

General comments received.

2nd Consultation Ref:	Name 1	Name 2	Company/ Organisation	Policy or Paragraph	Summary	Response
LPR182Q.002	Lucy	Owen		General	Port of London Authority has no comments to make at this stage, but due to small areas of land ownership would like to be kept up to date.	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.029	Jeremy	Fraser		General	Document relies heavily on previous planning strategies, but less relevant where planned approved in outline	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.031	Hannah	Clifton		General	Majority of sites allocated already have permission, which reduces scope for comment.	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.031	Hannah	Clifton		General	Evidence base is incomplete at this stage.	Acknowledged. Evidence is complete.
LPR182Q.031	Hannah	Clifton		General	Continuous engagement between organisations since 2012. Local Plan has limited added value due to lack of detail in evidence and the document itself. Lack of consistency with Newham Plan and frequent deferral to the London Plan.	Acknowledged. Evidence is now complete. LLDC is a mayoral development corporation so as much as possible, conforms to the London Plan.
LPR182Q.031	Hannah	Clifton		General	Should have a Proposals Map, its absence does not make a user-friendly document.	Acknowledged. There will be an accompanying Policies Map to the Publication Version.
LPR182Q.031	Hannah	Clifton		General	Local Plan will use adopted plans such as Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan but lack of commitment to this causes concern.	Acknowledged. There will be some inconsistencies with adopted policy where borough documents differ. In this case the approach has been adequately justified by evidence to determine the most appropriate approach for the area as a whole.
LPR182Q.031	Hannah	Clifton		General	Plan should be amended to include the need to control hot food takeaways and health impacts. No mention of betting shops and consequences in deprived areas where often linked to incidences of anti-social behaviour.	Change made to include within Policy B.2 takeaway and betting shop issues.
LPR182Q.031	Hannah	Clifton		General	Is less detail within the Plan	Change made to Publication Version to include greater degree of detail.
LPR182Q.031	Hannah	Clifton		General	Some potential conflicts with the FALP.	Change made to reflect the FALP throughout the document.
LPR182Q.031	Hannah	Clifton		General	Low, medium and high densities are not consistent with the London Plan.	Change made. Density descriptions have been removed.
LPR182Q.035	Joseph	Alexander		Evidence Attached	Open space at Carpenters Should be protected by MOL.	No change. MOL designation is subject to a number of criteria.
LPR182Q.039	Keith	Ellis		General	Should not be too prescriptive and inflexible, should be able to build in accord with demand.	No change.
LPR182Q.040	Phil	Wainwright		General	Plan is complex with a lot of jargon. Cross-references to other policies are also difficult to follow.	Acknowledged. A great deal of care has been taken to ensure language and style are accessible to all, however as it is also a statutory planning document, the inclusion of some technical language is unavoidable.
LPR182Q.040	Phil	Wainwright		General	Comments relate to concerns of the residents of the Three Mills Residential Moorings (3MM) by Three Mills Green. This was set up in 1998 as a local government initiative, partly to provide a means of affordable accommodation in the area. Landprop have inherited ownership and management of the moorings. In Landprop's	Specific policies within the Local Plan deal with waterways and moorings, as well as new moorings proposed.

General comments received.

