment noted. The Council has a newly established Infrastructure planning team and is confident in our capacity to review such statements.
Reg19-E-226	NHS North East London		Reg19-E-226/004	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Blank	Blank						Blank	NHS NEL would like to continue to work with LBN to agree an approach to securing developer contributions, prioritisation and associated development viability where key infrastructure cannot be funded in line with population growth given the financial climate. We would also like to work closely with LBN if they decide to develop a Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.		Comment noted. This comment has been subject to further discussion with NHS NEL, on behalf of NHS bodies in Newham, and a satisfactory resolution regarding future engagement has been found. This is set out in more detail in a Statement of Common Ground, included in the updated Duty to Cooperate Report.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-226	NHS North East London		Reg19-E-226/006	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Blank	Blank						Blank	NHS NEL would like to make a general point regarding references to health infrastructure contained within site allocations. As LBN will be aware planning for healthcare infrastructure is a complex process. There are many variables and scenarios that need to be considered and planning for large site allocations without certainty as to whether they will be delivered by developers (or indeed information regarding phasing) as envisaged within the Local Plan is one of these. We would therefore request that NHS NEL and LBN continue to work closely together to ensure that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is regularly updated to reflect the forthcoming NHS NEL Infrastructure Strategy and projected population growth as planning permission delivery becomes more certain. Additionally, it is critical to the delivery of new and improved healthcare infrastructure that money continues to be allocated to health infrastructure through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and S.106 contributions. Going forwards, clarity regarding adequate contributions is required to mitigate the current viability risks to proposed schemes and NHS NEL would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with you.		Comment noted. This comment has been subject to further discussion with NHS NEL, on behalf of NHS bodies in Newham, and a satisfactory resolution regarding future engagement has been found. This is set out in more detail in a Statement of Common Ground, included in the updated Duty to Cooperate Report.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-226	NHS North East London		Reg19-E-226/012	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Blank	Blank						Blank		<p>Policy BFN4 – developer contributions</p> <p>The prioritisation hierarchy outlined in part 3 of policy BFN4 should be amended to include health and social infrastructure as priority b):</p> <p>3) Where financial viability concerns are substantiated, it is expected that the Plan’s objectives will be prioritised as follows:</p> <p>a) affordable and family housing</p> <p>b) health and social infrastructure</p> <p>c) local access to employment and training</p> <p>d) delivery of other required infrastructure</p> <p>This amendment would ensure that the policy is reflective of the proposed vision and objectives of the Local Plan as well as the Council’s wider priorities in relation to community wealth building. Newham’s health outcomes are consistently significantly lower than both the London and England averages, whilst economic activity level remains in line or above comparable averages.</p> <p>Currently, health infrastructure is covered by part d) delivery of other required infrastructure. The quantum of residential development proposed in the Local Plan and Site Allocations must have adequate social infrastructure to support new and existing residents. With Healthy Places forming a core principle of the National Planning Policy Framework consultation and the limited resources of the NHS to fund new and existing health infrastructure, developer contributions must be recognised as a key component of improving the borough’s health assets.</p> <p>NHS NEL welcomes that on page 160 under the heading Planning Obligations, it is noted that contributions may be secured from residential development which generates additional demand for community and health facilities., We therefore request that this is reflected within the wording of Policy BFN4 to formalise the borough’s stance.</p>	Comment noted. This comment has been subject to further discussion with NHS NEL, on behalf of NHS bodies in Newham, and a satisfactory resolution regarding prioritisation has been found. This is set out in more detail in a Statement of Common Ground, included in the updated Duty to Cooperate Report.

Representation Reference	Representor	Agent	Comment Reference	Chapter	Policy	Site allocation	Introduction	Clause	Justification	Implementation text	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Positively prepared?	Justified?	Effective?	Consistent with the NPPF?	Consistent with the London Plan?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate?	Representor Comment	Representor Proposed modifications and explanation	LB Newham Response
Reg19-E-234	Places for London		Reg19-E-234/035	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery						Blank	No							<p>The draft Policy BNF4, Part 3 sets out priorities for planning obligations being negotiated as part of viability discussions. This ranks the delivery of required infrastructure below family housing and local access to employment and training.</p> <p>This is not aligned with London Plan Policy DF1 Part D which makes it clear that in such situations priority should firstly be given to affordable housing and necessary public transport improvements.</p> <p>It should be noted that there are some situations where certain infrastructure items (eg. the new bridge link on the Limmo site) are ‘must-have’ infrastructure items to unlock the development potential of a site and therefore must be prioritised and weighted accordingly where viability is stretched.</p>		<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the Plan is already considered sufficiently flexible to enable to delivery of infrastructure, with the implementation text of policy BFN4.3 already allowing for site level flexibility when the provision of infrastructure is required by the site allocation and/or an infrastructure provider.</p> <p>This prioritisation approach is also in Newham’s adopted Local Plan (2018) and Newham do not consider there to be any examples where required transport infrastructure has not been delivered as a result of the existing policy.</p> <p>The flexibility for site-specific context to lead to changes in the prioritisation of contributions could be used where a piece of transport infrastructure is required for a site to come forward. The Council is satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>
Reg19-E-238	Environment Agency		Reg19-E-238/013	Building a Fairer Newham	BFN4 Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery														<p>BFN4: Developer contributions and infrastructure delivery</p> <p>We would like to remind you that within our remit, a key concern here will be to ensure that flood risk management (flood defences) infrastructure and any needs for improvements have been identified and inform the evidence base’.</p>		<p>Comment noted.</p>
Reg19-E-013	Transport for London		Reg19-E-013/007b	General								No							<p>[However, there are a few outstanding issues that we believe need to be addressed to ensure soundness and consistency with the London Plan] including a more positive approach towards securing contributions towards transport improvements.</p>		<p>Comment noted. A more detailed response regarding securing contributions towards transport has been provided in a Statement of Common Ground, included in the updated Duty to Cooperate Report.</p>
Reg19-E-195	St William Homes LLP	Quod	Reg19-E-195/011	Building a Fairer Newham															<p>3 Building a Fairer Newham</p> <p>3.1 St William continues to support the Local Plan’s approach to building a fairer Newham, in particular through the delivery of at least 47,600 homes in Newham over the period 2019/20 to 2028/29 (paragraph 3.1) in line with the targets set in the London Plan (2021). The urgent need for housing delivery is confirmed in the Government’s recent consultation on the NPPF, which outlines the Government’s commitment to deliver economic growth by approving more housing and commercial development. The Government makes clear that the intention is to actually deliver the identified housing need and the consultation elevates the substantial weight that should be applied to the value of using suitable brownfield land. Building a fairer Newham and achieving the level of change and development proposed is based on Good Growth principles which is fully supported.</p>		<p>Support noted.</p>