

Reference Number	Organisation/Company/On behalf of	Section of the Plan (where applicable)	Summary
GCNP_001	Sport England	General	<p>Sport England has no comments to make as the proposed development does not fall within their statutory remit (Statutory Instrument 2015/595) or non-statutory remit (PPG) Par. 003 Ref. ID: 37-003-20140306). However, Sport England referred to their general guidance and advice particularly if any proposal would result in a loss of any sport facilities or the creation of new.</p> <p>General guidance and advice can however be found on our website: www.sportengland.org/planningapplications If the proposal involves the loss of any sports facility then full consideration should be given to whether the proposal meets Par. 97 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), link below, is in accordance with local policies to protect social infrastructure and any approved Playing Pitch Strategy or Built Sports Facility Strategy that the local authority has in place. If the proposal involves the provision of a new sports facility, then consideration should be given to the recommendations and priorities set out in any approved Playing Pitch Strategy or Built Sports Facility Strategy that the local authority may have in place. In addition, to ensure they are fit for purpose, such facilities should be designed in accordance with Sport England, or the relevant National Governing Body, design guidance notes: http://sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-costguidance/ If the proposal involves the provision of additional housing (then it will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then new and/or improved sports facilities should be secured and delivered in accordance with any approved local policy for social infrastructure, and priorities set out in any Playing Pitch Strategy or Built Sports Facility Strategy that the local authority has in place. In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and PPG (Health and wellbeing section), consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing or assessing a proposal.</p>

			<p>Active Design provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policyframework/8-promoting-healthy-communities PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-andwellbeing Sport England's Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.</p>
GCNP_002	Port of London Authority	General	<p>Given the location of the Neighbourhood Plan area, which is outside of the PLA's jurisdiction and landownership, the PLA has no comments to make.</p>
GCNP_003	Private Individual	General	<p>Clarification sought on the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum. A question was raised as to how the Forum has been allowed to submit a Neighbourhood Plan without the knowledge or agreement of the majority of tenants on the Carpenters Estate. Clarification also sought to know why people who work in the designated area are represented as the majority of people living on the estate are tenants and residents and it should be the majority view that should be considered. Further to a series of meetings between residents of Carpenters Estate and Newham's Mayor, a resident steering group has been set up to represent the estate. A concern raised over the Plan preparation without estate wide consultation.</p>
GCNP_004	Private Individual	General	<p>Additional information sought on the Greater Carpenter Neighbourhood Plan and the procedure for its preparation and adoption.</p>

GCNP_005	Private Individual	General	<p>Supports the GCNP as it considers that the Plan would allow for regeneration whilst still maintaining the character of the neighbourhood and ensuring that the community feels heard and supported. Considers that the Forum have actively engaged with local residents and the Plan truly reflects their hopes for the future of the area.</p> <p>Considers that the housing target in the neighbourhood plan is sensible and is consistent with the phasing for the Estate outlined in the SHLAA for the London Plan (which assumes the maximum capacity of the estate will increase by a net 1600 homes by the end of Phase 4, mid 2034).</p>
GCNP_006	Private Individual	4.3 Homes, refurbishment and Sensitive Infill	<p>I have lived in Stratford for nearly twelve years and for the first half of that time the Carpenters estate was under threat of demolition and many properties were boarded up. That the estate was nearly sold in 2012 for development was an example of how to disregard the needs of residents.</p> <p>Supports the GCNP and it considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - the proposal for sustainable refurbishment is the right choice to maintain the estate as well as bring back greater housing provision which is much needed 2 - any additions to the estate need to be sensitively incorporated in terms of density and scale and existing green spaces should be protected - the estate layout is exceptionally well-planned 3 - homes for older residents on the estate should be a priority given the years of uncertainty <p>Two transport changes highlighted - the new entrance to Stratford Station from Gibbins Road and the reinstatement of the 276 route - are good ideas too.</p> <p>Notes of other examples of estate regeneration across London detrimental to residents and bitterly contested. Considers that the refurbishment of the Carpenters Estate is the opportunity to do things differently and I would like to think that this consultation is the first step to that happening.</p>

GCNP_007	Private Individual	4.3 Homes, refurbishment and Sensitive Infill	<p>Support for the Greater Carpenter's Neighbourhood Forum's plan to save the Carpenter estate for use as public housing for the people of Newham. Notes that Newham has one of the highest homelessness rates in London, and more generally in East London, which over the last 10 years has been affected by soaring housing prices which are leading to the pricing out of vast numbers of residents who have always lived there, considers that it is essential to safeguard any option to provide Council/public housing for the less affluent residents, and the Carpenter Estate is a prime example of perfectly good existing housing stock that can be devoted to that with a moderate investment aimed at maintaining it and restoring it where necessary. Considers that it would be much more cost-effective than demolishing it and replacing it with new housing.</p> <p>Hope the right decision will be made, which is to keep the Carpenter and give it back to the local community, which has used it and lived in it since it was built in 1967.</p>
GCNP_008	Natural England	General	<p>Natural England, as a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning, does not have any specific comments on this neighbourhood plan.</p>
GCNP_009	Historic England	General	<p>The Historic England states that the proposed Plan does not raise any significant issues or concerns relevant to the Historic Environment or Historic England's interests. They do not therefore wish to comment in detail and are happy for the proposed plan as submitted to be determined by the local authority and the thorough examination. However, the following observations have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Historic England responded directly to the Neighbourhood Forum in respect of an earlier draft (2017) identifying that the character of the area is predominantly post war housing and low rise industrial uses and is subject to peripheral but extensive redevelopment and change following the Olympics. The proposed Plan area does not include any formally recognised designated or

			<p>undesigned heritage assets (such as listed buildings or conservation areas).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The principal aims of the proposed plan is on improving social and environmental quality and access to cultural facilities and they would consider this to be an appropriate and proportionate approach and would encourage the community to explore wider opportunities with proposed cultural facilities and improved access to the heritage of the Lea Valley and Stratford. - The draft plan acknowledges the area falls within a Tier 2 Archaeological Priority Area with a potential for deep buried archaeological finds. APA's define the potential for archaeological deposits. Further explanation and guidance is available on their website. <p>In the event of significant finds these could help inform local character and identity and add interest to Project Objective O5 (Create a local history trail celebrating the local area and its communities). The Forum may wish to consult the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service, Heritage Environment Record as a primary resource for the identification of heritage assets. The HER should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes.</p>
GCNP_010	National Grid	General	<p>National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales and National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) operates the electricity transmission network across the UK. The energy is then distributed to the eight electricity distribution network operators across England, Wales and Scotland.</p> <p>National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.</p> <p>National Grid previously owned part of the gas distribution system known as 'National Grid Gas Distribution limited (NGGDL). Since May 2018, NGGDL is now a separate entity called 'Cadent Gas'.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved</p>

in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect National Grid's assets.

Assets in your area

National Grid has identified the following high voltage underground electricity cables as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:

- Underground Electricity Cable (x2) from Carpenters Road Head House substation in Newham to West Ham substation in Newham

From the consultation information provided, the above underground electricity cables do not interact with any of the proposed development sites.

Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure

Whilst there are no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate /High-Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network.

Electricity distribution

Information regarding the distribution network can be found on the National Grid webpage.

Further Advice

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. In addition, the following publications are available from the National Grid website or by contacting us at the address overleaf:

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sense of place – design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines: A sense of place design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines: https://www.nationalgrid.com/sites/default/files/documents/Sense%20of%20Place%20-%20National%20Grid%20Guidance.pdf • Guidelines when working near NGG assets: https://www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets • Guidelines when working near NGETT assets: https://www.nationalgridet.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets
GCNP_011	Private Individual	3. Objectives	<p>As an owner of property on the Carpenters Estate I wish to respond to the consultation. I would like to wholeheartedly confirm my support for the Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. It is a sensible compromise between the competing demands of the need for additional homes and employment/seedbed infrastructure the desires of the existing occupiers and other stakeholders. The Plan meets both objectives in a consensual manner.</p> <p>Also as the proposals are for retention/ refurbishment, it is far more environmentally sustainable and ecological than alternatives such as wholesale demolition and new build.</p>

GCNP_011	Private Individual	General	<p>Green space influences mental wellbeing</p> <p>Research has suggested that living within 300m of urban green space is associated with greater happiness, a sense of worth and life satisfaction. This could be parks, nature reserves or play areas.</p> <p>Conducted by researchers at the University of Warwick, Newcastle University and the University of Sheffield, the study applies new geospatial research techniques to create an accurate measure of the relationship between green space and three different aspects of mental wellbeing.</p> <p>It combines survey responses from 25,518 participants in the UK Government's annual population survey (APS) with data on the shape, size and location of London's 20,000 public green spaces. The researchers explained that they modelled green space distribution in relation to where each of the survey participants lived and considered how that influenced their mental wellbeing. Published in Applied Geography's August issue, it was found that green space within 300m of home had the greatest influence on mental wellbeing.</p> <p>It also found:</p> <p>There is a "very strong" relationship between the amount of green space around a person's home and their feelings of life satisfaction, happiness and self-worth. An increase of one hectare – about the size of an international Rugby Union pitch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – within 300m of residents was associated with an increase of 8 percentage points in life satisfaction, 7 in worth and 5 in happiness. <p>Green space was less important for mental wellbeing in central London and east London.</p> <p>Dr Victoria Houlden, Professor João Porto de Albuquerque, Professor Scott Weich and Professor Stephen Jarvis worked together on the research. Houlden, from Newcastle University, said: "We believe this it is the first study to demonstrate how urban green space may improve a broader definition of mental wellbeing. A lot of research focuses on poor mental health, or single aspects of wellbeing like life satisfaction. What makes our work different is the way we consider multi-dimensional mental wellbeing, in terms of happiness, life</p>
----------	--------------------	---------	---

			<p>satisfaction and worth.</p> <p>“While government guidelines recommend minimum amounts of green space in residential developments, our study was able to establish more specifically where green space may be most valuable.”</p> <p>Professor João Porto de Albuquerque, director of the University of Warwick’s Institute of Global Sustainable Development, added:</p> <p>“As part of the Sustainable Development Goals, members states of the United Nations committed to provide every access to green and public spaces for every citizen by 2030, which is usually measured based on the area of cities that is open space for public use.</p> <p>"However, our study makes clear that it is not only the area of public green space in the whole city that matters when it comes to maximising benefits for mental wellbeing. We provide evidence that the proximity of green space to an individual’s home is important for detecting significant associations with improved mental wellbeing, and that the strength of this association may vary in different areas of the city.</p> <p>“This result has important implications for urban planning and decision-making related to how we measure access to urban green spaces and how to design more sustainable and liveable cities.”</p>
GCNP_012	Private Individual	4. Policies	<p>Supports the formal adoption of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. I have followed the Forum’s work on the Plan, and have supported it by attending meetings and giving my opinion at consultations. In particular, support to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Economy and employment (pages 10-12), keeping and helping the growth of local businesses and employment, with improved access to education and life-long learning. - Green space, biodiversity and community gardening (pages 13-16), enhancing existing green spaces and new ones, encouraging community gardening, more trees, sport and play. -Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill (pages 17- 20), protecting existing homes from demolition and instead refurbishing them as appropriate. Considers that this will preserve the existing community instead of destroying it, as well as safeguarding threatened social homes, and the rights of leaseholders and

			<p>freeholders. Support to the building of new homes by sensitive infill, in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community's quality of life.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposals for transport (pages 21-27), improved walking, cycling and public transport connections with the surrounding area. - Community facilities, ownership and empowerment (pages 28-29), considers that this will provide genuine bottom-up regeneration instead of decisions dictated from above. Support to improvement of existing community amenities and provision of new ones.
GCNP_013	Private Individual	4.1 Economy and Employment	Supports the formal adoption of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. Support for the Plan's objectives on economy and employment, (pages 10-12) keeping and helping the growth of local businesses and employment, with improved access to education and life-long learning.
GCNP_013	Private Individual	4.2 Green space, Biodiversity and Community Gardening	Support for the Plan's objectives on green space, biodiversity and community gardening, (pages 13-16) enhancing existing green spaces and new ones, encouraging community gardening, more trees, sport and play. In particular, supports the need to increase the biodiversity of green spaces and other planted areas on the estate.
GCNP_013	Private Individual	4.3 Housing Refurbishment and Sensitive infill	Supports the Plan's objectives on housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (pages 17-20). Considers that is essential to protect existing homes from demolition and instead implement a plan to refurbish them in an appropriate and sustainable way. This will preserve the existing community instead of destroying it, as well as safeguarding threatened social homes, and the rights of leaseholders and freeholders. Supports the building of new homes by sensitive infill, in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community's quality of life.
GCNP_013	Private Individual	4.4 Transport Connections and Movement	Supports the Plan's proposals for transport (pages 21-27), improved walking, cycling and public transport connections with the surrounding area.

GCNP_013	Private Individual	4.5 Community Facilities, Ownership and Empowerment	Supports the Plan's objectives on community facilities, ownership and empowerment (pages 28-29), providing genuine bottom-up regeneration instead of decisions dictated from above. I support improvement of existing community amenities and provision of new ones.
GCNP_014	Private Individual	4.1 Economy and Employment	Support for the formal adoption of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. Supports the Plan's objectives on economy and employment, (pages 10-12) keeping and helping the growth of local businesses and employment, with improved access to education and life-long learning.
GCNP_014	Private Individual	4.2 Green Space, Biodiversity and Community Gardening	Supports the Plan's objectives on green space, biodiversity and community gardening, (pages 13-16) enhancing existing green spaces and new ones, encouraging community gardening, more trees, sport and play
GCNP_014	Private Individual	4.3 Housing Refurbishment and Sensitive Infill	Supports the Plan's objectives on housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (pages 17- 20) protecting existing homes from demolition and instead refurbishing them as appropriate. Considers that this would preserve the existing community instead of destroying it, as well as safeguarding threatened social homes, and the rights of leaseholders and freeholders. Supports the building of new homes by sensitive infill, in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community's quality of life.
GCNP_014	Private Individual	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	Support for the Plan's proposals for transport (pages 21-27), improved walking, cycling and public transport connections with the surrounding area.
GCNP_014	Private Individual	4.5 Community Facilities, Ownership and Empowerment	Support for the Plan's objectives on community facilities, ownership and empowerment (pages 28-29), providing genuine bottom-up regeneration instead of decisions dictated from above. Supports improvement of existing community amenities and provision of new ones.
GCNP_015	Private Individual	4.1 Economy and Employment	Supports the formal adoption of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. Considers that the Plan is the result of a great deal of careful work by the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum. Supported the Forum's work on the Plan, and attended meetings and given my opinion at consultations. Supports