					originally proposed plan for Strand East, the moorings was no more than a group of boats tied to 2 pontoons. There was a public bridge right over the top of the boats and no on-shore facilities (or any other facilities) shown at all. Consultation did not take place with the community on this and community feels marginalised. Planning application conditions have been ignored. Should consider these communities within the planning process.	
LPR182Q.048	D. Casey & J. Baker			Evidence Attached	Evidence attached	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.048	D. Casey & J. Baker			General	Local Plan unsound as does not identify Bow Yard West as a safeguarded rail head protecting for aggregate distribution in future. This was agreed in the Fish Island AAP.	This site falls within a designated employment cluster, specifically a Strategic Industrial Location (Preferred Industrial Location). The Publication Plan states that this cluster includes: A safeguarded rail head and associated bulk freight distribution use. B2, B8 and waste management uses are appropriate. Only development supporting the rail-related and aggregates distribution uses and small-scale ancillary uses will be supported. Furthermore safeguarding the Bow Midland West Rail site for rail use is one of the sub-area 1 priorities. The revised chapter also states: 'New development should not adversely affect existing business uses and should be designed to take account of their existence and operational requirements, particularly where those businesses are located within the designated employment clusters'.
LPR182Q.051	Tommy	Whittingham		General	No SRN within the area, M11, A13 and the A1306 and M25 Junctions 29 and 30 are located to the north and east. Impact of congestion on the SRN would be a concern. Have duty to safeguard SRN operation through collaborative working. Scale of projected development and gross direct jobs to 2030 will impact which should be indicated within the Local Plan. This should be clarified.	The transport policies within the plan support the role of the Strategic Road Network.
LPR182Q.054	Clyde	Loakes		General	Local Plan should be consistent with up to date Waltham Forest plans.	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.054	Clyde	Loakes		General	Transport, social and other physical infrastructure should be clarified, in particular IT infrastructure in securing high-grade employment uses.	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.055	Steven	Pugh		General	Large amount of information within the document which can be difficult to understand	Acknowledged. A great deal of care has been taken to ensure language and style are accessible to all, however as it is also a statutory planning document, the inclusion of some technical language is unavoidable.
LPR182Q.055	Steven	Pugh		General	No enough emphasis on the waterways within the Plan.	An intention of the re-draft of the plan is to make the document and its policies as concise as possible; this is in response to various comments throughout the consultation process. Where it has been possible to combine certain policies whilst maintaining the overall

General comments received.

						outcome and strength of policies this has been done. The provision of moorings is addressed within the policy.
LPR182Q.072	Mallory	Giardino		General	Local Plan provides opportunity to foster creative, affordable and sustainable neighbourhoods. Should have greater emphasis towards sustainability of an affordable ecology which has allowed development of thriving artistic and cultural scene.	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.057	Daisy	Bentley		General		
LPR182Q.058	Eftychia	Karamolegkou		General		
LPR182Q.059	Kent	Jeudy		General		
LPR182Q.060	Jacob	Nicholson		General		
LPR182Q.061	James	Brady		General		
LPR182Q.062	Andreas	Lang		General		
LPR182Q.063	Viola	Bruni		General		
LPR182Q.067	Marisa	Davies		General		
LPR182Q.068	Virginia	Valli		General		
LPR182Q.069	Tom	Slingsby		General	NPPF states plans should be plan-led, shaped by local communities. Should be kept up to date, based on co-operation, providing a practical framework for basing local decisions. Support for this aim and the production of a Masterplan for the Pudding Mill area through collaborative working between LLDC officers and landowners. Should not place unnecessary delays over development at Pudding Mill and Cooks Road.	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.069	Tom	Slingsby		General	NPPF states plans should reflect presumption in favour of sustainable development, setting clear policies how applied locally. Should meet fully assessed needs with flexibility for change. Should accord with NPPF, be aspirational but realistic. Para 158 refers to use of proportionate evidence base and Para 173 requires viability consideration. Para 182 requires plans to meet the specific tests of soundness.	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.073	Stephen	Wilkinson		General	20% of the LLDC area lies within the Regional Park. The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority has a statutory responsibility to either provide facilities for sport, recreation, leisure, entertainment and nature conservation throughout the Park. It has a range of powers which relate to the statutory planning process. The Authority's work on proposals for Area 1 covering the Park south of Ruckholt Road through to the River Thames and therefore including land within the LLDC area has just started.	Although there is no specific policy for the Lee Valley Regional Park, the proposals of the Authority are supported throughout the re-draft. For example, Policy CI1 will help to address (a) and (b), the transport chapter will help to address (c), Policies BN2 and BN3 will help to address (d) and (e). The supporting text also identifies that in relation to waterways environments, such as the Lea Valley, applications will need to take account of proposals developed by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, this includes the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority's Park Plan and Park Development Framework (PDF) adopted Area Proposals. The Built and Natural Environment Chapter Strategic Policy supporting text is also currently being re-drafted and will make further reference to this. The LLDC development management team will ensure that the correct consultation procedures

General comments received.

						are followed with regard to planning applications.
LPR182Q.075	Owen	Whalley		General	Tower Hamlets Council welcomes commitment Local Plan supporting convergence. This is generally defined as seeking to raise the standard of living among residents living within these boroughs to align with the wider London metropolitan average. Currently east London has some of the nation's most deprived residents and lags behind the rest of the city. The Mayor of London's Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance reiterates the commitment to the principle of convergence and the guidance seeks to provide the spatial context for its achievement.	Acknowledged
LPR182Q.075	Owen	Whalley		General	Overall, while the Council supports the principles of the LLDC draft Local Plan consultation document, but object to the approach to affordable housing. This is not robust to maximise the delivery of affordable housing and does not have any safeguards to ensure that new 'affordable rent' homes in the LLDC area will be truly affordable. The Council is also concerned that the site allocations in Sub Area 1 Hackney Wick and Fish Island do not accord with the adopted development plan. Should engage better with the Council on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and related Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	Change made. The AAP allocations are now included in their own right or as part of wider allocations. The Background Housing Paper seeks to demonstrate the relationships between affordable rents and affordability. Engagement ongoing with Council on CIL.
LPR182Q.076	Leyre	Gonzalez		General	Local Plan provides opportunity to foster creative, affordable and sustainable neighbourhoods. Should have greater emphasis towards sustainability of an affordable ecology which has allowed development of thriving artistic and cultural scene.	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.078	Katie	Glasgow		General - Figures	East Wick housing crescent boundary should reflect those within the LCS.	Acknowledged, the allocation map will reflect the correct boundary.
LPR182Q.078	Katie	Glasgow		General	Plan should be more ambitious. Strategic policies reiterate London Plan position. Should include more extensive development management policies and policy wording should be strengthened.	Acknowledged. Policies have been given more detail and strengthened.
LPR182Q.078	Katie	Glasgow		General - Policies Map	Should have a Proposals Map.	Acknowledged. There will be an accompanying Policies Map to the Publication Version.
LPR182Q.078	Katie	Glasgow		General	Appreciate collaboration to date. Many comments repeat previous comments on interim but still some concerns, particularly SA1. Plan lacks vision reiterating the London Plan position which does not reflect the opportunities. LLDCs strong economic vision and projects are intended to emphasise east London's position, promoting major economic growth. Hackney Wick/Fish Island is as a significant creative district, this can add value and help shape the 'grand' proposals that should underpin the Plan's vision. Should acknowledge the existing conditions that have established Hackney Wick/Fish Island and including availability and concentration of workspace, low/affordable rents which should be well-integrated. As Hackney Wick AAP only adopted recently should be better reflected within the new Plan. The principles of this document have been taken forward in the LLDC's Hackney Wick	Changes made. A considerable amount of work has gone into creating a clearer and ambitious vision. There will be some inconsistencies with adopted policy where borough documents differ. Where this is the case, the approach has been adequately justified by evidence to determine the most appropriate approach for the area as a whole. Acknowledged. The revised Sub Area 1 section takes full account of the existing/expanding creative, artistic and tech sectors, as well as the value/contribution of artisan and creative uses to the character of the area. The policies are shaped to preserve the conditions that have allowed these to flourish and have been predicated upon the constituent elements of both AAPs and the HWFIDPG.

General comments received.