			the Plan's objectives on economy and employment, (pages 10-12) keeping and helping the growth of local businesses and employment, with improved access to education and life-long learning.
GCNP_015	Private Individual	4.2 Green Space, Biodiversity and Community Gardening	Support for the Plan's objectives on green space, biodiversity and community gardening, (pages 13-16) enhancing existing green spaces and new ones, encouraging community gardening, more trees, sport and play. The existing green areas on Carpenters Estate are an important community asset for the wider neighbourhood.
GCNP_015	Private Individual	4.3 Housing Refurbishment and Sensitive Infill	Supports the Plan's objectives on housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (pages 17-20) protecting existing homes from demolition and instead refurbishing them as appropriate. Considers that this would preserve the existing community instead of destroying it, as well as safeguarding threatened social homes, and the rights of leaseholders and freeholders. Support for the building of new homes by sensitive infill, in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community's quality of life. The change of scale represented by the low-rise housing provides an important contrast to the numbers of very tall new blocks. The relatively small number of traditional terrace houses are an important community asset. In his role as local Vicar, he meets too many people who leave the neighbourhood because of the lack of traditional housing. Considers that these properties should not be lost.
GCNP_015	Private Individual	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	Supports the Plan's proposals for transport (pages 21-27), improved walking, cycling and public transport connections with the surrounding area.
GCNP_015	Private Individual	4.5 Community Facilities, Ownership and Empowerment	Supports the Plan's objectives on community facilities, ownership and empowerment (pages 28-29), providing genuine bottom-up regeneration instead of decisions dictated from above. Supports improvement of existing community amenities and provision of new ones. Considers that these are an important

			resource for the wider neighbourhood, which currently lacks the infrastructure to develop a strong and socially sustainable community.
GCNP_016	Private Individual	4.1 Economy and Employment	An artist who works in the studios run by acme in Rowse close and an active member of the Forum. Dissatisfied that the three tower blocks have been almost empty and neglected for such a long time, especially with the homeless crisis in Newham, tangible in the immediate surroundings of the estate. It nets that Alexander McQueen, one the greatest fashion designers of all time, grew up in this estate, considers that there should be something to commemorate and celebrate his time in there. Supports the formal adoption of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. Supports the Plan's objectives on economy and employment, (pages 10-12) keeping and helping the growth of local businesses and employment, with improved access to education and life-long learning.
GCNP_016	Private Individual	4.2 Green space, biodiversity and community gardening	Supports the Plan's objectives on green space, biodiversity and community gardening, (pages 13-16) enhancing existing green spaces and new ones, encouraging community gardening, more trees, sport and play.
GCNP_016	Private Individual	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill	Supports the Plan's objectives on housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (pages 17- 20) protecting existing homes from demolition and instead refurbishing them as appropriate. It considers that this would preserve the existing community instead of destroying it, as well as safeguarding threatened social homes, and the rights of leaseholders and freeholders. Support the building of new homes by sensitive infill, in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community's quality of life.
GCNP_016	Private Individual	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	Supports the Plan's proposals for transport (pages 21-27), improved walking, cycling and public transport connections with the surrounding area.

GCNP_016	Private Individual	4.5 Community facilities, ownership and empowerment	Supports the Plan’s objectives on community facilities, ownership and empowerment (pages 28-29), providing genuine bottom-up regeneration instead of decisions dictated from above. Support the improvement of existing community amenities and provision of new ones.
GCNP_017	Thames Water	Policy H3 – Environmental Standards for new housing	<p>Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) to comment on the above.</p> <p>As you may be aware, Thames Water are the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for the Corporation area and hence a “specific consultation body” in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. We have the following comments on the consultation document:</p> <p>Policy H3 Environmental Standards for New Housing - Comments in Relation to Water and Sewerage Infrastructure</p> <p>We support Policy H3 in relation to utilising best practice in SuDS, but consider that it needs to be improved in relation to water and sewerage infrastructure, or a new policy added in line with the following comments.</p> <p>Thames Water seeks to co-operate and maintain a good working relationship with local planning authorities in its area and to provide the support they need with regards to the provision of sewerage/wastewater treatment and water supply infrastructure.</p> <p>Water supply and wastewater infrastructure is essential to any development. Failure to ensure that any required upgrades to the infrastructure network are delivered alongside development could result in adverse impacts in the form of internal and external sewer flooding and pollution of land and water courses and/or low water pressure.</p> <p>A key sustainability objective for the preparation of Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 20 of the revised National Planning Policy Framework</p>

			<p>(NPPF), February 2019, states: “Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for... infrastructure for waste management, water supply, wastewater...”</p> <p>Paragraph 28 relates to non-strategic policies and states: “Non-strategic policies should be used by local planning authorities and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development. This can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure...”</p> <p>Paragraph 26 of the revised NPPF goes on to state: “Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary...”</p> <p>The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) includes a section on ‘water supply, wastewater and water quality’ and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that “Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development” (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).</p> <p>It is important to consider the net increase in wastewater and water supply demand to serve the development and also any impact that developments may have off site, further down the network. The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore seek to ensure that there is adequate wastewater and water supply infrastructure to serve all new developments. Thames Water will work with developers and local authorities to ensure that any necessary infrastructure reinforcement is delivered ahead of the occupation of development. Where there are infrastructure constraints, it is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>upgrades take around 18 months and Sewage Treatment & Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 3-5 years.</p> <p>The provision of water treatment (both wastewater treatment and water supply) is met by Thames Water's asset plans and from the 1st April 2018 network improvements will be from infrastructure charges per new dwelling.</p> <p>From 1st April 2018, the way Thames Water and all other water and wastewater companies charge for new connections has changed. The economic regulator Ofwat has published new rules, which set out that charges should reflect: fairness and affordability; environmental protection; stability and predictability; transparency and customer; and focused service.</p> <p>The changes mean that more of Thames Water's charges will be fixed and published, rather than provided on application, enabling you to estimate your costs without needing to contact us. The services affected include new water connections, lateral drain connections, water mains and sewers (requisitions), traffic management costs, income offsetting and infrastructure charges.</p> <p>Thames Water therefore recommends that developers engage with them at the earliest opportunity (in line with paragraph 26 of the revised NPPF) to establish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The developments demand for Sewage/Wastewater Treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; and- The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met.- The developments demand for water supply and network infrastructure both on and off site. <p>In light of the above comments and Government guidance we consider that the Neighbourhood Plan should include a specific reference to the key issue of the provision of water supply [and sewerage/wastewater] infrastructure to service development proposed in a policy. This is necessary because it will not be</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>possible to identify all of the water/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs). We recommend the Neighbourhood Plan include the following policy/supporting text:</p> <p>PROPOSED NEW WATER SUPPLY/WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE TEXT</p> <p>“Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.”</p> <p>“The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.”</p>
GCNP_017	Thames Water	Policy H3 – Environmental Standards for new housing	<p>We consider that the policy should also cover water efficiency.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has designated the Thames Water region to be “seriously water stressed” which reflects the extent to which available water resources are used. Future pressures on water resources will continue to increase and key factors are population growth and climate change.</p> <p>Water conservation and climate change is a vitally important issue to the water industry. Not only is it expected to have an impact on the availability of raw water for treatment but also the demand from customers for potable (drinking) water. Therefore, Thames Water support the mains water consumption target of 110 litres per head per day (105 litres per head per day plus an allowance of 5</p>

litres per head per day for gardens) as set out in the NPPG (Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 56-014-20150327) and support the inclusion of this requirement in the Policy.

Thames Water promote water efficiency and have a number of water efficiency campaigns which aim to encourage their customers to save water at local levels. Further details are available on the our website via the following link:

<https://www.thameswater.co.uk/Be-water-smart>

It is our understanding that the water efficiency standards of 105 litres per person per day is only applied through the building regulations where there is a planning condition requiring this standard (as set out at paragraph 2.8 of Part G2 of the Building Regulations). As the Thames Water area is defined as water stressed it is considered that such a condition should be attached as standard to all planning approvals for new residential development in order to help ensure that the standard is effectively delivered through the building regulations.

Proposed policy text:

“Development must be designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption. Refurbishments and other non-domestic development will be expected to meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits. Residential development must not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres per head per day (excluding the allowance of up to 5 litres for external water consumption). Planning conditions will be applied to new residential development to ensure that the water efficiency standards are met.”

GCNP_017

Thames Water

Policy H3 –
Environmental
Standards for new
housing

SuDS

With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or surface water sewer. It is important to reduce the quantity of surface water entering the sewerage system in order to maximise the capacity for foul sewage to reduce the risk of sewer flooding.

Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system. By doing this, SuDS have the potential to play an important role in helping to ensure the sewerage network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change.

SuDS not only help to mitigate flooding, they can also help to: improve water quality; provide opportunities for water efficiency; provide enhanced landscape and visual features; support wildlife; and provide amenity and recreational benefits.

With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan **“It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”**

GCNP_017	Thames Water	Policy H3 – Environmental Standards for new housing	<p>Thames Water considers that the information contained within the Neighbourhood Plan would be of significant value to as they prepare for the provision of future infrastructure. Thames Water would therefore welcome early engagement once there are details of the proposed sites.</p> <p>The water network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development/s. Local upgrades to the existing water network infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development.</p> <p>The scale of development/s is also likely to require upgrades to the wastewater/sewerage network. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to agree a housing and infrastructure phasing plan. More information on network infrastructure is available on the Thames Water website.</p>
GCNP_018	Private Individual	4.1 Economy and employment	<p>Support for the formal adoption of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. Followed the Forum’s work on the Plan from the beginning, and supported it by attending meetings and giving my opinion at consultations. Supports the objectives on economy and employment, (pages 10-12) keeping and helping the growth of local businesses and employment, with improved access to education and life-long learning.</p>
GCNP_018	Private Individual	4.2 Green space, biodiversity and community gardening	<p>Support for the objectives on green spaces, biodiversity and community gardening, (pages 13-16) enhancing existing green spaces and new ones, encouraging community gardening, more trees, sport and play.</p>
GCNP_018	Private Individual	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill	<p>Supports the Plan’s objectives on housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (pages 17-20) protecting existing homes from demolition and instead refurbishing them where possible. Considers that this would preserve the existing community instead of destroying them, as well as safeguarding threatened social homes, and the rights of leaseholders and freeholders. Support for the building of new homes by sensitive infill, in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community’s quality of life.</p>

GCNP_018	Private Individual	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	Support for the proposals for transport (pages 21-27), improved walking, cycling and public transport connections with the surrounding area.
GCNP_018	Private Individual	4.5 Community facilities, ownership and empowerment	Supports the Plan's objectives on community facilities, ownership and empowerment (pages 28-29), providing genuine bottom-up regeneration instead of decisions dictated from above. Supports improvement of existing community amenities and provision of new ones.
GCNP_019	Private Individual	4.1 Economy and employment	<p>An economist who in past years has lived in the Stratford area and got to know the Carpenters Estate area well. I was involved in the Newham Local Plan examination in public, and through a London-wide environmental charity (CPRE London) I have had various contacts with recent developments in the Olympic Park area. These earlier involvements led me to take an active interest in the Carpenters neighbourhood and I became a member of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum. I have seen at first hand the careful research and community engagement which has gone into making the Neighbourhood Plan as submitted to LLDC. Believes that the Forum has grasped all the key issues for the future regeneration and conservation of this unique council estate neighbourhood and is now offering a Plan which deserves endorsement. Specifically, urges the formal adoption of the neighbourhood plan as amended since its 2017 consultation exercise, in which I participated. On particular key themes, I wish to make the following comments.</p> <p>Supports for the economy and employment section that offers some original initiatives built into the overall Plan, such as subsidised accommodation for small enterprises including start-ups, more general encouragement of businesses within the area and a new network of vocational training and education facilities based on collaboration of all relevant local institutions and agencies. The Plan is focused on the needs of local people to realise their potential as skilled workers or entrepreneurs through cost-effective support close at hand. This would help to close some of the skill gaps between already-qualified residents, many of them recent incomers to Stratford, and local people who deserve second chances to gain secure employment. It will also provide starter-level facilities for</p>

			new service, repair or making enterprises which will widen the LLDC area's economic base.
GCNP_019	Private Individual	4.2 Green space, biodiversity and community gardening	Support for the Plan's objectives on green spaces and biodiversity will play a key role in enhancing the overall environment to the benefit of public health and community development. The plan for the layout of the whole area allows for specific boosts to encourage community gardening, plant more trees, get more residents involved in on the spot sport and extend early-years play opportunities. These proposals are well worked out and fit neatly into an emerging masterplan.
GCNP_019	Private Individual	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill	Support for the Plan's objectives on housing refurbishment plus sensitive infill with low- and mid-rise apartment blocks on suitable renewal sites (pages 17-20). These policies are considered to protect existing council homes from demolition, instead refurbishing them as appropriate. The Forum has sought expert advice on the integrity and sustainability of the three tower blocks. This indicates that there could be cost-effective ways to avoid demolition. In addition the family-friendly small houses and three-bedroomed apartments will preserve the existing community pattern instead of destroying it. Supports the carefully

			researched proposals for the building of sensitive infill blocks, in modest numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing quality of life.
GCNP_019	Private Individual	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	Supports the Plan's proposals for transport (pages 21-27), improved walking, cycling and public transport connections with the surrounding area make optimum use of current site advantages.
GCNP_019	Private Individual	4.5 Community facilities, ownership and empowerment	Supports the Plan's objectives on community facilities, ownership and empowerment (pages 28-29) including improvement of existing community amenities and provision of new ones.
GCNP_020	Private Individual	General	A resident of Stratford, supports the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood plan as the basis for development of the estate. Considers that the 400 empty homes should provide accommodation for those on the homeless waiting list, as homelessness is a huge issue in Newham. Wishes to see developments accompanied by health facilities and utilities for the local community, not luxury homes built for profit which do not benefit our local community.

GCNP_021	Private Individual	4.3 Homes, Refurbishment and Sensitive Infill	<p>Supports the Neighbourhood Plan for the Greater Carpenters neighbourhood. Acknowledges that the Plan has been prepared by the official forum (GCNF) set up by residents for the purpose, over a period of years and help from various professional organizations. It follows decades of uncertainty, a decade of three tower blocks standing mostly empty - with people cajoled and misled into leaving them and some other parts of the Carpenters estate, by the local council's (previous) administration - and a long history of that administration grinding residents down, side-lining the Forum and previous community organizations on the estate. Most of the tower block homes are habitable, and most could have been inhabited all this time if the council had not been so intent on 'gentrification', and what many call "social cleansing" of poor people from an area (especially one which visitors to the Olympics might see), partly destroying the existing community - to replace them with new people from outside, from, on average, a better-off segment of society. The new political administration has denounced practices of the past, though has set up another group of residents of its own; but the attitude of many council officers is difficult to turn around, and council publicity tries not to acknowledge that the GCNF even exists.</p> <p>I support the provisions of the Plan generally, and in particular, the requirement for developers to work with the existing Forum (Policy C1). But of course, the main contention is housing. I greatly applaud the Forum's aim to have the tower blocks re-used as homes for people to the greatest extent possible, and this should start as soon as possible. I understand the council, motivated by the prospect of having a developer level the site and replace it with shiny new (more expensive) housing, has much exaggerated the supposed costs of refurbishment, e.g. by playing up problems, and maximizing estimates. For example, if there's an issue with the waste water capacity, steps could be taken to actively prevent overcrowding, inform residents about peak times for water use and advise on the best time to use washing machines, and leave some whole floors empty pending potential upgrading of the system. There are bound to be technological fixes to create a warning system, e.g. along the lines of those installed in</p>
----------	--------------------	---	--

tower blocks with flammable cladding for detecting heat. Creative solutions can be found to all sorts of things if the relevant authorities are actually minded to do so, rather than looking for excuses to start again. As for the rest of the designated area, the existing low-rise and terraced housing should be retained unless there's a very good reason for a particular one to go. These houses are the bedrock of the remaining battered community. I accept the need for some new e.g. blocks to be built in spaces available, especially as the area is near to the large transport hub of Stratford. But with the three existing towers on the estate itself, and the many new ones already lining the High Street, these should not be excessively high, the highest being appropriate only at the corner nearest the station.