					and Fish Island Planning and Design Guide and the proposed expansion of the existing conservation areas, both in terms of built form and uses.	
LPR182Q.078	Katie	Glasgow		Evidence Base -HWFI Design Brief	Welcome the HWFIDG as brings out much of the HWAAP detail and Conservation Area. Local Plan should be stronger in terms of reconnection of the area. Urban Design definition of areas at edge of HWFI needs more refinement. The plan promotes a high level of pedestrian permeability around Hackney Wick Station. This should be fine tuned to develop a character for each year. The expansion of the conservation area and identification of non designated heritage assist is supported. The Council would like to work with the LLDC to consider the statutory listing of properties in the area. Design briefs should be prepared for the key sites across the area that bring together the guidance and set a design policy framework. Should have some flexibility on heights including clear criteria for buildings proposed above 6 storeys. Should note possibility of connectivity to further CHP/energy/heat reticulation systems.	The HWFIDPG is currently in draft and therefore comments relating to its content will be considered when revising the document prior to Examination. SA1 chapter substantially re-written to address concerns.
LPR182Q.078	Katie	Glasgow		Evidence Base -Schools	Learning Trust colleagues feel that school place demand within the LLDC area has been under-estimated within the Schools Study. It is not clear what methodology was used within the Study and this should be described. The GLA will be developing a child yield toolkit from the 2011 Census data enabling a much more accurate understanding of child yields within London to be obtained. This study should be reviewed once the GLA complete their work. Should review actual numbers of children living in the area after completion. Should amend some wording to sections. DfE's current advice is that forecasts can only include developments with full planning permission; or where the LA can demonstrate a degree of certainty that the development will go ahead. Housing mix will have a substantial impact on the child yield; letting of private dwellings could have a child yield closer to affordable housing than from private housing. DfE data suggests that a significant proportion of the predicted shortfall in school places will be in the Kings Park/Wick area, closest to the LLDC. Question whether the 7% average for private schools is appropriate to Hackney. Section 3.43 should specify that it relates to Orthodox Jewish schools, with no assumption that other children might attend those schools. Hackney principles do not agree with more than 3FE schools.	Plan has been substantially reordered with format addressing many of the concerns. School place yield will continue to be monitored.
LPR182Q.079	Richard	Rothwell		Evidence Base -HWFI Design Brief	HWFIDPG will be material consideration in the determination of planning applications but has not been subject to direct formal consultation. Objectives seek to create a mixed use neighbourhood with a multifunctional neighbourhood centre, including residential and employment uses, and promote exemplary standards of design as set by Groveworld and the proposals for Wallis Road are consistent	The HWFIDPG is currently in draft and therefore comments relating to its content will be considered when revising the document prior to Examination.

General comments received.

					with the document's broad emphasis. Repeatedly highlights the importance of the area's industrial heritage and promotes 'heritage-led regeneration' however, the townscape is generally mixed and frequently of a poor quality. The vision to create a mixed use and multifunctional neighbourhood centre at Hackney Wick, including residential and employment uses and with exemplary design standards is supported. The emphasis on 'heritage-led regeneration' and conservation should again be balanced with the deficiencies in the area's townscape (recognised at p47) and the significant opportunities for regeneration. Should show B1a/B1c/A1/A2/A3/A4 uses at ground floor level and C3 residential use above within the Stone Brothers site. Only a part of No. 88 Wallis Road is in creative industrial use. Only illustrate the corner of No. 88 Wallis Road as a 'building of townscape merit. Should reflect the mixed character and interest associated with the yards and spaces in Hackney Wick. The land use plans (p56 & 58) and accompanying guidance should be updated to indicatively show B1a/B1c/A1/A2/A3/A4 uses at ground floor level within the Stone Brothers site and C3 residential use above. Any references to promotion of B2/B8 and A5 uses should be omitted from the neighbourhood centre.	
LPR182Q.083	Aston	Matthews		Evidence Base -HWFI Design Brief	Concern about proposals HWFIDPG which seek to restrict heights of development on the site even further to four storeys. This is a departure Fish Island Area Action Plan (FIAAP) that provides for buildings of 4-6 storeys or above to be considered, subject to a design assessment.	LLDC's position in relation to building heights is clarified in sub area Policy 1.6 and its supporting text.
LPR182Q.083	Aston	Matthews		Evidence Base -HWFI Design Brief	HWFI Design Guide and Conservation area provide a spatial interpretation of plans and evidence base for plans. Concerns about open space provision as hinders ability to deliver a comprehensive scheme. Document proposals limit height to 4-6 storeys should be consistent with FIAAP. Guide lists future and existing land uses on site, identifies as employment led and only one building with element of housing which is contrary to client's proposals and adopted policy. Should amend Guide accordingly. Use as a material consideration is inappropriate as has not been subject to consultation. Contains principles contrary to FIAAP and hinder the development ability of the site.	The HWFIDPG is currently in draft and therefore comments relating to its content will be considered when revising the document prior to Examination.
LPR182Q.088	David	Wilson		General	Concerns regarding land at Abbey Mills Pumping Station.	Acknowledged.
LPR182Q.089	Glenn	Burton		General	QDD generally supportive of LPCD, subject to next version being concise, with flexibility and clear policy framework. East Village	Acknowledged.