Supports the highest possible proportion of social housing for the area as a whole, as that is the most pressing need.

GCNP_022	Private Individual	4.4 Green space, biodiversity and community gardening	<p>I am writing to express my support for the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan, and my hope that your consultation leads to its acceptance.</p> <p>I have participated in many of the outreach and community input sessions, and have been impressed by the professionalism of the planners and by the enthusiasm of the local residents and neighbours. A huge amount of well-publicised, supported and reported consultation has taken place over recent years, which demonstrates the evolution of the approach and shows that the Neighbourhood Plan's many policies are deeply and strongly underpinned by the overall views of local people.</p> <p>Engagement has been properly planned and therefore the Neighbourhood Plan's many policies are deeply and strongly underpinned by the overall views of local people. Supports the Plan's objectives on green space, biodiversity and community gardening, enhancing existing green spaces and new ones, encouraging community gardening, more trees, sport and play (as detailed on pages 13-16 of the Plan), as well as its objectives on community facilities, ownership, and empowerment (pages 28-29).</p>
GCNP_022	Private Individual	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill	<p>Considers that the most important aspect of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan is its strong support for environmental and economic sustainability, in particular the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives on housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (detailed on pages 17-20). Considers that despite resistance from the London Borough of Newham, which has utterly failed in its legally mandated duties to constructively engage with this neighbourhood planning process, the Neighbourhood Plan will protect hundreds of decent, truly affordable existing homes from demolition, and support refurbishing them as appropriate. Considers that refurbishment of existing buildings would preserve the existing community instead of destroying it, as well as safeguarding threatened social-rent homes and the rights of leaseholders and freeholders.</p> <p>Numerous studies have shown that demolition and new construction also have significant environmental costs in terms of carbon emissions and toxic waste,</p>

			<p>notably asbestos, while refurbishing the existing housing at the Carpenters Estate will be better for people and for the environment, and will maximise the supply of genuinely affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan also support the building of new homes by sensitive infill, in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community's quality of life. Considers that the Carpenters Estate local authority, London Borough of Newham, claims without any evidence that refurbishment of this existing housing will be "too expensive," yet their efforts to displace the existing residents has cost local tax-payers more than £40 million so far, without producing a single home. Newham's exaggerated estimates are contradicted by numerous examples of successful, cost-effective renovation of socially rented flats across London. Within Newham itself, to fully renovate the Ferrier Point tower block at Custom House cost £85,000 per home to exceed Decent Homes standards, including energy efficient windows and insulation, and solar panels generating renewable electricity. By comparison, demolishing and rebuilding new homes at the Carpenters Estate will cost more than £250,000 per unit, making social rents or real affordability impossible to sustain. In short, approving the Great Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan, enabling it to move it toward a referendum, and eventually refurbishing the existing housing at the Carpenters Estate, will be better for people, and better for the environment, and will maximise the supply of desperately need, genuinely affordable housing. I hope and trust that the Examiner will decide that Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it meets the legal requirements, in particular the fundamental goal of neighbourhood planning: that it should give "communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need." (quote from Paragraph 183, National Planning Policy Framework).</p>
GCNP_023	Private Individual	General	<p>As Stakeholders in the Carpenters Estate, support for the Neighbourhood Plan. Local changes should be driven by local people.</p>

GCNP_024	Private Individual	General	<p>I have lived in Newham since 1985. I support the whole plan but in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I support the Plan's ideas on economy and employment, keeping and helping the growth of local businesses and employment. - I support the Plan's ideas on housing refurbishment, protecting existing homes from demolition and instead refurbishing them. This will preserve the existing community instead of destroying it, as well as safeguarding threatened social homes, and the rights of leaseholders and freeholders. - I support the building of new homes which do not crowd the site in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community's quality of life.
GCNP_025	Private Individual	General	<p>As a resident of the Carpenters Estate, I have witnessed the transformation of Stratford.</p> <p>This transformation seemed to accelerate leading up to the Olympics, and is now developing at a constant fast pace. I along with many of my neighbours got caught up in the maelstrom caused by regeneration. Most of the people I talk to think that the LDA/LLDC has created a beautiful park, shopping centre and transport hub. However, we are worried that our enjoyment of these new sites and amenities will be short lived. This is because we have been locked in a battle to save our community for many years. We are not NIMBYs, we understand that it is important and necessary to have change. We just want to have a 'real' say in the process of shaping the future of our community. When I hear words like Legacy, Localism, Convergence and affordable. I wonder if these words are too ambiguous to have any real meaning to people lacking the means to utilise them. The Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan is representative of the aspirations of local people. I know this because I was one of many locals involved in formulating the plan. I therefore want to formally endorse the neighbourhood plan, and would like to be notified of the Legacy Corporation's decision on whether or not to 'make' the plan under Regulation 19.</p>

GCNP_026	Private Individual	General	<p>Objects the developers plan to demolish the existing housing stock in the Carpenters block. Opposes any new development that would rid this area of its character and charm. Considers that another clinical, mundane "executive" block of flats is certainly not what the Carpenters estate needs. It would appear to be forced exodus for the residents who will not be able to afford to live in the new block of flats.</p> <p>Instead, supports the renovation of the Carpenters estate and the adoption of the greater carpenters neighbourhood plan. Works in Newham, and have lived there. Saddened to see the area being gentrified and the poorer in my community being forced outwards towards Essex etc due to spiralling living costs, rents etc.</p> <p>Supports the adoption of the Plan and considers that it makes financial sense to renovate as opposed to rebuilding a whole community. Considers that displaced people would not return.</p>
----------	--------------------	---------	--

GCNP_027	Private Individual	General	<p>Have been residing in Newham for the last forty-six years, knows and cares about every corner of the borough and all the borough's problems especially lack of housing and employment. Agrees with the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan and urges its adoption. Supports the housing proposals. Considers that the existing tower blocks should be refurbished so that there is no further loss of much needed social housing. Should Newham Council continue to claim that this will be too costly, wishes would urge you to bring their evidence into the public domain where it can be scrutinised and alternative quality options considered.</p> <p>In light of global warming, finds the policies on green space, biodiversity and community gardening particularly valuable. Considers that the Carpenters Estate has always been attractive because of its abundance of green space and the Plan will retain and improve on this. As someone reliant on public transport and walking to visit the Carpenters Estate, finds all the proposals for improved and more pleasant - and better lit! -access eminently practical and helpful. Considers that there is a strong entrepreneurial culture among the residents of Newham and welcomes the Plan's proposals for small businesses contained in the section on Economy and Employment. Considers that there are particular problems of youth unemployment and graduate unemployment in Newham which these ideas would address in an exemplary manner.</p>
GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>1. The declared key objective of the London Olympic Legacy was to ensure benefits for local residents: "It is therefore vital that the regeneration of the Olympic Park and Stratford does not result in an isolated island of prosperity, but will instead help raise the social and economic well being of east London as a whole. London's 2012 Bid confirmed that 'The most enduring Legacy of the Olympics will be the regeneration of an entire community for the direct benefit of everyone who lives there.'" Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance 1.5 Convergence— London's key strategic challenge.</p>

GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>2. The Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan has been created by the community living within this local area of Stratford, precisely the community referred to in the Supplementary Planning Guidance. The community has taken advantage of the provisions of the Localism Act to provide a clear statement about its needs and hopes. In this instance the Localism Act and the Supplementary Guidance work together to enable this local community to express how it can benefit from the London Olympics and how to fulfil the objectives set out in that guidance as to how the community can receive the benefits promised under the Legacy. Without the Localism Act and the opportunity to present a Neighbourhood Plan to guide future development in the area this statement of the community's needs and hopes would not be possible and the objective of providing 'a direct benefit of everyone who lives there' would be much harder to achieve.</p>
GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>This Neighbourhood Plan provides a means to fulfil the goals set for the Olympic Legacy for this community both in the specifics of the Plan and in the involvement of local people in bringing these hopes to life.</p>
GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>The Greater Carpenters community is not an island of prosperity nor is it part of such an island. The purpose of the Olympics we were told was: "It is therefore vital that the regeneration of the Olympic Park and Stratford does NOT (my emphasis) result in an isolated island of prosperity". If this goal of not creating an island of prosperity which excludes local people is to have any meaning then it must apply to those communities still in existence in Stratford and other areas on the fringe of the Park. However, the Carpenters Estate, which is part of the Greater Carpenters area, exists on the fringe of the Olympic Park and is at risk of being displaced by developments which threaten to create just such an island of prosperity. If the Olympic Legacy is to mean anything it is precisely communities like that in the Greater Carpenters area and the Carpenters Estate that need to be protected and provided for so that they can continue to exist within the Stratford area and benefit from the facilities to be created in the aftermath of the Olympics.</p>

GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	The reality is the Carpenters Estate and community faces precisely this threat of demolition which would render the Olympic Legacy void of meaning in the context of the statement made in the Supplementary Planning Guidance.
GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	The Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum (GCNF) sets out a realistic plan for the area which both allows for a considerable increase in the amount of housing in the area while preserving the existing community and housing. It does this by setting out a plan for the refurbishment of the three tower blocks on the Carpenters Estate along with infill at suitable sites.
GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	There is in fact the potential to increase this infill as a triangle on the edge of Stratford Station could also be developed for housing. This possibility has already been raised by and with the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC). The point here is that the refurbishment and infill option provides a template for the development and retention of the estate as part of the wider Greater Carpenters area.
GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>8. It is interesting to note that Newham Council, in its present consultation on the future of the Carpenters Estate, includes a refurbishment and infill option among the possibilities for the future of the estate. The problem with this is that Newham more or less dismisses this option by saying it may not be viable on grounds of cost. It does not provide any basis for this statement and has consistently failed to provide any up to date information on costs of refurbishing the tower blocks.</p> <p>9. Newham takes a similar line with its partial demolition option which also refers to unaffordable refurbishment. The only route it endorses is full demolition.</p> <p>10. The only information Newham has provided regarding the cost of refurbishing the towers is several years old and was circulated to residents in a document (see attached photograph). The figures provided at that time could be said to be at the top end of the anticipated costs and Newham has failed, indeed refused, to provide any information about how these figures were reached.</p> <p>11. If Newham is serious about including a refurbishment and infill option in its consultation then it should provide proper information about the costs and how</p>

			they have been arrived at. Failure to do this suggests this is more about dismissing this option rather than seriously considering it.
GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>It is worth noting that the Inspector of the LLDC's Local Plan during the examination in 2015 said the refurbishment option deserved to be more closely examined. Plainly to do this would require a proper assessment of costs. The inspector said in her report "there remain questions as to whether (Newham Council's) assessments of refurbishment schemes are sufficiently up to date, and whether the most reasonable option for this area in the future has been defined.</p> <p>In fact, there is a compare able tower block refurbishment scheme in Newham, namely at Ferrier Point, where a refurbishment scheme in 2011 on a 23 floors tower block was refurbished for £9.8 million https://ecda.co.uk/projects/ferrier-point/point/. As above, the only cost estimate available from Newham for the refurbishment of the Carpenters Estate tower blocks put the costs at £23 million per tower block. Newham has not chosen to provide the Forum with any information as to how it arrived at this figure.</p> <p>In its Appendix 1 LLDC / LBN "Site Allocation SA34 response to Inspector 31st March 2015.pdf") Newham suggested asbestos would be a problem for a refurbishment option.</p> <p>However, in LLDC / LBN "Site Allocation SA34 response to Inspector 31st March 2015.pdf") the authorities say "The asbestos in the blocks is now safe and will stay safe. Nearly all of it is contained in concrete so can't be accessed. Any areas which can be accessed have been legally tagged and the asbestos safely removed. Any structural work to the blocks would risk exposing it."</p> <p>Plainly this undermines the cost estimates at least with regard to asbestos.</p> <p>Furthermore, this statement shows demolition would create an asbestos risk,</p>

			and therefore cost, whereas a refurbishment option would not making refurbishment a more acceptable option.
--	--	--	---

GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>The Forum includes members from outside the Carpenters Estate. Newham has launched a consultation programme for the estate’s residents. However, those not living on the estate are notable to at tend these sessions.</p> <p>The extraordinary failure of the Mayor and Newham to engage with the Forum is not new. Newham has consistently refused to meet with self-organised groups on the Carpenters. This policy remains unchanged.</p> <p>What is different on this occasion is this group was organised under legislation, it has spent years creating and consulting on a Plan in accordance with that legislation. It is seeking to take its place alongside other planning bodies like the LLDC and Newham within the planning framework.</p> <p>Moreover, its Plan includes an option, Refurbishment and Infill, which matches in concept one proposed by Newham. If such an option ever had any real meaning for Newham then plainly it would have made sense to discuss it with a community group operating in the same location both to try to meet the community’s hopes and to arrive at a viable plan, including for example by sharing information on costs of refurbishment or preparing an updated assessment. Newham has failed to do this on every level.</p> <p>Newham’s lack of care towards the Forum, a care it should show any community group in the borough, is matched by its lack of interest in providing real support for a community to become involved in the planning process. Public bodies tend to place great weight on consulting local people. The idea of Neighbourhood Planning takes this a step further and puts the community in the driving seat of preparing plans rather than just reacting to them. Newham has disregarded not only this second goal but it has failed to even open its door to the group.</p>
----------	--------------------	---------	--

GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>There is an irony, if it can be called that, that the amount of housing available to the general public inside the Olympic Park has been reduced by around 2000 units with the decision to create a cultural quarter, now called East Bank, and to house University College London. This will include elite institutions including the BBC, the V&A, Sadler's Wells and the University of the Arts. In addition, University College London will occupy a large area of land and will include a considerable amount of student housing which will be of no use to the local community. This had been known as Margate Wharf had been expected to produce 2,600 units.</p> <p>In other words, space has been made inside the Olympic Park for precisely the kind of housing and facilities which could be described as being part of an 'island of prosperity'.</p> <p>The amount of housing expected by the authorities to be created at the Carpenters Estate more or less matches this loss of housing inside the Olympic Park. In effect this shortage is being off loaded onto a community which should reasonably be expecting to benefit from the Olympic Legacy but instead faces demolition in order to meet this target.</p>
GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>The GCNF Plan is not just about housing. It is also designed to preserve and develop local business, which has suffered heavily from the demolitions visited upon Stratford, in particular within the Olympic Park.</p>
GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>Again one of the peculiar features of the Olympic development was that it was based on the false claim that the industrial land within the Olympic Park was a wasteland, land that was underused. The businesses occupying that land disputed this. However, what is interesting is that even the LLDC now disagrees with that original assessment as can be seen on its website 'Sweetwater, Before the Games' https://www.queenelizabetholympicpark.co.uk/the-park/homes-and-living/sweetwater. Whereas before the Games those arguing for the Games described the area as a 'scar' (Andrew Higgins, CEO ODA) or 'an urban desert' (Stephen Frost, ODA Head of Inclusion) the LLDC now says Before the Games One of the most</p>

important industrial sites in London, the area around Sweetwater has seen some of the UK's most important innovations. In the 19th century, the area was home to the East London Waterworks Company, but it was during the late 19th and early 20th century that it really came into its own with the grow of chemical, confectionery and petroleum industries taking off in the area.

Petrol was first registered for a patent by the company Carless, Capel & Leonard in the area around White Post Lane and a company based on White Post Lane first introduced the French process of dry cleaning to the UK. A German V1 rocket and heavy bombing damaged many of the buildings in the area during World War Two, but industrial development continued from the 1950s onwards with confectionary, fur trade, engineering and fruit businesses, as well as timber yards and warehouses continued to make the area a real hive of activity and industrial innovation (my emphasis)

The Olympics demolished this 'real hive of activity and industrial innovation' and with the destruction of that industry and those jobs the local economy and the job prospects of local people have suffered serious damage. With the demolition of this mass of industry, what may be called 'dirty' industry, in this key area the pressure on industry on the fringe of the Olympic Park has increased so that in areas like Hackney Wick, Fish Island and Chobham Farm industry is on the retreat.

The Neighbourhood Plan has made it a priority to preserve the industry in its area along with plans to provide training and education to assist local people to gain skills to go with the jobs it seeks to maintain. Included in this is the retention of the Building Crafts College.

GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan has also prioritised community facilities such as the Dockland Centre, located on the Carpenters Estate, which provides services for the wider community.</p> <p>The Greater Carpenters area is now home to a considerable number of new tower blocks of varying heights. The estate provides the only green spaces in the neighbourhood and the Plan emphasises how important they are to the area. It seeks to enhance this provision.</p> <p>However, as important is the place of the low-rise housing in what is now an area fringed by towers. This creates an entirely different ambience to go along with the open and green spaces which are part of its makeup. Should the estate be demolished and be replaced by high density housing the whole area will be filled up with blocks of housing which will demolish this contrasting environment.</p>
GCNP_028	Private Individual	General	<p>Obviously as part of that physical demolition will go the demolition of the community which inhabits this space. Once removed, even if offered a right to return, the reality is many, if not most, of those forced to move will never return because of the hassle of making another move after they have settled into a new home and a new neighbourhood, sorted out schools, doctors and got used to local shops and facilities and made friends in their new locations. It is also likely the rents they will have to pay will be higher if they return and, unless guaranteed by the Council, they will lose their secure council tenancies, something which has already happened to many of the tenants who have already moved.</p> <p>For leaseholders and freeholders the compensation on offer will in no way meet their needs if they wish to stay in the area. The reality is, as was seen at the Heygate Estate in Elephant and Castle, most will be forced to move a considerable distance away from their present homes, see attached diagram taken from this link http://heygatewashome.org/displacement.html 37. The reality is that many tenants will also have to move considerable</p>

			<p>distances, even if there is a greater chance they will be able to stay in Newham. The same lesson can be seen from what happened to the tenants at the Heygate Estate, see attached diagram from the same link for a diagram.</p> <p>The refurbishment option proposed by the Forum will ensure the retention of the estate as a genuine social housing estate in the heart of Stratford.</p> <p>In every respect the Forum's Plan represents the fulfilment of a genuine legacy for the existing community in line with the planning guidance quoted at the start.</p>
GCNP_029	Private Individual	General	<p>Support for the plan put forward by Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood. Considers this to be the best option out of all options seen.</p>

GCNP_030	The London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) in its capacity as a neighbouring landowner and developer	General	The London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC), in its capacity as a neighbouring landowner and developer, is responsible for bringing forward development and regeneration in and around Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park and overseeing the delivery of the Legacy Communities Scheme (LCS) (planning ref no. 11/90621/OUTODA as amended); an outline planning permission for residential-led mixed-use development at the Park. The Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Area is located within the neighbouring area of Planning Delivery Zone 8 (PDZ8) as identified in the LCS planning consent.
----------	--	---------	--

GCNP_030	The London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) in its capacity as a neighbouring landowner and developer	3. Objectives, Figure 3.1	<p>On Figure 3.1 Early Proposals Map, the Neighbourhood Plan identifies part of the Warton Road development plot, located to the west of Warton Road and east of the Waterworks River, as 'Enhanced public green space'. This plot sits within land owned by LLDC identified in green. As part of LLDC's interim uses strategy, the Warton Road development plot is currently occupied by a community garden area with MUGA, outdoor gym and growing area which is subject to a temporary planning consent expiring on 31st December 2019 (13/00248/FUL as varied by 14/00244/VAR). The plot however is earmarked for long-term re-development and currently benefits from the LCS permission as PDZ 8.4 with outline consent for one residential block.</p> <p>The LLDC is currently progressing revised proposals for the Pudding Mill Lane and Bridgewater sites (the latter includes the Warton Road development plot) and it is anticipated that that a new planning application will be submitted in conjunction with a Section 73 application to 'slot-out' PDZ 8 from the LCS permission. The Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan should therefore reflect the long-term aspirations for the site and revise Figure 3.1 Early Proposals Map to show the entire plot as 'Proposed new development'.</p>
----------	--	---------------------------	--

GCNP_030	The London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) in its capacity as a neighbouring landowner and developer	4.2 Green Space, Biodiversity and community gardening, Figure 4.3	Figure 4.3 Existing public and private green space should also be updated to reflect the temporary nature of the current use on the Warton Road development plot.
----------	--	---	---

GCNP_030	The London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) in its capacity as a neighbouring landowner and developer	4.4 Transport Connections and Movement, Figure 4.10 and 4.11	<p>Figure 4.10 Proposed Pedestrian Network and Figure 4.11 Proposed Cycling Network outline the E48 bridge as a proposed pedestrian and cycling route. This is secured through the LCS permission (condition LCS0.188) which requires a new bridge providing pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access to the Bridgewater site to be delivered. Any future proposals for the site will therefore adhere to this requirement, however, it should be noted that the exact location of the new bridge is to be determined as part of the detailed design process.</p> <p>The LLDC also notes the aspiration for a new bus route 276 via Carpenters Road. The Stratford Waterfront S106 Bus Route Enhancement Plan, contained in Appendix 6 of the Stratford Waterfront S106 Agreement, identifies a proposed Carpenters Road Enhancement Corridor. However, any proposals for a new bus route will need to be discussed and agreed with Transport for London.</p>
GCNP_031	Private Individual	General	Supports and agrees with all aspects of the Carpenters Neighborhood.

GCNP_032	Canal & River Trust	General	<p>The following information also outlines some of the general opportunities presented by waterways to create the conditions for prosperous, healthy and sustainable communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The waterway corridors provide the opportunity to improve connectivity both within and between the city and town centres and beyond, and to increase the use of sustainable transport modes thereby improving air quality, lowering carbon dioxide levels and reducing congestion on roads. • The potential for inland waterways to contribute to the low carbon economy and build resilience includes new energy technologies such as biomass capacity, and the identification of waste streams such as from the operation and maintenance of waterway management for recycling, reuse and energy from waste markets. • The canal network provides readily available opportunities for developments to incorporate innovative technologies to make use of its water such as the abstraction of canal water for heating and cooling purposes where there is a sufficient flow of water to sustain this use and the canal towpath for the running of pipelines etc. The water flowing through the Trust's waterways which pass through most major cities in England contains enough thermal energy to produce approximately 640 MW of energy. This has attracted a number of businesses which now utilise this low carbon source to heat and cool their buildings. DECC have also acknowledged this potential in their Heat Map which includes a specific canal layer. • The waterway network presents a number of opportunities to support and enhance urban development, with particular reference to water management. Water levels in the canal network are managed by the Trust using a variety of control structures and with careful design and assessment may be able to receive runoff from future development sites, providing sustainable options for site drainage (although mitigation works to the canal infrastructure may be
----------	---------------------	---------	--

necessary to cope with this.) This may allow development of sites that would otherwise not be viable due to flood risk concerns with alternative site drainage options. The ability of canals to accept surface water run-off may also assist in wider consideration of flood mitigation measures given the managed nature of canal water levels. (The Trust is not however a land drainage authority and there is no obligation on the Trust to accept discharges.)

- The wider environmental benefits of waterways as green infrastructure are well known, but in urban areas waterways are particularly important in providing "blue lungs" for residents and visitors, with resulting physical and mental health benefits, and for their contribution to urban cooling in hot summer months. Independent research has shown that spending time by the waterways can make you happier and improve life satisfaction with an equivalent estimated social wellbeing value of £3bn per year {SIMETRICA Assessing the wellbeing impacts of waterways usage in England and Wales 2018}

<https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/refresh/media/thumbnail/38060-simetrica-report.pdf>

- The waterways already generate economic benefits, particularly in terms of tourism and leisure activity, which generates an economic return through increased expenditure by visitors, which in turn leads to money being retained locally within the economy, supporting jobs in local businesses. Waterways have also been successfully used as vehicles to deliver Welfare to Work schemes and heritage skills development programmes.

- Canals can also act as a catalyst for the development of property alongside them, help to establish developer and investor confidence, particularly in disadvantaged areas. Improvements to canal environments have been shown to bring forward the development of previously vacant or underused sites. Their linear form means that canals can also help integrate discrete development schemes. Attractive development can enhance the vibrancy and vitality of an area and evidence suggests that property developments at waterside locations command a premium value of between 15-25% when compared to other schemes.

- The Town and Country Planning Association set up the 'Developers and Wellbeing' project in 2017. Their report <https://www.tcpa.org.uk/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=b9a54964-9cf5-49d4-8ef4-095d2436719f> (Securing constructive collaboration and consensus for planning healthy developments 2018) details the principles of healthy place making and, using the findings from several case studies, sets out key messages as to how collective action between developers, local authorities and wider stakeholders such as the Trust can help lead to the development of new sustainable, high quality, healthy places.
- Canals have successfully formed the basis for leisure and recreation-driven regeneration across the country.
- There is a strong correlation between underperforming waterways and some of the most deprived districts in the country and this can be clearly seen by mapping the index of multiple deprivation data against our waterways. Information on how the Trust contribute to wellbeing and makes sure communities benefit from or waterways can be found on the Trusts website at: <https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/specialist-teams/planning-and-design/planning-and-wellbeing#contribute>

GCNP_032	Canal & River Trust	General	<p>In light of the benefits the waterways can bring to local communities, we believe that our waterways have a role to play in the development of a successful Neighbourhood Plan area, and the Trust would therefore welcome on going engagement with the LLDC, the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum and developers about the wide range of opportunities that our waterways provide. We have the following specific comments to make on the document:</p> <p>We note that Waterworks River forms the south western boundary of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan area, and therefore may appear to have limited impact on it. However, we feel that there are multiple opportunities for interaction, through, for example, the impacts of development on the structural integrity of waterway infrastructure, and the visual impact on river character, as well as sustainable transport links, and environmental and biodiversity enhancements.</p> <p>Development at riverside sites (and in particular, Wingate House, and the adjacent plot along Warton Road, as this is the remaining section to be redeveloped) has the potential to impact directly on the river, the waterway wall, water quality, and the character of the river corridor. We are particularly concerned about the current proposals for Wingate House, which exclude the strip of land between the waterway wall and the site, leaving this vulnerable to fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>We note that the Introduction on page 5 of the plan acknowledges that the area "...is adjacent to waterways and green spaces", but otherwise there is no reference to Waterworks River, or to the towpaths or other network of waterways that these link to. The towpaths are a key walking and cycling link, and have the potential to connect the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood area with the wider canal network, for connections to Docklands, Hackney and the Lee Valley.</p> <p>We also note that access to the waterways was mentioned several times in the Consultation Statement from the community consultation events.</p>
----------	---------------------	---------	--

GCNP_032	Canal & River Trust	4.4 Transport connections and movement	Section 4.4 'TRANSPORT CONNECTIONS AND MOVEMENT' makes references to connections that could be along or across Waterworks River, and these could be amended to include clear support for use of the waterway and towpaths.
GCNP_032	Canal & River Trust	Policy T1 Transport Connections and Movements	Developments will support the better integration of the Greater Carpenters neighbourhood with the surrounding area. Key linkages that need improving are access to Stratford station and to the Olympic Park and its facilities."
GCNP_032	Canal & River Trust	Paragraph 4.4.1	<p>Paragraph 4.4.1 states <i>There should be a clear and accessible pedestrian and cycling route to the Greenway that avoids crossing Stratford High Street and improved access so that the community benefits from the Olympic Legacy.</i></p> <p>This route would be alongside Waterworks River, and/or over Bridgewater Road bridge. The original towpath, closed off at the beginning of the Transformation stage of the Olympic Games works in the area, should be reinstated, as was originally envisaged, to help support these connections.</p>
GCNP_032	Canal & River Trust	Policy T3 Walking and Cycling Routes	<p>Policy T3 could also be amended to include reference to the towpaths connections, as suggested below</p> <p>"Development will assist in providing clear and accessible pedestrian and cycling routes. Specific measures will include: routes linking up <i>green spaces and towpaths</i>, so to increase their use. "</p> <p>On page 26, the route across Bridgewater Road Bridge is described as a 'main pedestrian route' but doesn't include any access along the water edge, where the original towpath should be being reinstated. We understand that Bridgewater Road bridge is due to be replaced in the near future, but this is not mentioned in the plan.</p> <p>In addition, the water space itself is a setting for improving biodiversity and visual environment, which could be enhanced through aquatic planting. Reed</p>

			beds have been successfully installed in several areas around Bow Back Rivers and subject to the appropriate contests, could also be continued in this area, improving water quality. Biodiversity and the visual appearance of the river corridor. Finally, there may also be opportunities or mooring points along the river edge, to further animate and activate the waterspace.
GCNP_033	Private Individual	4.3 Homes, Refurbishment and sensitive Infill	<p>Supports the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. Have been following the work of the Plan and have actively engaged in the consultations. Considers that the Plan reflect the popular opinions in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Considers that the proposed plan would allow for regeneration whilst still maintaining the character of the neighbourhood and ensuring that the community feels heard and supported. Support for the prioritisation of refurbishment over demolition (pages 17-20). Considers that the Forum had actively engaged with local residents and that the Plan truly reflects their hopes for the future of the area.</p> <p>Considers that the housing target in the neighbourhood plan is sensible and is consistent with the phasing for the Estate outlined in the SHLAA for the London Plan (which assumes the maximum capacity of the estate will increase by a net 1600 homes by the end of Phase 4, mid 2034).</p>

GCNP_034	Private Individual	General	<p>A resident of the area for the past 11 years, confident that without private investments the Carpenters Neighbourhood rejuvenation idea will remain a pipe dream for many years to come. This is currently a somewhat shabby area, in my humble opinion, not very well looked after by some of the local residents and by the local authorities also. The aged stock of terraced homes requires a facelift and the three known towers must be demolished: bringing private investors in to replace such towers with new residential / commercial developments (and to sensibly build additional developments) will also allow to upgrade the local infrastructure to some extent (as a condition for such developments to be built or with respective levies collected by the council for a further regeneration of the area). Otherwise box parks / workshops and shops on top of existing garages will remain just that - a students' fantasy. This is not Shoreditch. This is a time for action and enabling private entrants to develop the area with the requirements for affordable homes and infrastructure levies set at levels making commercial sense to such entrants. Otherwise there may be another decade lost and the deprivation and shabbiness of the estate will be perpetuated and conserved. It is a shame that all the talk about housing needs does not translate into a pragmatic action.</p>
GCNP_035	Private Individual	General	<p>Supports the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. Participated in the consultations and feels that the final outcome positively reflects residents views about the future of the neighbourhood. Considers that the Plan would allow for the meeting of housing targets in the area, without forcing out current residents or requiring demolition of the entire estate. Considers that the Plan's promotion of green space is important and would not only make the area more aesthetically pleasing but would foster more community engagement through gardening, sports and play, and will also help the area become a healthier place to live. Considers that the transport proposals (page 21-27) would also improve the conditions for walking and cycling in the area. Supports the adoption of the Plan and to safeguard the future of the neighbourhood in a way that will improve conditions whilst still making us feel supported and heard.</p>
GCNP_036	London Borough of Waltham Forest	General	<p>LB Waltham Forest has no comments to make.</p>