General comments received.

					comprises a large proportion of Zones 3-6 of Stratford City development under 10/90641/EXTODA. The development of Zones 3-6 is now subject to a retrofit programme. In total, 2,818 new homes will become available for occupation, of these 1,439 will be private homes, mainly for private rent alongside 1,379 affordable homes. The first residents have already started to occupy East Village, and it is anticipated that all buildings built to date will be available for occupation during 2014, creating a brand new neighbourhood for East London. The SC OPP also permits the development of six further plots with residential units and related accommodation. Pre-application discussions are underway with LLDC concerning reserved matters applications as to the detailed design of the buildings to accommodate these remaining units. Any future reserved matters applications are required to be informed by Zonal Masterplans (ZMP) which define the principles for the layout, scale and general arrangement of development. The ZMP for Zones 3-6 was approved in 2008 (as subsequently amended in February 2011 and March 2013) (refs: 07/90208/AODODA, 10/90272/AODODA and 13/00053/AOD respectively). QDD has already started to market and let residential units through its newly established management and letting operation- Get Living London, operating a new PRS letting approach that aims to simplify the letting process and to offer high quality management.	
LPR182Q.089	Glenn	Burton		General	Plan is over-long and too focussed upon reproducing current policies in other documents. Should be more succinct and clear what is required. This is essential in context of NPPF para 154.	Acknowledged. A great deal of effort has been made to ensure Plan is as clear and succinct as possible.
LPR182Q.089	Glenn	Burton		General	Sub-area boundary clarification sought as half within Sub Area 2 and 3. Should have clear and concise framework for developers to maintain flexibility under alternative conditions.	Acknowledged. Sub area boundaries have been drawn to reflect the nature of the area, and in some cases sites could cross two boundaries. In this case there will be no change in consideration for the site resulting from crossing two areas.
LPR182Q.090	Charlie	Hammond		General	Roypark and Newstates are longstanding landowners, landlords and investors within Fish Island and are part of a stakeholder group that represents delivery partnership for the area. LLDC should recognise the role of landowners in delivering regeneration and to identify a viable development strategy. This way the housing, economic and wider environmental targets for the area can be secured. These representations against policies affecting land Fish Island North. The Draft Local Plan (DLP) proposes an inequitable imbalance between the positive approach to delivery strategy and a negative development management approach. The DLP represents a significant and unjustified departure from Olympic Legacy SPG and Fish Island AAP. Challenge both the soundness and effectiveness of the DLP in respect of, for example:	Acknowledged. The Legacy Corporation is proposing a positive development management approach for sub-area 1. This is clearly outlined with the 'Development Potential' section of the revised chapter and is not a departure from the adopted AAPs. The policies and development aspirations outlined within the chapter will be viability tested as part of the Local Plan process and amended accordingly, although the residential and employment targets are the same as those expressed within the AAPs. LLDC's position in relation to building heights is clarified in sub area Policy 1.6 and its supporting text. LLDC agree that sub area 1 does comprise a number of opportunities for re-development

General comments received.