GCNP_037	Newham Cyclists	4.4 Transport Connections and movement	<p>Newham Cyclists (NC) support the broad outline of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum (GCNF) consultation statement on local transport, connections and movements policies in terms of improving connectivity, sustainable transport prioritisation and walking/cycling routes.</p> <p>NC hope the GCNF will improve local air quality and create the street conditions that make it easy and safe residents to walk/cycle within the estate and to/from it in terms of the objectives listed below. Objective(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creation of a healthy, safer and comfortable CNA environment for all whilst securing access for estate residents, pedestrian movements, cycling traffic, public transport and certain motor vehicles (of exception). CNA should aim to be a local Healthy and Safety Neighbourhood (i.e. a Low Traffic Neighbourhood). - Reducing 'cut through' motor traffic journeys through the CNA and motor vehicle anti-social behaviour e.g. inconsiderate/inappropriate parking, speeding, dangerous vehicle manoeuvres etc. - Traffic calming measures including legal pedestrian priority crossings on Carpenters Road and Warton Road. - Review the Carpenters Road/Stratford High Street junction towards making it safer for pedestrian footfall and cycling traffic use.- Securing and improving the existing desired 'quietway style' cycle route between Carpenters Road and Stratford High Street via Hutchins Close, Gibbins Road, Wilmer Lea Close and Letts Road. - Develop new prioritised walking and cycling traffic routes within the CNA with connectivity to the Newham Greenway/ the QE Olympic Park via Bridgewater Road bridge (over the Waterworks River), riverside paths, the 'green spaces' and Stratford Station - Development of new CNA residential/public cycle parking and strategic cycle hire facilities.
----------	-----------------	--	--

GCNP_038	Private Individual	4.1 Economy and employment	<p>A freeholder/resident on the Carpenters Estate Since 1986. I bought the house as the community aspect really stood out. Since 1986 children and now grandchildren are raised here, children went to school in the area. Always felt safe and secure within this community. Therefore, supports the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. A member of the Forum and have been attending meetings and have followed all progress.</p> <p>Economy and Employment: In full support of the plan's objectives.</p>
GCNP_038	Private Individual	4.2 Green space, biodiversity and community gardening	In full support of the Green Space, Biodiversity and Community Gardening policies. Considers that this policy would make the most of existing green spaces and create new spaces, maybe having allotment space encouraging community gardening and children's play areas.
GCNP_038	Private Individual	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill	Fully supports the plan's objectives to protect and save existing homes, to refurbish and not demolish. Considers that this would help retain and not destroy the community. Understands the need for New homes but considers that this can be done with sensitive infill where possible without destroying the communities quality of life.
GCNP_038	Private Individual	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	Fully supports Plan's objectives to improve public transport links, improve safe walking and cycling areas.
GCNP_038	Private Individual	4.5 Community facilities, ownership and empowerment	In full support of improving our existing community amenities and marking provision of New ones.
GCNP_039	Environment Agency	General	The area covered by your neighbourhood plan area is sited within areas of flood zone 2 and 3. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Para 100-102, Environment Agency recommends that the Sequential Test is undertaken when allocating sites to ensure development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk. The Sequential Test should be informed by the Local

			<p>Planning Authorities Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). Environment Agency would have concerns if development is allocated in this high-risk flood zone without the Sequential Test being undertaken.</p> <p>It is important that that the Plan also considers whether the flood risk issues associated with these sites can be safely managed to ensure development can come forward. Without this understanding, the Environment Agency is unsure how the plan can demonstrate compliance with the NPPF.</p>
GCNP_039	Environment Agency	4.2 Green Space, Biodiversity and community gardening	<p>☒ A naturalised buffer zone of a minimum of 8 metres from the top of the bank of the River Lee. The buffer zone should be designed and managed for the benefit of biodiversity, e.g. by planting of locally appropriate species native to the UK, and otherwise undisturbed by development i.e. no fencing, footpaths or other development and should not include formal landscaping. A buffer zone will provide multiple benefits including natural flood management, aesthetically pleasing space and improved habitats for local biodiversity.</p> <p>☒ If invasive species are present, these should be removed with consideration for a long term management and control plan. When visiting any site, work methods should include appropriate biosecurity measures to prevent the spread and contamination of Invasive Non-native Species in order to avoid contravention of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p>☒ The proposed development has the potential to cause light spill onto the River Lee. Light spill from external artificial lighting disrupts the natural diurnal rhythms of a range of wildlife using and inhabiting the river and its corridor habitat, and in particular is inhibitive to bats utilising the river corridor. To minimise light spill, development proposals should consider location and direction of external artificial lights to be such that the lighting levels within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the watercourse should not exceed background levels of 0-2 lux.</p> <p>☒ SUDs offer significant advantages over conventional piped drainage systems in reducing flood risk by attenuating the rate and quantity of surface water run-off from a site, promoting groundwater recharge, absorbing diffuse pollutants and improving water quality. Ponds, reedbeds and seasonally flooded grasslands can be particularly attractive features within public open. The variety of SUDS techniques available means that virtually any development should be able to</p>

			<p>include a scheme based around these principles and provide multiple benefits, reducing costs and maintenance needs. Further information can be found at the interim code of practice for SUD's .</p> <p>Developments within or adjacent to this watercourse should not cause further deterioration and should seek to improve the water quality based on the recommendations of the Thames River Basin Management Plan. A Water Framework Directive (WFD) WFD assessment of the potential impacts of the development on this watercourse may be required if direct works are proposed. Please also see our guidance together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission, we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available here: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.</p>
GCNP_039	Environment Agency	4.2 Green Space, Biodiversity and community gardening	<p>Climate Change</p> <p>Climate change will present significant challenges to the people and environment of your borough. The Plan should therefore consider evidence bases, plans and policies that ensure your borough is resilient to current and future climate change risks. Planning for Climate Change: Guidance for Local Authorities, produced in May 2018, contains helpful guidance and examples of how to incorporate climate change in plan-making. Environment Agency Climate Ready service is also a potential source of information as it provides tools and practical information to help businesses and other organisations live with the changing climate.</p>
GCNP_039	Environment Agency	4.2 Green Space, Biodiversity and community gardening	<p>Environment Agency is pleased to see the inclusion of Policy G1 'Green Space' and G3 'Biodiversity'. The natural environment should feature in policies to ensure it is recognised as a priority. Even if the development site would have very minimal impact on the environment, it should aim to improve the natural environment where it can. This is in line with policy 2.18 on Green Infrastructure of the London Plan, including planning green infrastructure needs and managing them to realise the value of green and open space to communities is addressed, in addition to Policy 5.10 of the London Plan on Urban Greening.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan may wish to also wish to consider the inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems. SUD's are an approach to managing surface water</p>

			<p>run-off which seeks to mimic natural drainage systems and retain water on or near the site as opposed to traditional drainage approaches which involve piping water off site as quickly as possible. SuDs measures that offer multiple benefits are particularly important for chalk stream habitats as they rely on producing clear waters with a generally stable flow and temperature regime and support some of the UK's most endangered species. Support for the use of SUDs approach to ensuring development does not increase flood risk elsewhere is set out in paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework. SUDs offer significant advantages over conventional piped drainage systems in reducing flood risk by attenuating the rate and quantity of surface water run-off from a site, promoting groundwater recharge absorbing diffuse pollutants and improving water quality. Ponds, reedbeds and seasonally flooded grasslands can be particularly attractive features within the public realm. The variety of SUDS techniques available means that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles and provide multiple benefits, reducing costs and maintenance needs. Further information can be found at the interim code of practice for SUD's . Infiltration SUDs should not be located in unsuitable and unstable ground conditions such as land affected by contamination or solution features. Where infiltration SUDs are to be used for surface run-off from roads, car parking and public or amenity areas, they should have a suitable series of treatment steps to prevent the pollution of groundwater. Therefore, SUD's do not only help control flood risk, but they can enhance biodiversity and create aesthetically pleasing spaces. This would benefit in with Policy G2 Enhancing the social qualities of green spaces.</p>
GCNP_039	Environment Agency	4.2 Green Space, Biodiversity and community gardening	<p>Environment Agency is pleased to see the inclusion of Policy H3 'Environmental standards for new housing'. This policy can be strengthened further with specific reference to policies that encourage water efficiency. Hackney is within Thames Water's London Water Resource Zone – this is classified as 'seriously water stressed.' This means there is a high population with high water demands and limited water availability – it does not reflect water companies' ability to supply water. Improving the water efficiency of new development should be a priority and as a minimum new development should comply with London Plan policy 5.15 which requires residential development to meet water consumption targets</p>

			<p>of 105 litres or less per head per day. Inefficient use of water can lead to unnecessary carbon emissions. Currently water use accounts for 27 percent of all carbon emissions from our homes. Building a house to 105 l/h/d will save 79 kilograms of CO2 and 15 cubic meters of water per year, per house, over and above building regulations (125 litres per head per day).</p> <p>Non-households consume significant amounts of water. In London non-households accounts for 29 percent of water consumption and is therefore an area where further water and carbon savings can be made. The Mayor's Water Strategy (October 2011) notes that 'commercial water efficiency has a significant potential to save water'. The London Plan (draft 2018) Policy SI5 Water infrastructure further emphasises the sustainable use of water. We therefore recommend that you consider that new non-household development, including refurbishments, achieve a water efficiency standard, such as BREEAM (BRE Environmental Assessment Method) 'Excellent' with maximum number of 'water credits'. BREEAM credits are awarded for water where water efficient appliances (e.g. low flush toilets), water metering, leak detection systems and water butts are in place. Alternatively, buildings could meet the 'best practice' level of the AECB (Association for Environment Conscious Building) Water Standards.</p>
GCNP_039	Environment Agency	4.4 Transport Connections and Movement	<p>Environment Agency is pleased to see the inclusion of a policy relating to sustainable transport (Policy T2 'Sustainable Transport'). This policy would benefit from providing specific mention to Air quality. We regulate certain processes under the Environmental Permitting Regulations and support and work closely with local authorities in improving air quality through the UK Air Quality Strategy, Local Air Quality Management and Air Quality Action Plans, especially where these processes may have an impact on local air quality. Your Director of Public Health has to report on air quality (deaths attributable to particulate pollution) under the Public Health Framework. For these reasons, and given that main source of air pollution is frequently transport, Environment Agency expects relevant local plan policies to reference and link with your Borough Air Quality Action Plan and the Mayor's Air Quality and Transport Strategies.</p>

GCNP_040	Private Individual	General	Fully supports the submitted plan. Born in Newham and still lives there and have noticed over the years just how more and more desperate the need for social housing is becoming. Considers that the regeneration of the Carpenters estate provides an exiting opportunity to try and build some homes for local people, and in a time when Newham council has declared a Climate Emergency, it feels pertinent use what we already have. Considers that the most important part of the process should be listening to local residents. They have made their wishes clear, and it would be undemocratic and cruel to ignore their suggestions. Thinks that Newham needs social housing - not new luxury flats!
GCNP_041	Private Individual	4.1 Economy and employment	Support the formal adoption of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. Have been living in Carpenters neighbourhood for over 15 months. Currently rents a room from a landlady who owns this home for over 5 years. Have followed the Forum's work on the Plan - the house owner has been attending meetings and giving household's opinion at consultations. Supports the Plan's objectives on economy and employment, (pages 10-12) helping the growth of local businesses and employment, with improved access to education and lifelong learning.
GCNP_041	Private Individual	4.2 Green space, biodiversity and community gardening	Supports the Plan's objectives on green space, biodiversity and community gardening, (pages 13-16) enhancing existing green spaces and new ones, encouraging community gardening, more trees, sports and play.
GCNP_041	Private Individual	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill	Supports the Plan's objectives on housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (pages 17- 20) protecting existing homes from demolition and instead refurbishing them as appropriate. Considers that this would preserve the existing community instead of destroying it, as well as safeguarding threatened social homes, and the rights of leaseholders and freeholders. Supports the building of new homes by sensitive infill, in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community's quality of life.

GCNP_041	Private Individual	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	Supports the Plan's proposals for transport (pages 21-27), improved walking, cycling and public transport connections with the surrounding area.
GCNP_041	Private Individual	4.5 Community facilities, ownership and empowerment	Supports the Plan's objectives on community facilities, ownership and empowerment (pages 28-29), providing genuine bottom-up regeneration instead of decisions dictated from above. Supports improvement of existing community amenities and provision of new ones.
GCNP_042	TfL	General	<p>The comments represent the views of Transport for London (TfL) officers and are made entirely on a "without prejudice" basis. They should not be taken to represent an indication of any subsequent Mayoral decision in relation to this matter. The comments are made from TfL's role as a transport operator and highway authority in the area. These comments also do not necessarily represent the views on the Greater London Authority (GLA).</p> <p>TfL reminds the Neighbourhood Forum that the new London Plan has gone through Examination in Public, and is expected to be adopted later this year. We will have regard to this Plan when assessing and responding to local planning policy consultations.</p> <p>TfL welcomes the Neighbourhood Plan's promotion of sustainable travel and improved public realm. TfL strongly encourages embedding the Mayor's Healthy Streets Approach and Vision Zero approach to eliminating death and serious injuries on the road network. Given the very well-connected nature of the area and its location in an inner London Opportunity area, TfL expects new development to be car-free. Proposals should be designed in such a way as to improve PTAL across the Neighbourhood Plan area where possible. TfL should be consulted on any development proposals close to public and active travel infrastructure.</p>
GCNP_042	TfL	Paragraph 4.4.2	TfL supports the principle of the provision of a new entrance to Stratford station from Gibbons Road to improve the accessibility of the Greater Carpenters area, subject to this having a satisfactory business case and having no negative impact on congestion in the station. We continue to work with partners – including

			Network Rail, Newham Council and LLDC – to progress designs for a new station entrance. TfL is keen to work with the Neighbourhood Forum and LLDC in finding a solution to delivering a new entrance, for example through use of Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL), CIL, Section 106 agreements or as part of wider commercial development.
GCNP_042	TfL	Paragraph 4.4.4	Please clarify what is meant by ‘agreed access plans’ to the Carpenters estate on event days at the London Stadium and how these would work in practice.
GCNP_042	TfL	Policy T2 Sustainable Transport	<p>We welcome this policy’s commitment to improving sustainable travel, in particular the provision of cycle parking that exceeds the standards set out in the London Plan. We strongly recommend provision of on-street cycle storage hangars in addition to on-site cycle parking in new developments as a way to encourage and enable cycling across the Greater Carpenters Area. Cycle hangars can serve residents of existing buildings which do not necessarily have sufficient or secure cycle parking, thereby increasing active travel and potentially reducing congestion and overcrowding.</p> <p>We do not support, however, that part of the policy that states that ‘development may include car parking space’, as this is too general and therefore not in line with the draft London Plan. Given that the area is very well connected by public transport, its location in an Opportunity Area and within walking and cycling distance of Stratford town centre, we expect all development to be car-free (except for provision of disabled persons parking). Opportunity Areas have been identified as areas that will see significant change, and are well placed to encourage and enable people to switch to walking, cycling and public transport use. Furthermore, we expect new residential development to be permit-free, where new residents are restricted from applying for a parking permit. Ensuring that new development is permit-free will prioritise on-street car parking for existing residents and will help mitigate overspill car parking. This will help reduce car dominance, improve road safety, and reduce emissions.</p> <p>TfL reminds that the Carpenters estate is entirely within a Controlled Parking Zone, where there is extensive on-street car parking. This is not an efficient use of space given the very high public transport connectivity, walking and cycling connectivity, and excellent access to amenities and services within walking and</p>

			cycling distance. Much of this car parking is not fully used and TfL therefore suggests that on-street parking be rationalised and repurposed for other uses for example cycle parking, play space or enhanced public realm such as 'parklets' and other planting.
GCNP_042	TfL	Paragraph 4.4.5	TfL supports the principle of extending the Mayor's cycle hire scheme to the area and notes the proposals for docking stations shown in figure 4.11. TfL suggests that the provision of new docking stations in the Greater Carpenters area be funded through NCIL or as part of wider commercial developments.
GCNP_042	TfL	Paragraph 4.4.6	TfL notes the suggested changes to bus routes set out in the Neighbourhood Plan. TfL welcomes encouraging people to use public transport, in addition to walking and cycling. Any detailed proposals for bus route changes would be considered as part of TfL's bus network review process. TfL is keen to work with the Neighbourhood Forum and LLDC to help deliver these improvements. Given the challenges around funding, TfL is keen to work with the Neighbourhood Forum and LLDC to find solutions, for example through use of Neighbourhood CIL and by encouraging mode shift through repurposing of car parking. TfL reminds that route 339 was recently re-routed via Sidings Street bringing it closer to the Greater Carpenters neighbourhood area
GCNP_042	TfL	Policy T3 Walking and cycling routes	TfL supports Policy T3. It suggests embedding TfL's Small Change, Big Impact approach in the delivery of Healthy Streets in the Neighbourhood Plan area. This need not be limited to physical interventions, but also include community events such as play streets and school streets. Lett Road, Wilmer Lea Close, Gibbins Road and Hutchins Close provide a direct link from Stratford High Street station to the Olympic Park. Upgrading this route and introducing a wayfinding strategy for the Carpenters estate will enhance permeability. There are several informal crossings on Stratford High Street that are not identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. Improving walking and cycling crossings on Stratford High Street is important for improving connectivity and safety.
GCNP_042	TfL	Figure 4.10 and Figure 4.11	TfL supports in principle improved walking and cycle routes and crossings. Any detailed proposals as shown on figures 4.10 and 4.11 would need to be subject to site surveys and traffic modelling, and agreed with other stakeholders including Newham Council and LLDC. Any improvements would need to consider

			public transport operations and ensure the safe operation of the Strategic Road Network.
GCNP_043	Private Individual	General	Please accept this email as an endorsement of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan as submitted by the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum.
GCNP_044	Private Individual	4.1 Economy and employment	Supports the formal adoption of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. Has been living in Carpenters neighbourhood for 10 months; rents a room from my landlady who has owned the home since 2017. Has followed the Forum's work on the Plan - me and the and has been attending meetings and giving opinions at consultations. Supports the Plan's objectives on economy and employment, (pages 10- 12) helping the growth of local businesses and employment, with improved access to education and life-long learning.
GCNP_044	Private Individual	4.2 Green space, biodiversity and community gardening	Supports the Plan's objectives on green space, biodiversity and community gardening, (pages 13-16) enhancing existing green spaces and new ones, encouraging community gardening, more trees, sports and play.
GCNP_044	Private Individual	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (pages 17-20)	Supports the Plan's objectives on housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (pages 17-20) protecting existing homes from demolition and instead refurbishing them as appropriate. Considers that this would preserve the existing community instead of destroying it, as well as safeguarding threatened social homes, and the rights of leaseholders and freeholders. Supports the building of new homes by sensitive infill, in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community's quality of life.
GCNP_044	Private Individual	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	Supports the Plan's proposals for transport (pages 21-27), improved walking, cycling and public transport connections with the surrounding area.

GCNP_044	Private Individual	4.5 Community facilities, ownership and empowerment	Supports the Plan's objectives on community facilities, ownership and empowerment (pages 28-29), providing genuine bottom-up regeneration instead of decisions dictated from above. Supports the improvement of existing community amenities and provision of new ones.
GCNP_045	Architects for Social Housing	4.6 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill	<p>Architects for Social Housing (ASH) supports the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan to save the Carpenters estate from demolition through refurbishment of the existing housing and infill development on brownfield and commercial-use land in and around the estate. Through their own research ASH considers that they have been able to demonstrate in detail that the cost of demolishing the Carpenters estate and replacing the demolished homes would mean the new development being proposed by the commercial venture, Red Door Ventures, will have to be at least 50% for market sale, with the remainder for various categories of so-called affordable housing, and primarily shared-ownership deals, with the resulting mass loss of homes for social rent and the social cleansing from the neighbourhood of the existing community. These are financial givens that under current funding revenues cannot be circumvented except by the decision not to demolish but to retain, refurbish, maintain and extend the existing estate.</p> <p>ASH considers that no genuine refurbishment and infill option have been considered by Newham council, and that the figures quoted to justify the refusal to do so are without financial basis when compared to equivalent sites. ASH considers that the Newham Council has refused to provide the quantity surveyors' report for those figures, or to answer any of the many other questions they have asked relating to the regeneration of the Carpenters estate. Finally, ASH are concerned that no case study has been produced of the enormous environmental costs of demolishing and disposing of the Carpenters estate, which will have negative and ongoing consequences for the health not only of existing residents but of residents in the local area, and contradicts everything the industry is committing to in terms of environmentally sustainable development and the re-use of resources. ASH thinks that the pattern of recent housing development in Newham is a shameful story of privatisation and luxury developments that bear no resemblance to housing need in a borough with the worse record of homelessness and housing poverty in London, they consider that</p>

			<p>it is crucial that the regeneration of the Carpenters estate break with this pattern.</p> <p>ASH submission include the following documents: architectsforsocialhousing.co.uk/2019/01/18/the-carpenters-estate-a-fresh-start-orbusiness-as-usual-at-newham-council/ architectsforsocialhousing.co.uk/2018/09/07/the-costs-of-estate-regeneration/ architectsforsocialhousing.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Central-Hill.pdf</p>
GCNP_046	Private Individual	General	<p>Supports the adopt the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. It consdiers that the Plan has been developed with strong community involvement and consultation and it keeps almost all the council homes and adds new mid-scale apartment blocks along the rail-line boundary. It also considers that the Plan would regenerate public and green spaces and add much needed new retail and small enterprise units. It consdiers that the Neighbourhood Plan was endorsed through public surveys and meetings in 2017.</p> <p>In particually shows support for the Plan's objectives as it considers that the Plan would achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the protection of existing homes from demolition and careful infill of new homes without oppressive building heights and massing. This will preserve the existing community and its quality of life - improved connections for public transport and support for walking and cycling - improved and new green spaces, more trees and encouraging community gardening, sport and play - improved and new community facilities, so that regeneration comes from the community not imposed upon it.

GCNP_047	Private Individual	General	<p>Lives and works in Newham and is concerned by the rate of insecure housing and homelessness in the borough.</p> <p>Supports the Greater Carpenter's Neighbourhood Forum's proposal for the Carpenter's estate, which considers as being the best way to ensure housing provision that meets the needs of the community, fulfils the council's commitment to greener infrastructure, and prevents further displacement of people from the areas they have lived and grown in.</p> <p>It considers that it would be an affront to those who have experienced housing insecurity for years since the Carpenter's was emptied, to sell the estate to private developers for demolition. It states that the Carpenter's was built to provide for the community; and considers that this purpose needs to be maintained.</p>
GCNP_048	Private Individual	General	Supports the Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan.
GCNP_049	London Borough of Newham	General	<p>The London Borough of Newham (LBN) in its role as a neighbouring Local Planning Authority (LPA) welcomes the opportunity to review and comment on the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version May 2019 (GCNP).</p> <p>Given the location of the plan area in question – which falls within the Borough boundary – the LPA's response is predicated on assessing whether the policies of the GCNP (as with any submitted neighbourhood plan) meet the 'basic conditions'¹ and other planning related legal tests; as well as act to promote sustainable development principles and conform with the strategic policy context.</p> <p>Newham's LPA notes that the GCNP sets out a Vision and Objectives that reflect, in many ways, the principles and objectives set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019), the London Plan (2016) and Draft London Plan (2018), the LLDC Local Plan (2015) and submission Draft Revised Local Plan (2019). This includes the pursuit of vibrant, inclusive, integrated, healthy and resilient communities; promotion of affordable and family housing; promotion of active travel and public transport; supporting the growth of local businesses; protection and activation of green spaces; energy efficiency and carbon reduction; community empowerment and engagement. However, the</p>

			<p>fundamental issues regarding the Plan, raised by Newham’s LPA in previous pre-submission correspondence remain unaddressed². These relate to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conformity with the Local Plan and regard to National Planning Policy. 2. Deliverability. 3. Justification.
GCNP_049	London Borough of Newham	1. Conformity with the Local Plan and regard to National Planning Policy	<p>1. Conformity with the Local Plan and regard to National Planning Policy</p> <p>As a basic condition, neighbourhood plans are required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan and have regard to National Planning Policy.</p> <p>The LPA has concerns that the Basic Conditions Statement provided within the GCNP submission refers to the 2012 NPPF. It is stated (p.2), that this is due to the revised NPPF (July 2018) not being in force when the GCNP was being either being prepared or consulted on at pre-submission stage. It should be noted however, that the transitional arrangements of the NPPF state that plans submitted for examination after 24 January 2019 will be considered under the revised NPPF. Footnote 69 clarifies that for neighbourhood plans, 'submission' in this context means where a qualifying body submits a neighbourhood plan to the local planning authority under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended). Since the GCNP was submitted in May 2019, the Plan and Basic Conditions Statement should accord with the Revised NPPF (2019).</p> <p>Paragraph 29 of the NPPF makes clear that whilst neighbourhood plans can shape, direct, and help to deliver sustainable development by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory Development Plan, they cannot promote less development than the existing strategic policies of the area or undermine those. Therefore, the GCNP must conform with the adopted and emerging LLDC Local Plan Strategic Site Allocation SA3.4 Greater Carpenters District. This allocation promotes “potential for extensive mixed-use redevelopment” through a set of strategic development principals requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Optimisation and increase in residential capacity; density and uses should reflect location and public transport accessibility.

- ☑ Development densities and uses which reflect location and public transport accessibility.
- ☑ Mixed-use development including residential, and more extensive business, commercial, education and community uses located along key routes and related to the station, the town centre and Stratford High Street.
- ☑ Connectivity enhancements, including a new western entrance to Stratford Regional Station, improvements to the Jupp Road bridge, improved connections to the town centre, the Olympic Park and the Greenway via Bridgewater Road, and better connections within the site.
- ☑ Safeguarding of land for DLR North Route Double Tracking phase 2.
- ☑ Consideration of the retention of existing low-rise family housing, where this does not prevent the achievement of wider regeneration objectives.
- ☑ Support for early community consultation and the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan (where this conforms to the requirements of the SA3.4 allocation).

The LLDC is currently undergoing a review of its Local Plan. The Draft Revised Local Plan (2019) proposes to amend SA3.4 to include a housing capacity of 2,300 new homes, which if adopted will act as an indicative housing target for the GCNP.

Housing densities on all identified sites across London are capacity derived and act as the basis for the housing targets which are then apportioned to each Borough (or Development Corporation) through the London Plan. As such, there is a requirement to optimise and increase density on the Carpenter's Estate to ensure that, as a minimum, the current targets in the London Plan are met. The 2,300 indicative capacity set out within the LLDC's draft Local Plan contributes towards the identified capacity that forms the basis of the emerging draft London Plan's increased housing targets for the LLDC.

Any reduced provision on identified sites is therefore likely to compromise the ability of the LLDC to meet its regionally apportioned London Plan housing target. This places the LLDC at risk of not being able to maintain an up-to-date Local Plan in the context of the NPPF's Housing Delivery Test and requirement to demonstrate a 5 Year Housing Land Supply. This would have knock-on effects on the ability of other Local Planning Authorities in the wider Housing Market Area

			<p>(including Newham) to absorb the impact of under-delivery in the LLDC area. All LPAs have pre-existing and challenging housing delivery targets to meet. Newham's LPA is of the firm view that the GCNP proposal for infill development (Policy H1) with a housing capacity of 650 units (Policy H2) is not in general conformity with the Development Plan. The GCNP does not acknowledge the site's full strategic potential, and this will have a likely impact on the LLDC's (and the wider Housing Market Areas) ability to meet the identified housing need set out in the London Plan. It therefore does not meet the requirement of NPPF (2019) Paragraph 29.</p> <p>In promoting out of centre retail on an ad-hoc bases without evidenced justification or impact testing, Policy E3 (Diversity of Retail Provision) fails to take account of the wider strategic policy context. The policy therefore fails to accord with Chapter 7 of the NPPF (2019), London Plan Policy 2.15 and LLDC Local Plan Policies B.2, 3.1 and Site Allocation SA3.4: Greater Carpenters District.</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Deliverability	<p>Whilst the delivery of the GCNP is considered in Chapter 5, the Plan does not provide sufficient detail about how its polices will be implemented or monitored. Furthermore, no supporting evidence has been provided with the Submission version of the Plan. This renders it impossible to determine the deliverability or viability of Plan's policy aspirations; for instance how employment spaces over garages (Policy E2) will be delivered. Moreover, the viability of affordable workspace (Policy E2) and requirement for 50% of all new homes being 'not-for-profit' (Policy H2) have also not been tested and the delivery mechanisms for bringing forward environmental improvements to the area have not been explored since these have not been linked to development sites (Policies G1, G2 and G3).</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Justification	<p>One of the requirements of national policy is that neighbourhood plan policies must be evidence based. National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) paragraph 40 asserts that the policies and the approach taken in Neighbourhood Plans should be supported by proportionate and robust evidence. This evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies in the draft neighbourhood plan. Whilst community engagement is a key element of</p>