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Viability – a failure to demonstrate a viable framework within which to secure key housing and employment targets. Should demonstrate viability tested. 2. Failure to plan positively – the delivery strategy for Fish Island being ambiguous and constraining 3. An unjustified and inappropriate emphasis towards employment undermining housing targets 4. An inappropriate level of protection of existing employment low grade and unsustainable employment floorspace 5. An unduly cautious approach to development capacity building heights and densities 6. A lacking certainty in respect of housing delivery in Hackney Wick and Fish Island (HW&FI) 7. A failure to objectively assess existing urban character and an undue emphasis upon 'heritage' and heritage-led regeneration 8. – SA1 aspirations for HW&FI fail to provide clarity on how the area's development potential with specifics representing an unjustified and significant departure from adopted policy approach which is not sound. We have sought to provide constructive responses demonstrating where issues can be addressed. There are, however, a number of concerns where stakeholder dialogue would be required, others addressed through clarification, and more fundamental review. <p>The lack of clarity in relation to housing targets and site allocations is a key area, other concerns being on place making and delivery. FI AAP sets out a clear and effective land use structures with positive promotion of identified opportunity sites. Introduction of flexibility removes clarity and uncertainty about housing location, quantity and form and absence of clarity is contrary to the NPPF and the London Plan / OLSPG and the DLP significantly reduces the area's opportunity, particularly in terms of new housing. This is an unjustified shift towards employment from residential development. There is no undermining viability evidence. Undue weight upon matters of conservation reduces opportunity within HW&FI as whole, including areas with no discernible architectural or historic quality. Also object to heritage-led' at Mid and North Fish Island as area is of a low grade in terms of buildings and general urban fabric, and there is no 'single identity' to the Fish Island impacting on housing targets. Should retain the best heritage assets only.</p> <p>The status of the Design and Planning Guidance is not clear and raises some significant concerns in respect of, for example, the weight it seeks to place upon the existing built fabric of questionable value . If this document is to progressed, it must itself be the subject of a formal consultation process and be supported by robust evidence. We recommend establishing a clear presumption</p>	<p>in the form of cleared sites and modern buildings of lower architectural and townscape quality. Although these should deliver a range of uses through contemporary schemes that are informed by an understanding and evaluation of the area's defining characteristics. Retaining the employment floorspace within sub area 1 is fundamental to maintaining the economic base of the LLDC area. The Hackney Wick and Fish Island sub-area contains 39% of employment land, but 61% of businesses. By contrast, the Bromley-by-Bow, Three Mills and Pudding Mill sub-area contains 31% of the LLDC area's employment land but only 22% of businesses. This implies that business density is greatest in Hackney Wick and Fish Island. Overall, the revised policies promote residential development whilst simultaneously retaining the level of employment floorspace in sub-area 1.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

General comments received.

					<p>in favour of development within HW&FI, greater emphasis on housing capacity, identifying key sites contributing towards housing and commercial uses, a Proposals Map, reducing the weight applied to the protection of employment space and character. With regard to soundness:</p> <p>Positively Prepared – In respect of HW&FI the plan reverses the adopted for land use and scale of development, with subjective, unjustified and unnecessary evidence.</p> <p>Justified –No evidence justifying the approach</p> <p>Effective and Deliverable –Undermines viable delivery strategy, meaning failure to meet housing and employment targets.</p> <p>Consistency with National Policy – In respect of HW&FI, the Plan fails the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ without necessary flexibility and adaptability. Any deviation from this should ‘significantly and demonstrably’ outweigh the benefits. A highly subjective assessment of local character does not justify this.</p>	
LPR182Q.090	Charlie	Hammond		General	<p>Detailed responses on the Draft Local Plan. Our clients are concerned that the Draft Local Plan stifles the development capacity and opportunity of Fish Island. A number of issues need to be addressed within the Local Plan which is a shift from adopted policy with emphasis on employment rather than residential capacity. The Draft Local Plan is ambiguous and un-aspirational. Conservation and character is applied to areas of little identity. Need support of delivery partners in the planning process. Viability is a clear consideration. Policies are in conflict with the London Plan, the NPPF and the Development Corporation's own regeneration remit. Fish Island is singled out as an area of significant constraint. The Legacy Corporation needs to meet with the landowner group in order to assure 'its delivery partners' that a positive and equitable framework for the regeneration of Fish Island can be delivered.</p>	<p>These concerns have been addressed within the response to the representor's previous comment.</p>
LPR182Q.092	Frances	Young		General	<p>Applicants for Chobham Farm site is within Sub Area 2 of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
LPR182Q.093	Jeremy	Castle		General	<p>Innovation City (London) Limited is a key stakeholder having submitted four related applications for permission to develop iCITY which comprises IBC and MPC on QEOP. Four applications should be read in conjunction with each other due to links with the landscaped public realm around these buildings. They have been prepared to provide a holistic proposal with consistency of vision, architecture and public realm. Application numbers are 13/00534/FUM; 13/00535/AOD; 13/00536/COU; and 13/00537/FUL. New and revised policies provide context for the company to bring forward its proposals for this strategic site, other significant regeneration benefits the proposals will bring will not be delivered.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

General comments received.