			<p>justifying and shaping the GCNP, it seems to be relying primarily on engagement evidence base over technical studies.</p> <p>A research report, 'UCL: Water and Energy Infrastructure', alongside research by AECOM (which, it is stated, underpins the housing target and site allocation) have been referenced but have not been submitted for scrutiny as part of the Submission (Regulation 16) consultation. Without this evidence, it is not possible to justify the assumptions made, and in particular the Plan's priority to maintaining and refurbishing all existing homes in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Objective 3 of the GCNP states that the Plan '...meets identified housing need, particularly for low-cost rented homes and homes for older and disabled people'. Yet no evidence has been submitted to explore this need, or to demonstrate how the policies in the Plan would meet this need. In addition the rationale behind proposed building heights of 8 storeys in Policy H2 is not explained or substantiated with evidence.</p> <p>As previously stated, there is no reference to impact testing of the proposed commercial uses policy (Policy E3) on the vitality and viability of the nearby town centres, particularly Stratford. No evidence has been provided to support the approach taken to fast food takeaways (Use Class A5), nor does the Plan justified the rationale for the 333m buffer zone around local schools. The Policy also contains no definition of 'over concentration'. On a technical note, it should be recognised that 400m is the standard metric to represent a 5 minute walk.</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	General	<p>It is unclear as to why the garage sites have not been considered as potential residential infill sites. There has been no assessment submitted to understand car ownership levels, or whether the garages can accommodate modern cars, or whether indeed they are used for storage only.</p> <p>There are a number of policy aspirations which go beyond the remit of planning. Planning cannot, for example, control the concentration of 'brand name cafes' (Policy E3) or the type of engine a vehicle using a parking space in a new development has (Policy T2).</p> <p>The Plan period is given as 2019 – 2028. Whilst the timeframe for the neighbourhood plan will be for Community to decide, it is unlikely that the GCNP will be adopted in 2019. Therefore it is suggested that a start date of 2020 is more applicable. Aligning</p>

			with the time from for the LLDC Local Plan (2020-2036) should also be considered. Indeed, page 30 of the GCNP makes reference to a 10 year plan period, yet the timeframe published is nine.
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Summary and conclusion	LBN support the delivery of revitalised, vibrant, inclusive, resilient, healthy and empowered communities in the Greater Carpenters area, and wish to see the realisation of a neighbourhood which is better integrated socially and physically with the surrounding area. LBN considers that many of the policies of the GCNP present issues in terms of ensuring this delivery, failing to meet the required basic conditions or lacking clarity on the criteria for policy application and monitoring, weakening potential effectiveness and deliverability. Moreover, LBN considers that in not sufficiently interfacing with other policies and development activity in the area, as stated in previous correspondence with the GCN Forum3, the GCNP does not appear to have been fully developed in the round.
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy E1 Education and Training	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Policy E1 meets the basic condistion.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>What constitutes support is not quantified/qualified. It is unclear how policy success will be implemented or monitored.</p> <p>No detail on the location of the new multi-purpose Community Hub has been provided. The justification text seeks for learning support to be based in this facility. No evidence has been provided as to why this service can not be provided as part of the school provision.</p>

GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy E2 Encouraging Local Businesses and Local Employment	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that the policy would meet the Basic conditions if viability/business case can be demonstrated.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>'Local business'/'local economy' or 'genuinely' is not defined. Currently the area is a residential neighbourhood, with insufficient employment base to be the primary source of establishing business 'need'. Local apprenticeships, work placement schemes, up-skilling requirement is not qualified. It is unclear how policy success will be implemented or monitored. No evidence has been provided to support the proposed 50% market rents. It is stated that this is based on the 'experiences of other London Boroughs'.</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	POLICY E3 DIVERSITY OF RETAIL PROVISION	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that the policy does not meet the Basic conditions. LBN consider that unquantified, untested promotion of town centre uses outside of a designated town centre and note that this is against NPPF Ch. 7 and London Plan Policy 2.15, and LLDC Local Plan Policy B.2. Not positively prepared as required by NPPF (outright development ban is unacceptable in planning policy terms).</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>Out of Centre location. This policy should be supported via technical evidence base, including sequential and impact testing. This has not been presented. 'Over-concentration' is not defined. This will therefore be challenging to implement. No evidence has been submitted to substantiate the 333m takeaway buffer exclusion zone around local schools.</p>

			<p>Planning cannot control/prescribe brands occupation of new development, it can only specify use class. Policy can not outright ban any type of development without a clear set of criteria (i.e. school buffer zone criteria is not part of the policy).</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy G1 Green Space	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN Considers that Policy G1 meets the Basic Conditions. However, is largely duplication of existing LLDC Local Plan Policy BN.7.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>S106 required for the application of the maintenance/management policy – but intended to apply to all residential development (i.e. including minors – under 10 units that would not require a S106).</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy G2 Enhancing the Social Qualities of Green Spaces	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Policy G2 meets the Basic Condition.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>A map should be made a clear part of the policy, as this is where the policy adds value to the Development Plan.</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy G3 Biodiversity	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Policy G3 meets the Basic Condition. However, LBN considers that this is duplication of LLDC Local Plan Policy BN.3.</p>

GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy G4 Trees	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Policy G4 meets the Basic Condition. However, LBN considers that this is duplication of LLDC Local Plan Policies BN.3, S.7.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>Unclear policy targets/expectations or how policy success will be implemented or monitored.</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy G5 Local Food Growing and Community Gardening	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Policy G5 meets the 'Basic conditions'.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>Clarification is needed regarding if the policy simply requires provision composting 'facilities' – i.e. a bin, or if indeed it means a dedicated 'space' to be designed for the ability for composting in new developments. This policy needs to be supported by a review of current waste authority practices regarding providing composting bins on request.</p> <p>This policy could potentially be overly onerous on small scale development.</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy H1 Homes, Refurbishment and Sensitive Infill	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Poliy H1 does not meet Basic Condition and that is not in line with strategic allocation for comprehensive redevelopment.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>Policy is not supported by any evidence base to justify the housing under-provision and how/if the lost capacity could reasonably be provided elsewhere in order to not undermine LLDC's ability to meet its strategic housing target.</p>

GCNP_049	LB Newham	POLICY H2 NEW HOMES	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Poliy H2 does not meet Basic Condition. Housing capacity against principle of NPPF Ch. 11. Not in line with Policy SP.2 of the Local Plan and the strategic allocation; could undermine LLDC's ability to meet its overall housing target (prescribed by the London Plan). Duplication of some standards from LLDC Local Plan Policy BN.5.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>Policy not supported by any evidence base to justify the level of housing proposed and how/if the lost capacity could reasonably be provided elsewhere in the context of the wider strategic housing target.</p> <p>Policy has not been viability tested, therefore it is not known if it is deliverable.</p> <p>Clarification is required regarding reference to 'median income level' in terms of spatial area benchmarks.</p> <p>'Home Quality Mark' is a post-delivery benchmark that looks at matters outside of planning control, such as mortgages and running costs, visual defects inspection, and also takes account of locational matters that will differ from building to building (e.g. flood risk or access to public transport, GP surgeries,</p>

			<p>parks). The policy therefore needs to be supported by evidence how this benchmark can be implemented at planning stage and in a non-prejudicial way.</p> <p>No evidence base to support the policy requirement for new development (homes) not to exceed 8 storeys.</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy H3 Environmental Standards for New Housing	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Policy H3 meets the Basic Condition. However it LBN considers that this is largely duplication of LLDC Local Plan Policies SP.5, S.2, S.3, S.4.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>Standards are not quantified, it is therefore unclear how this policy will be implemented and monitored.</p> <p>'Low carbon' not defined, and undermining Development Plan Zero Carbon targets.</p> <p>Unclear if requirement is to monitor electricity and heat in centralised or individual/smart meter way.</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy T1 Improving Connectivity and Accessibility	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>Yes. Conforms with and duplicates existing site allocation policy.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>No reference to the area's exceptional public transport accessibility (PTAL).</p>

GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy T2 Sustainable Transport	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Policy T2 meets the Basic Condition. However it LBN considers that this is largely duplication of existing LLDC Local Plan Policy T.4.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>Bus routes are a strategic matter; it is unclear if support has been gained for this policy from either TFL or LBN.</p> <p>No scope to control the type of cars used in new development. It is unclear how bullet point 3 could therefore be implemented as this sits outside the remit of planning. Development will need to accord with Policy T.4 of the LLDC Local Plan (no or minimum car parking, which do not exceed London Plan parking standards).</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy T3 Walking and Cycling Routes	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Policy T3 meets the Basic Condition. However it LBN considers that there is some duplication of LLDC Local Plan Policy T.9.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>Maps are not referenced in the policy, although they are effectively the 'new' added value policy. LBN is unclear of TFL/LBN Highways engagement for deliverability. Some sections of proposed cycle routes are questionable in terms of legibility/directness/ease of use.</p>

GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy C1 Community Empowerment	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that Policy T3 meets the Basic Condition.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Forum is a consultee at application stage, but there is no legal framework to include them as part of confidential pre-app discussions.</p> <p>'Social Impact Assessments' could be welcome addition in order to capture difficult measure of social value, but criteria could be more clearly defined or supported by guidance.</p> <p>No mapping has been included to demonstrate the rationale behind the approach to community space. It is stated that a new multi-purpose community hub will be provided at the former TMO building and that this could include a youth zone. However, no detail of its location has been provided. It is unclear how facility would be delivered.</p> <p>The Reasoned Justification text mentions that the area falls within a Tier 2 Archaeological Priority Area. While of interest, it is not clear why this point is referenced under this policy.</p>
GCNP_049	LB Newham	Policy C2 Community Facilities	<p>'Basic conditions' met?</p> <p>LBN considers that the Policy C2 meets Basic Conditions. However there is some duplication of LLDC Local Plan policies CI.1.</p> <p>Other legal / technical tests</p> <p>Does not engage with LBN/LLDC/NCCG evidence of education/health need and related development programmes. There is insufficient detail regarding future</p>

			<p>demand on education facilities or how development would be expected to facilitate the improvement or expansion of existing education facilities.</p> <p>No evidence of viability testing of the affordability criteria.</p>
GCNP_050	London Borough of Newham/Regeneration	General	<p>The London Borough of Newham (LBN) as landowner of the Carpenters Estate and majority landowner within the GCNF site area welcomes the opportunity to review and comment on the GCNF Neighbourhood Plan submission version May 2019.</p> <p>These comments follows three meetings¹ held between LBN and the GCNF where the following concerns were made by LBN:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of justification for overall approach taken in the neighbourhood plan 2. Insufficient explanation as to why the garage sites are not considered as potential sites for residential development 3. No reference to the strategic policy context given the location of the site and its high level transport accessibility; and how this has informed the GCNF response 4. Insufficient evidence of how the plan would be financially viable and deliverable. <p>These are fundamental issues, which to date remain unresolved. As the landowner, LBN is of the view that unless resolved, delivering a viable and sustainable housing development is unachievable in light of the site's strategic location within the wider Stratford area.</p>
GCNP_050	London Borough of Newham Regeneration	General	<p>Background</p> <p>In December 2018 the Council announced its commitment to implement a programme of consultation and engagement with residents living on the Carpenters Estate (including those who have the right to return), to inform the review of regeneration options for the Carpenters Estate. Through consultation</p>

and the full involvement of residents on the estate, the Council intends to identify the optimum routes to deliver the largest proportion of council-owned, genuinely affordable homes on the Carpenters Estate possible, with at least 50 percent to be secured. The Council's aim is to set a new benchmark for successful, long-term place making in Estate Regeneration. As part of its commitment, the Council also ended the then OJEU procurement for a Joint Venture partner/s for the redevelopment of the Carpenters Estate which was being pursued by the council, as it would not have been able to achieve the key strategic objectives of the council's new priorities following the election of Mayor Fiaz in May 2018.

The current options review underway is led by a number of strategic objectives for the estate including:

1. Maximise the number of homes that can be viably delivered on the estate to address the housing crisis in Newham
2. Achieve the largest proportion of genuinely affordable homes at social rent levels on the estate, with a minimum of 50%
3. Restore the neighbourhood to create a mixed and balanced community that addresses both the housing and infrastructure needs of existing residents on the estate, as well as residents in Newham presently and in the future (including housing provision for the elderly and families) ,
4. Full and meaningful involvement of residents and stakeholders to create proposals that meet local and national policy requirements, are financially viable and technically deliverable
5. Develop a sustainable approach to ensure the long-term future of the estate and residents. This includes addressing environmental requirements and fuel poverty; alongside promoting healthy and active lifestyles

The Carpenters Estate is home to 710 households of which a significant proportion have been decanted in anticipation of the restoration of the estate. These decanted residents have the right to return to the estate and the right to be consulted on future plans and policies that effect the estate.

GCNP_050	London Borough of Newham Regeneration	Membership of the GCNF	<p>The GCNF was designated by the LLDC in July 2015. LBN notes that the membership profile of the GCNF has not been formally reviewed for over 4 years, though a review is anticipated at some point in 2020. Moreover, feedback with local residents on the estate suggests social housing tenants and decanted residents are under represented by the Forum. This compromises the ability of the GCNF to fully represent the views of the local community, <i>including all those residents on the estate who have a right to be consulted on any plans affecting them.</i></p>
GCNP_050	London Borough of Newham Regeneration	Lack of evidence base	<p>LBN notes that the GCNF plan lacks sufficient and proportionate evidence to demonstrate that its proposals meet the basic requirements of the LLDC's Local Plan. Also there is insufficient and up-to-date evidence in the GCNP to be able to assess whether the plan is financially viable and can be delivered. This is particularly relevant to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the under provision of housing and the development of appropriate policies in accord with the strategic location of the site area 2. prioritisation of retention and refurbishment of all existing properties without financial evidence base or evidence of building condition 3. the suitability of garage sites for redevelopment and justification for workspace rather than housing 4. business case for low cost workspace 5. promotion of town centre uses outside of a designated town centre

GCNP_050	London Borough of Newham Regeneration	Public consultation process	<p>Given current guidance, LBN would have expected in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan, that the GCNF demonstrates clearly that it has been inclusive and open to ensure the whole community is kept informed and can make their views heard. This is not clear in the submitted consultation statement, including the profile of residents that have been consulted. No details are given about the GCNF's approach in consulting all relevant stakeholders, or the profile of responses received to demonstrate a robust consultation and engagement strategy.</p> <p>The GCNF consultation material appears to limit the opportunity for stakeholders to be actively involved in shaping the emerging plan and that other options have been considered LBN would have expected a co-design approach to this critical aspect of the plan's development. For example, a survey carried out in October 2017 asks residents if they agree with the polices in the draft plan. The language used directs respondents to particular answers and the survey design doesn't allow the opportunity for respondents to share their own views. No further consultation has been carried out since 2017 suggesting the neighbourhood plan has not given residents adequate opportunity to shape emerging proposals.</p> <p>Moreover, the Forum does not appear to have addressed a number of comments and concerns cited by LBN as the landowner about insufficient evidence to support the development of their neighbourhood plan, including the required technical and financial robustness expected.</p>
GCNP_050	London Borough of Newham Regeneration	General	<p>LBN considers that the GCNF haven't adequately engaged with all qualifying residents living on the Carpenters estate or the council as majority land owner. Also it appears that no other options for restoring the Neighbourhood have been considered. The lack of a robust evidence base and supporting information we feel undermines the plan's ability to bring forward sustainable and deliverable proposals that would enable LBN as a landowner within the site area to deliver a viable scheme that would be in accord with local and national planning policy. The delivery of a viable scheme, that meets local priorities and is in accordance with planning policy is imperative to progress with revitalising the Carpenters Estate and surrounding areas. That is why emerging proposals being developed</p>