LPR182Q.096	Tom	Mulligan		General	Status of HWFI Design guide is unclear. Site comprises the land bounded by White Post Lane, the London Overground railway line immediately south east of Hackney Wick Station. It is within Hackney Wick neighbourhood centre and SA1.	The HWFIDPG is currently in draft and therefore comments relating to its content will be considered when revising the document prior to Examination.
LPR182Q.096	Tom	Mulligan		Evidence Base -HWFI Design Brief	The status of the draft Hackney Wick and Fish Island Design and Planning Brief (HWFIDPG) is unclear. Comments are as below. The vision and objectives set out in the HWFIDPG are supported by Bluecroft Property. The document envisages a mixed use neighbourhood centre in Hackney Wick including residential and employment uses and achieving exemplary standards of design. Repeatedly highlights the importance of the area's industrial heritage and promotes 'heritage-led regeneration' however, the townscape is generally mixed and frequently of a poor quality. Promotion of entirely non-residential uses at Queens Yard inconsistent with the FI AAP, as well as the neighbourhood centre and are not viable. No justification provided in the document for the land uses shown at Queens Yard. Clarnico Factory and 14 Queens Yard as building of townscape merit are unsupported. A local town centre including housing focused on Hackney Wick Station is supported. Yards can have a detrimental effect on the area's townscape. Only the former Clarnico building exhibits the scale, height and character identified in the document as positive townscape attributes give enclosure. Should balance with townscape deficiencies. The approach to access, movement and public space promoted in the document is generally supported. FI AAP promotes the managed release of former industrial and employment land in the area. It anticipates that 3,000 new homes 3,500 new jobs. Queens Yard site falls within Fish Island North where 'mixed use regeneration' is promoted. Adopted and emerging policy and guidance firmly promotes mixed use development including a range of employment and residential uses in this area. B2 (general industry), B8 (storage/distribution); and, A5 uses (hot food takeaways) are inconsistent with the LLDC's vision for the area should promote B1a/ B1c and A1/ A2/ A3/ A4 uses at ground floor level. Will be making representations about extension to Conservation Area and no justification for identification of further heritage assets. Only the former Clarnico building warrants identification. Suggests that buildings of 4-6 storeys are supported in the HW/FI Sub Area while taller buildings will not normally be appropriate. This should have more flexibility and is unduly restrictive. The broad guidance for Hackney Wick neighbourhood centre endorses the north-south route between White Post Lane and Hackney Wick Station, and accepts that No. 14 Queens Yard is likely to be replaced.	The HWFIDPG is currently in draft and therefore comments relating to its content will be considered when revising the document prior to Examination.
LPR182Q.098	Ron	Dobson	London Fire and	General	Authority aims to reduce the impact of fire on people, property and the environment, so want to work with developers and agencies to	Acknowledged. Although this level of detail is too great for inclusion within the Local Plan itself, the Legacy

General comments received.

			Emergency Planning Authority		<p>ensure future developments are as fire safe as possible. Development within the LLDC area should meet good practice, and should make this commitment within the Local Plan. Those at most risk from residential fires are younger people, older people, people with mental health problems, and people with restricted mobility who are unable to leave buildings quickly in the event of an emergency. From the projected housing growth in the LLDC area and the commitments in the consultation document to mixed communities and "highest quality" development that there will be a significant number of people in these categories occupying new housing developments. We suggest that this requires that they be well protected from fire, to standards recommended by experts in fire safety.</p> <p>Sprinkler systems can be installed and operated in a way that permits, and in many cases facilitates, innovative, inclusive and sustainable architecture. Sprinkler systems should be introduced in development under 30m high where those vulnerable to fire risk may be living. The benefits of fire safety should be offset against the costs of introduction. This should be included within the document.</p>	<p>Corporation is committed to fire safety and want all homes on the Park to be safe for future residents. As such all homes will comply with current Building Regulations. The additional cost of installing fire sprinklers across all development and not just those required by building regulations places an additional burden on the viability of development, which could have some potential impacts on the delivery of family and affordable housing.</p>
LPR182Q.128	Siraj	Izhar	Secondary Modern Community Association	General	<p>There is no mention of Community Land Trust within the Local Plan. Contact has been established with the Legacy Corporation on this and have been given some advice which states need to address a number of issues to progress. Support exploration of options but are aware of the challenges. Young Foundation's research publication on CLTs in the UK (2011) is a good reference. Legacy Corporation should commit to CLT and invite community involvement.</p>	<p>No change. The assertions within the Legacy Corporation's previous correspondence remain.</p>