			<p>by LBN in collaboration with local residents and stakeholders has the opportunity to shape a genuinely resident-led and co-designed masterplan for the Carpenters Estate that will provide a catalyst for development within the wider neighbourhood.</p> <p>Through an extensive public engagement strategy and ultimately a resident ballot, LBN intends to bring forward an ambitious and robust plan for the long-term sustainable future of the estate framed by the strategic objectives set out above. Proposals will be financially viable and technically deliverable whilst meeting the needs of new and existing residents within a mixed and balanced community. This community-led masterplan will recognise the strategic importance of the estate and maximise the opportunities to deliver more genuinely affordable homes at social rent level for Newham residents who are at the brunt of a national housing crisis.</p>
GCNP_051	Private Individual	General	<p>I wish to formally add my support for the GCNF plans for development of the Carpenters Estate through refurbishment and infill.</p> <p>I wish to formally join in with the objections to any proposed redevelopment of the Carpenters estate involving any demolition of existing housing as being fundamentally ill advised and not in the best interests of the residents of Newham. This is particularly in regard to those in temporary accommodation needing to be rehoused.</p> <p>Some of these people were former residents have been decanted from their homes that are now lying empty and neglected.</p> <p>It should be the council's responsibility to answer the needs of the community first. The GCNF provides detailed, community inclusive alternatives to other developer led options and addresses so many other points including lower costs and a larger numbers of genuine social housing.</p>

GCNP_052	Private Individual	4.1 Economy and employment	Supports the formal adoption of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan. I have followed the Forum's work on the Plan and giving my opinion at consultations. I support: The objectives on economy and employment, (pages 10-12) keeping and helping the growth of local businesses and employment, with improved access to education and life-long learning.
GCNP_052	Private Individual	4.2 Green space, biodiversity and community gardening,	The objectives on green spaces, biodiversity and community gardening, (pages 13-16) enhancing existing green spaces and new ones, encouraging community gardening, more trees, sport and play
GCNP_052	Private Individual	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill	The Plan's objectives on housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (pages 17-20) protecting existing homes from demolition and instead refurbishing them where possible. This will preserve the existing community instead of destroying them, as well as safeguarding threatened social homes, and the rights of leaseholders and freeholders. The building of new homes by sensitive infill, in reasonable numbers and at heights that will not threaten the existing community's quality of life.
GCNP_052	Private Individual	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	The proposals for transport (pages 21-27), improved walking, cycling and public transport connections with the surrounding area.
GCNP_052	Private Individual	4.5 Community facilities, ownership and empowerment	The Plan's objectives on community facilities, ownership and empowerment (pages 28-29), providing genuine bottom-up regeneration instead of decisions dictated from above. I support improvement of existing community amenities and provision of new ones.
GCNP_053	Private Individual	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill, (pages 17-20)	I am writing in support of the preservation and refurbishment of the Carpenters Estate. I wish to support the Carpenters Forum plan as an alternative to the demolition and the redevelopment of the estate because I believe

			it is a more cost effective way to safety these homes for the people who most need a secure home for themselves and their families.
GCNP_054	London Tenants Federation	General	<p>Background: London Tenants Federation brings together borough- and London-wide federations and organisations of tenants (including leaseholders) of social housing providers. Our membership also includes the London Federation of Housing Co-operatives and the National Federation of Tenant Management Organisations. A number of our member organisations involve both council and housing association tenants and a few (a minority) also involve some private tenants. LTF's main focus is on engaging its member organisations in London-wide and national strategic policy – particularly relating to housing and planning. Our planning policy project work: Between 20012 and 2017, London Tenants Federation carried out project work on supporting networks of community groups, including tenants' organisations, in deprived and excluded parts of London, to influence planning policy. This work was funded by Trust for London. Through our grant funding, we commissioned and worked closely with Just Space, a London-wide network of voluntary and community groups, some local and some London-wide, who are involved in influencing and challenging planning policy.</p> <p>From 2014 our work was focused mostly in the London Legacy Development Corporation and the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation areas. As part of the work we provided support, with Just Space for the establishment of Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum, the Forum's work in developing a Neighbourhood Plan and in influencing the LLDC's 2015 Local Plan.</p> <p>Prior to this, we and Just Space had worked with residents of the Carpenters Estate, local businesses and social and community groups that are within the boundaries of, or on the edges of the estate in developing a bottom-up, grass-root's Community Plan as an alternative to top down local authority plans that were not supported by a majority of the estate residents.</p> <p>The proposals in the Community Plan gained the positive support of more than 50% of residents of the Carpenters Estate, who had been involved in meetings, walkabouts and events and all of whom were called on (at the door) to provide their views and concerns. There were almost no negative comments about the</p>

			Community Plan. Many who did not respond were short term private renters of householders who had exercised their right to buy.
GCNP_054	London Tenants Federation	General	<p>General comments on the GCNF Neighbourhood Plan: The relatively deprived community of this area is still looking for the benefits that were supposed to come with the Olympics. Many suffered the turmoil during the time of the neighbouring Olympic developments and small businesses lost trade during that time when the roads through what is now the Neighbourhood Area were closed off. Many residents of the Carpenters Estate continue to be frightened to the point of ill-health that their homes and community will simply be demolished to benefit a newer and wealthier community, pretty much to their total exclusion.</p> <p>The GCNF's Neighbourhood Plan is steeped in the views of local residents, local businesses and workers from social and community venues, many of who have lived or worked in the area for a very long time. The long-term commitment and hard work of members of the Neighbourhood Forum area has resulted in a Neighbourhood Plan that is very properly focused on the needs and aspirations of their local community.</p>
GCNP_054	London Tenants Federation	4.1 Economy and employment	The Plan's policy on economy and employment is sound particularly in its focus on education and life-long learning, providing the basis of ongoing and all-round support long-term for the needs of the Greater Carpenters' community.
GCNP_054	London Tenants Federation	4.2 Green space, biodiversity and community gardening	<p>The Plan's policy on green space, biodiversity and community gardening, puts community at the heart, supporting and retaining treasured existing green spaces as well as sensitive improvements. This is so important in an area that has bit by bit been surrounded and encroached upon by high density high-rise dwellings most of which are distinctively lacking in their own or shared green and play spaces.</p> <p>The Plan is conscious of the difficulties for young and old in independently accessing the Olympic Park's green spaces providing appropriate spaces close to home. This is something that would be valued by tenant and community groups across London.</p>

GCNP_054	London Tenants Federation	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill	<p>LTF strongly supports the Neighbourhood Plan’s policy on housing refurbishment and sensitive infill. This is positive policy in social, economic and environmental terms. It provides the basis for supporting both existing and new community members and provides for long term stability and sustainability.</p> <p>It is sensitive to the needs of renovation of existing and building new infill housing in London, and gives the right balance on where there is greatest need in the borough - for social housing. This is important at a time when there is ongoing failure to meet existing London Plan social rented targets and the London-wide evidence base demonstrates the need for almost 50% of all homes to be social rented homes.</p> <p>This policy is also essential for creating sustainable development, particularly when the surrounding area is predominantly short term private rented housing with high levels of transience. It is also the case that too many structurally sound low-cost social rented homes are still being unnecessarily demolished, across London despite changes in the London Mayor’s policies on this.</p> <p>There are sound health and well-being benefits from the policy. In our own work, both on the Carpenters Estate and elsewhere we have heard testimonies, particularly of older people who have lived most of their lives on an estate, made close friends and raised their children there, but who suffer mental and physical distress as a result of proposals that their homes will be demolished and their community displaced. The local GP for the area has often commented on this in consultations held on the estate.</p> <p>It is notable that the London Borough of Newham had no substantive evidence to support its ongoing proposals to demolish the estate. This very issue was challenged in the Planning Inspector’s EiP report of the draft LLDC 2015 Local Plan.</p> <p>We would argue that their ongoing failures to consider full refurbishment options for the Carpenters estate ultimately come, not from an evidence base</p>
----------	---------------------------	--	--

			<p>relating to the condition of the homes, but from a deal they made with central government in negotiations on the amount of the national Housing Revenue Account (HRA) debt that they would take on as part of changes to enable councils to manage their own HRA (in 2011/12). Newham argued for a smaller proportion of the debt as the were to demolish homes on the Carpenters Estate.</p> <p>In our view this was and still is absolutely wrong since this was a borough-wide issue foisted on one community that had not even agreed that their estate should be demolished.</p>
GCNP_054	London Tenants Federation	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	<p>The Neighbourhood Area, despite being so close to the Olympic Park is cut off from it. The transport policies in the Neighbourhood Plan provide very carefully considered beneficial and environmentally sustainable connections to areas surrounding the neighbourhood area, including the Olympic Park. Our London-wide tenants' organisation thoroughly supports this.</p>
GCNP_054	London Tenants Federation	4.5 Community facilities, ownership and empowerment	<p>LTF strongly supports the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives and policies on community facilities, ownership and empowerment. Despite some of the damaging things that have occurred to this community over many years, those working at local community facilities (notably the Docklands and Carpenters Centre) have consistently provided essential support to its neighbours and would appropriately gain support from improvements including some additional space for which there is so much demand in the area. It is sensible for the Plan to focus on more being in community hands to help in empowerment and confidence of this community.</p>

GCNP_055	Network Rail	General	<p>Network Rail is part of the Stratford Station Leadership Board which coordinates transport and local authority future requirements for Stratford Station across LLDC, LBN, TfL and NR. As such we broadly support the development of Greater Carpenters and kindly request that Network Rail is consulted on developing proposals with reference to anticipated additional passenger demand and any changes affecting the operation and access to Network Rail's existing maintenance depot. Any detailed proposal affecting NMR assets should be submitted to NR Town Planning, and this will be distributed to the appropriate NR team.</p> <p>In relation to the plan wanting to use the space below the rail tracks along Gibbons road for storage this would be subject to engineer's approval. Network Rail would welcome the opportunity to walk out on Gibbins Road with the LLDC Case officer to review in more detail.</p>
GCNP_056	Private Individual	General	<p>I Would like to go on record to state my complete and whole hearted approval of the neighbourhood plans put in place by the GCNF team at Carpenters Estate.</p> <p>The plan encompasses all aspects which will allow the residents and businesses to live and work in a community and estate that is green, friendly, welcoming and wholeheartedly practical for the betterment of society. I shall refrain from going into specifics which you can see from the plans itself.</p> <p>Please accept this statement as my total support for the 4 years of hard work by the team at GCNF.</p>
GCNP_057	Private Individual	General	<p>Please accept this email to represent my approval for the GCNF neighbourhood plans put in place by the GCNF team at Carpenters Estate.</p> <p>They have worked incredibly hard to put this together for the community and we are very grateful.</p> <p>I am fully supportive of the whole plan which takes in to consideration all aspects of the community, leaving no one out.</p>

GCNP_058	Private Individual	General	<p>I'm writing to let you know that I support the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan, and strongly urge that it should be formally adopted.</p> <p>I am a resident of the Greater Carpenters area for nine years, and have myself been an active member of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum for three years. So I know how much the local community supports the Plan, and how many of the community have actively contributed to drawing it up over the years. This has been a difficult and challenging task for us, few of whom are experts or have much specialised knowledge.</p> <p>From the outreach that we have many times carried out, we find that the large majority of residents support the main ideas in the Plan, although understandably most do not become actively involved due to lack of time or passivity.</p>
GCNP_058	Private Individual	4.3 Housing refurbishment and sensitive infill	<p>I believe the Plan offers the best way to ensure that future housing development (in the Carpenters estate especially) is in line with the needs and wishes of the local community and neighbourhood, whether residents (of any tenure) or stakeholders in a wider sense.</p> <p>We also need to remember the needs of others who are seldom represented e.g. people on the waiting list for a social home, as the Plan seeks to preserve all existing social homes, in contrast to virtually every competing plan we've seen, which include drastic loss of social homes and genuinely affordable homes.</p> <p>So I think preserving and refurbishing the existing homes is a vital element in the Plan. The entire Carpenters estate has been threatened with wholesale demolition by a previous administration in Newham Council, and although the present administration is in contrast consulting with residents, there appears to be still a strong risk that large numbers of homes, social and private, or even possibly the entire estate, are threatened with demolition.</p>

			<p>I live in a new build block just across the road from the Carpenters estate, so my own home is not at risk. But I want to stand with my neighbours in the local community whose homes are threatened. Apart from social homes, many freeholders and leaseholders have well-founded concerns that they will be forced to sell at a price which will not enable them to buy a property anywhere near their present home - they will have to move far away, as others who were frightened into accepting less than satisfactory offers have had to do.</p> <p>This threat has been hanging over them for years. The Neighbourhood Plan would remove this fear by ensuring the preservation of these homes, many of them terraced houses ideal for raising families, in short supply in London.</p>
GCNP_058	Private Individual	4.2 Green Space, Biodeversity and Community Gardening	<p>Apart from housing, another important issue addressed by the Plan is green spaces and environmental concerns. There are many potentially attractive green spaces in and around Carpenters estate, which are neglected at present. The Plan foresees that these could, at little expense, be revamped into very attractive amenities for the residents of the estate, as well as those nearby, like myself, who would benefit too. Huge numbers of people walk through or alongside the estate on their way to and from Stratford Station, and would also benefit. It's true we have the Olympic Park nearby, but that is actually not very 'green', and we have Stratford High Street, one of the most polluted streets in the UK, right beside us. So enhanced green areas with more trees, wild flowers and the other proposals are vital to make our neighbourhood attractive.</p>
GCNP_058	Private Individual	4.5 Community facilities, ownership and empowerment	<p>Although there is some good provision for community facilities in the area (thinking of the Carpenters and Docklands Centre, and the ex-TMO building in Doran Walk), the Plan seeks to safeguard and build on these, which could be threatened in future development. It's important that there are ample facilities for youth, who can be</p>

			tempted into anti social behaviour in this urban environment. Also elderly people, who can be at risk of isolation, and people on low incomes, who risk social exclusion, should be catered for with community spaces and facilities. And many local people are members of faith groups, who would like facilities such as prayer rooms to be available, which deserve consideration.
GCNP_058	Private Individual	4.4. Transport Connections and Movement	On the subject of transport, although it might seem that the area is well served, being right beside a major transport hub, there are gaps. Elderly and disabled or ill people visiting the Ludwig Guttman Health Centre appear not to be well served by existing bus routes, for example. The proposals for cycling in the Plan appear excellent, and could form part of improved cycling provision in London, improving the health and well-being of Londoners by making cycling easier and safer. I'm always hearing people say they would love to cycle in London, but dare not because it's too dangerous.
GCNP_058	Private Individual	4.1 Employment and Economy	<p>The Plan seeks to preserve the existing opportunities for employment and economy. This seems self-evidently beneficial to me, that as wide a variety of businesses, especially small and starter businesses, are encouraged.</p> <p>To sum up, I think the Plan seeks to facilitate needed new homes and development, but at the same time to preserve the existing community, homes and infrastructure, enhancing what we've got instead of wiping it out, as other proposals seek to do. In particular, I reject the absurd argument that the estate should be demolished as it's 'out of keeping' with the new build blocks going up all around. As the new blocks have been designed with no consideration whatever to aesthetic appeal i.e. each one seems designed separately, no thought at all has been given to how they look 'ensemble' , this argument seems ridiculous to me. In addition, the very charm of London is the hodgepodge of building styles, there is no dominant style. For myself, when I catch a glimpse of the 1970s buildings of the</p>

			Carpenters estate from Stratford High Street, they strike me as a very attractive contrast to the 21st century offerings now dominating in Stratford. Let's keep and cherish them, as their residents of every tenure themselves want.
GCNP_059	Private Individual	General	An active member of the Forum. Supports all policies within the proposed Submitted Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan.
GCNP_060	Private Individual	General	An active member of the Forum, supports the formal adoption of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood plan.
GCNP_061	Private Individual	General	In support of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Plan as submitted by the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum.