

**Bishopsgate Goods Yard**  
**Interim Planning Guidance**  
Consultation Summary Report  
October 2009



MAYOR OF LONDON





## **CONTENTS**

- 1. INTRODUCTION**
- 2. CONSULTATION STRATEGY**
- 3. CONSULTATION RESPONSES**
- 4. KEY ISSUES RAISED THROUGH CONSULTATION**
- 5. HOW THE PLANNING GUIDANCE HAS BEEN AMENDED**

### **APPENDICES**

**A: DIVERSITY MONITORING**

**B: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY WORKSHOP EVENTS**

**C: SUMMARY OF WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This consultation report explains how the London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Hackney and the Mayor of London have involved the community in the development of the emerging Bishopsgate Goods Yard Interim Planning Guidance (IPG). The IPG will be a material consideration when determining planning applications on the site and will supplement existing planning policies in Tower Hamlets and Hackney Unitary Development Plan. The IPG will ultimately form part of both Councils' emerging Local Development Framework.
- 1.2 This report explains what consultation took place, who was involved, what comments were made and how the draft IPG has been amended.
- 1.3 This consultation strategy had been developed in close liaison with the Council's Corporate Consultation and Involvement Team and seeks to meet and where possible, exceed the provisions of the adopted and emerging Statement of Community Involvement.
- 1.4 Public consultation took place between 23rd February and 1<sup>st</sup> May 2009. Preliminary consultation took place in June to July 2008 which informed the draft IPG, and the findings on this consultation were reported to members in the November 2008 cabinet report for Hackney and January 2009 cabinet report for Tower Hamlets.

## 2. CONSULTATION STRATEGY

- 2.1 The aim of the public consultation was to engage with the widest possible cross section of the local community, offer different opportunities for comments to be made and to proactively encourage participation.
- 2.2 The IPG is being prepared so that it can be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document, following the final approval of both Boroughs' Core Strategies. Therefore, the consultation needed to meet the pre-submission consultation regulations set out in Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and both boroughs' Statements of Community Involvement (SCI).

### What do the regulations require?

- 2.3 Before adopting the draft Interim Planning Guidance as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the regulations require that the Boroughs':
- Advertise locally the IPG and how, where and when the document can be viewed.
  - Make copies of the IPG available at:
    - Town Halls
    - Other places throughout the borough which we consider appropriate
    - Tower Hamlets and Hackney websites
  - Prepare a consultation statement setting out:
    - The names of the person or bodies who were consulted in relation to the SPD
    - How these people or bodies were consulted
    - Summary of the main issues raised in these consultations
    - How the issues have been addressed
  - Send to each of the specific consultation bodies we consider will be affected by the IPG as well as to any of the general consultation bodies we consider appropriate:

### What does Tower Hamlets' Statement of Community Involvement require?

- 2.4 In addition to the requirements set out in the regulations, the Tower Hamlets SCI also requires the Borough:
- Runs articles in **local newspapers**.
  - Displays **publicity materials** in suitable locations throughout the borough.
  - Runs **consultation events**.
  - Consults through **established community groups** and partnerships.
  - Notifies **anyone who has asked us to be notified** on revisions, updates and additions to the LDF.
  - Provides a **hotline and email address** for queries on the SPD.
  - Extends the **statutory consultation period** beyond 6 weeks to a length of time considered necessary.

### **What does Hackney's Statement of Community Involvement require?**

2.5 The Hackney SCI also requires the Borough:

- Runs **interactive workshops**.
- Meets with **selected stakeholders**.
- Sends out **written consultation**
- Formally consults **statutory bodies**.
- Ensures documents are **available at Council offices**.
- Meets with **advisory groups**.
- Runs articles in the **local press**.
- Advertises the consultation on **the internet**.
- Provides a **hotline**, contact email and postal address.

### **What was the consultation strategy?**

2.6 The local community were both informed of the public consultation and given the opportunity to offer feedback on the draft Interim Planning Guidance through a range of different ways.

2.7 **Statutory consultees** were notified in writing.

2.8 Electronic copies of the draft IPG, summary leaflet, Sustainability Appraisal and Equalities Impact Assessment and feedback forms were made available on both Boroughs' **websites**. The consultation had a specific web page which explained the purpose of the IPG, the process that the Boroughs are going through to adopt the IPG, how representations could be made and for how long the public consultation was open until. This page was set up before the public consultation began.

2.9 An advert was placed in the **local press** at the start of the consultation period (East End Life, Hackney Today and local ethnic minority press). The advert included information on when the public consultation period was and where more information could be found, such as the Council's website. This raised awareness of the public consultation and opportunity for the local community to be involved in the production and comment on the IPG.

2.10 Compact Discs (CDs) and hard copies of the draft IPG, summary leaflet, Sustainability Appraisal and Equalities Impact Assessment and feedback forms were made available in all **libraries** and **IDEA stores**, the boroughs town halls and receptions of Council main buildings.

2.11 Three **public drop-in events** were held at venues in Tower Hamlets and Hackney. The events were scheduled to take place at different times during the consultation period, at different locations (all local to the site) and at different times of the day and week (including a Sunday event). Officers from the Tower Hamlets, Hackney and the Greater London Authority attended the events to answer any questions that the local community had about the IPG and pass on any comments through discussing and completing the response forms provided. Display boards and a model of the site and surrounding area were also available to view.

- 2.12 Representatives of key stakeholders groups within the community from local businesses, interest groups, residents associations, open space users, young and elderly people were invited to a range of focused **community workshop events**. The target audience for these workshops were determined through understanding the demographics of the local community, the nature of the local economy and the topics that the IPG covers. The invitations were extended to people who expressed an interest at the public drop-in events. The events were held at local venues, at times of the day that were most suitable for the target audience. The events included a presentation of the guidance set out in the IPG, followed by group discussion with independent facilitators and officers from the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, London Borough of Hackney and the Greater London Authority.
- 2.13 The initial six week **consultation period extended** to ten weeks.
- 2.14 **Ward and lead members** from both Boroughs were invited to attend the drop in sessions through the Members Bulletin.

### 3. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

#### How many consultation responses did we receive?

- 3.1 A total of **70 written representations** were made on the IPG, with a **combined total of 304 individual formal comments**.
- 3.2 These were made by a number of individuals and a range of organisations. The organisations include statutory consultees such as Natural England, Environment Agency, Thames Water, English Heritage and City of London, and local organisations such as Open Shoreditch, Hackney Society, Jago Action Group and Spitalfields City Farm.
- 3.3 Approximately 34.9% of the responses expressed support for the content and approach taken within the IPG. 52.6% objected and 12.5% stated neither support nor objection.
- 3.4 Respondents were invited to complete the equalities monitoring form. Results from the forms that were collected demonstrate that a mix of people that broadly reflects the nature of the population surrounding the site, were actively involved in the consultation process. The results are included in appendix A.
- 3.5 Details of the individual representations, including the Councils' joint response to them are available on request. Subject to Cabinet approval of the draft IPG, everyone who made comments will be informed of the response to their individual comments.

#### The drop-in sessions

- 3.6 Three drop-in sessions were held:
- Shoreditch Town Hall (10am – 2pm on Thursday 26 February)
  - St Hilda (4-8pm on Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2009)
  - Spitalfields Market (12-4pm on Sunday 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2009)
- 3.7 In total, **142 people** attended the public drop in sessions, the most popular being at Spitalfields Market. Cllr Waiseul Islam (Tower Hamlets) attended one of the drop-in sessions.

#### The community workshop events

- 3.8 Five community workshop events were held:
- Local Businesses
  - Open Shoreditch
  - Local residents and open space users
  - Young people
  - Elderly people



3.9 In total, **70 people** attended the workshops with the most popular being the workshop with local business representatives, where 31 people attended, representing:

- Spitalfields Small Business Association,
- Brick Lane Business Association,
- East London Small Business Centre,
- East London Business Alliance,
- East London Business Place, and
- St Hilda's Community Association.

3.10 At the workshops people were encouraged to make brief comments on **canvas cards**, where **23 responses** were received. Facilitators also recorded the key points emerging from the workshop discussions. Details about each workshop can be found in appendix B.

## **4. KEY ISSUES RAISED THROUGH CONSULTATION**

4.1 The key issues raised throughout the public consultation, are as follows:

### **4.2 Scope of the IPG**

- Suggestion that the IPG area should be extended to areas outside of the Bishopsgate Goods Yard to include parts of Brick Lane and Bethnal Green Road and South Shoreditch.

### **4.3 Design Guidance**

- Concern that the document has not been informed by robust urban design analysis.
- Concern that the design guidance focuses on creating east-west routes and not sufficiently on creating links to the site from the north.

### **4.4 Tall Buildings**

- Concern about the impact of tall buildings on the setting of adjacent conservation areas, living conditions and local environment.
- Clearer guidance is needed on the appropriate height and mass, particularly for areas where tall building opportunities are identified and so that the design responds to the character of Shoreditch High Street and the Boundary Estate.
- Some concerns about the proposed overall scale and density of future development.

### **4.5 East London Line**

- Support for creating a development that helps to screen the unsightly concrete box that encases the East London line and station.
- Concerns that the new station does not provide a basis itself for increasing the density of future development on the site.

### **4.6 Heritage**

- Strong support for the re-use of the arches beneath the Braithwaite Viaduct.
- Concern that the guidance does not require all the listed structures to be retained and re-used in their current position.

### **4.7 Shops, restaurants and bars**

- Concern about the impact of the evening economy on noise and disturbance.

### **4.8 Open Space**

- Support for the provision of new public open space above the Braithwaite Viaduct.
- Concern that the park is not located in the best position on the site.
- Concern that the difference in levels may prevent access for all being achieved.

### **4.9 Residential development**

- Support for guidance on the mix of unit sizes.
- Stronger guidance needed to promote the need for affordable and family housing.

### **4.10 Health Care Facilities**

- Support for health care facilities to be incorporated into the development.

### **4.11 Affordable Workspace**

- Support for the provision of affordable workspace that would benefit local small businesses and creative industries as part of a mix of employment space.

- A number of suggestions were offered of the uses that could be supported, including an art centre, art workshops, theatre, photography and music studios.

4.12 Public Transport Interchange

- Support to allow for clear and easy movement between bus, train and other sustainable modes of transport for both cyclists and pedestrians.

4.13 Phasing

- Concern that the west-east phasing proposals is not flexible enough and would not be practical.
- Review of the phasing of development needs to take place to allow for the delivery of the retail and community uses below the Braithwaite Viaduct and the park above the Braithwaite Viaduct within the first phase.

4.14 Temporary Uses

- Support for activating the site with community and leisure uses before the delivery of the first phase.
- Support for opening Wheler Street and London Road to break up what is a barrier to movement in the local area.

## **5. HOW THE PLANNING GUIDANCE HAS BEEN AMENDED**

- 5.1 The comments received have been incorporated in the review of the draft IPG and have resulted in some significant changes, along with a number of minor amends.

### **Scope of the IPG**

- 5.2 The scope of the guidance is to provide detailed planning advice for the site area, given the existing and emerging planning documents which provide strategic policy guidance for the area, for instance the LB Hackney South Shoreditch Supplementary Planning Document, the LB Tower Hamlets City Fringe Area Action Plan and the City Fringe Opportunity Area Planning Framework. However, the document does take into account existing and proposed development within the vicinity of the site. Updated reference is made to major developments within the area, and sites with major development potential.

### **Design Guidance/ Tall Buildings**

- 5.3 The revised document incorporates clearer guidelines for the design and assessment of tall buildings, drawn up in accordance with guidance provided by English Heritage and the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment.
- 5.4 The impact of tall buildings on the setting of adjacent conservation areas, living conditions and the local environment has been considered. Revisions to the document clearly specify that tall buildings will only be accepted where it is demonstrated that such development preserves or enhances the setting of adjoining conservation areas, and where the amenity of nearby residential occupiers is not adversely affected.
- 5.5 Clear guidance is provided on the suitability of the site for tall buildings, where they may be acceptable, and the appropriate scale and mass of development. New visual illustrations help to explain the rationale for some tall buildings, working with existing and emerging constraints such as the protection of local views, and strategic views as prescribed through the London View Management Framework.
- 5.6 The revised guidance emphasises that the redevelopment of the site is expected to reopen, and to provide additional, north to south and east to west cycle and pedestrian routes providing strong links to local destinations and between residential areas to the north and Liverpool Street Station.

### **East London Line**

- 5.7 The guidance emphasises that the opening of Shoreditch High Street station will improve public transport choices, with the East London Line linking into the existing underground and overground rail network. It is confirmed that the Public Transport Accessibility Level for the site will increase from 5/6a/6b to 6a/6b.
- 5.8 The guidance requires that appropriately designed new development to the north of the site will conceal the concrete box which encases the East London Line and station. New text and improved visual material explains this.

### **Heritage**

- 5.9 The revised guidance stipulates that the Listed Buildings throughout the site should be retained in situ, and will form an integral part of the redevelopment of the site. In addition some other minor changes have been drafted including updates on recent amendments to conservation area boundaries.

### **Retail development**

- 5.10 Concerns raised with regard to the impact of the evening economy on noise and disturbance have been addressed by underlining that cafes, restaurants and bars should be located where it can be demonstrated that their operation would not result in noise or disturbance to local residents, for instance along Brick Lane and Shoreditch High Street, where evening economy uses are established. In addition the guidance now includes a requirement that a maximum of 25% of retail floorspace should be occupied by cafes, restaurants or bars.

### **Open space**

- 5.11 The location of the park over the Braithwaite Viaduct has been carefully considered. The park will be open to the south and west, to maximise levels of daylight and sunlight, with natural surveillance from residential properties to the north, and the elevated position will be a key feature of its character. It is confirmed that the park will be fully accessible to all, and the amended document sets out the scale and opportunities that the site provides.

### **Residential development**

- 5.12 Guidance on the mix of residential units expected is contained within the London Plan; however, the document includes a clear message that family sized housing will be expected and stipulates that innovative solutions will be expected in terms of creating good quality family housing within high density development. The guidance makes clear that at least 35% of new housing should be affordable.

### **Health care facilities**

- 5.13 The guidance explicitly states that a new community health centre should be provided in a prominent location on site, to help alleviate the shortage of health care facilities within the area.

### **Affordable workspace**

- 5.14 The provision of affordable workspace is highlighted as a key requirement of the site; such spaces will accommodate small and medium enterprises, particularly within the arches beneath the Braithwaite Viaduct. It is now stated that future proposals for the site should include managed workspace for such enterprises.

### **Public transport interchange**

- 5.15 The revisions to the document include an emphasis on the new and reopened routes which will enhance pedestrian and cycle links between stations and bus stops.

### **Temporary uses and phasing**

- 5.16 A revised suggested approach to phasing has been included within the redraft, recognising the need for temporary uses, including community and leisure uses and initial public realm works as a potential first phase of the wider development, with later phases running east to west, recognising the potential access problems of a west to east programme.

### **How will feedback be used in future discussions and for other purposes?**

- 5.17 Feedback will be also be used in future discussions regarding the site, in particular in the preparation of a temporary uses strategy as part of continued joint borough working. It is expected that feedback will also be valuable in future discussions with Transport for London with regard to transport interchange issues, including bus stops and bus routes. Feedback will also be useful in discussions with East London Line Project on the community aspirations for the public space and facilities available to the public upon the opening of Shoreditch High Street Station.
- 5.18 Comments received will also be useful in future discussions with Council departments of both boroughs including highways engineers, waste and recycling and licensing officers.

## APPENDIX A: DIVERSITY MONITORING

All figures are percentages of those who completed diversity monitoring forms.

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Respondents %</b>
Male	72%
Female	28%

<b>Ethnic origin</b>	<b>Respondents %</b>
Bangladeshi	43%
Pakistani	2%
Asian other	2%
Black Caribbean	2%
Arab	2%
White and Black African	2%
English	23%
Scottish	7%
Black British	7%
Other White Background	8%

<b>Age</b>	<b>Respondents %</b>
12-15	0
16-25	23%
26-34	40%
35-43	19%
44-52	6%
53-59	2%
60-64	9%
65+	0

<b>Stated religion</b>	<b>Respondents %</b>
No Religion	20%
Christian	27%
Hindu	0%
Muslim	52%
Buddhist	0%
Jewish	0%
Sikh	0%

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Respondents %</b>
Yes	6%
No	94%

<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<b>Respondents %</b>
Heterosexual	85%
Gay	10%
Bisexual	5%
Lesbian	0

## APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY WORKSHOP EVENTS

### Workshop 1 - Local businesses representatives

<b>Date</b>	27 March 2009
<b>Time</b>	3.00 – 5.00 pm
<b>Location</b>	Rich Mix Centre, Bethnal Green Road
<b>Attendance</b>	31 people
<b>Organisations represented</b>	Spitalfields Small Business Association Brick Lane Business Association East London Small Business Centre East London Business Alliance East London Business Place Ethnic Minority Enterprise Project City Fringe Partnership St Hilda's Community Association
<b>Interested in more information</b>	Yes, future events and site visits, discussion with future landowners/developers, when will development be complete, temporary uses, when park will be delivered

### Summary of discussion

#### A place to enjoy:

- Open space – should be well lit, mix of activities, linked to Allen Gardens, needs to be accessible to all, could incorporate a sunken theatre, should be open to the public as soon as possible; range of different activities catered for; free of charge; community themed; local ownership and management.
- Green links – easy to walk to from other parts of London through green spaces.
- Complementary uses – mix of uses throughout the site, lighting of arches is key to making them feel welcoming, different uses throughout day / night / seasons

#### A place to work:

- Local businesses – scheme should be designed to target small business, supported by subsidies from larger businesses;
- Independent businesses – concern about multiple chain retailing being dominant
- Internships – training for young / local people
- Uses - support music industry, Idea Store, spice market

#### A place to live:

- Appearance – affordable and private units should look same from outside;
- Variety – mix of unit sizes and design with emphasis on family housing;
- Parking – could be provided underground for residents only;

#### Other general comments:

- Good quality public realm will be key to success.



## Workshop 2 - Local Interest Group – OPEN Shoreditch

<b>Date:</b>	27 March 2009
<b>Time:</b>	2.00 – 4.00pm
<b>Location:</b>	Rich Mix Centre, Bethnal Green Road
<b>Attendance</b>	12 people
<b>Organisations represented</b>	OPEN Shoreditch
<b>Interested in more information?</b>	Yes – wish to be closely involved in ongoing development process

### Summary of discussion:

#### A place to enjoy:

- Open space – little evidence of options for the location of park and civic square
- Historic structures – support for the approach to maintaining and enhancing listed structures.

#### A place to work:

- Business Uses – need for space that encourages independent businesses, especially retailers.

#### A place to live:

- Transport interchange / hub – too much emphasis placed on the importance on the improvement to the transport links to and from the local area.

#### Other general comments:

- Scope of IPG – too narrow, should include all the development sites in the local area.
- Local Context – lacks required degree of local context analysis, especially character of adjacent neighbourhoods and conservation areas.
- Tall buildings – objections to the rationale for tall buildings on site and their location within the development site.
- Building Envelope – need for clarity around the acceptable massing of buildings on site, given the surrounding context.
- Building Typologies – Support for guidance on building setbacks, daylight, sunlight, overshadowing and amenity impacts.
- Phasing – Phasing that runs west-east would be impractical and needs review.
- Temporary Uses – Need to reopen site as soon as possible, regardless of long term intentions for the site.
- Community master plan – Specific master planning process involving all the local stakeholders in future developments on this site and in local area would allow for community negotiations to take place.

### Workshop 3 - Local residents associations and open space users

<b>Date:</b>	2 April 2009
<b>Time:</b>	2.00 – 4.00pm
<b>Location</b>	Rich Mix Centre, Bethnal Green Road
<b>Attendance</b>	10 people
<b>Organisations represented?</b>	Jago Action Group North Brick Lane Tenants Association Boundary Tenants and Residents Association St Georges Residents Association Spitalfields Housing Association Spitalfields Market Residents Association Friends of Christ Church, Spitalfields Friends of Arnold Circus
<b>Interested in more information?</b>	To be kept informed of next steps in adoption of planning guidance

Note – combined workshop held due to low response from invited open space user groups.

#### Summary of discussion

##### A place to enjoy:

- Open space – is it in the right location, local involvement, well-lit (more than just street lights);
- Flexible space needed;
- Complementary uses – need to accommodate noisy and energetic uses;

##### A place to work:

- Large Businesses – suitable on the western part of site;
- Retail - High Street feel on Shoreditch High Street with corner shops and independent retailers mixed in;
- Tourism – celebrate the site as a gateway to the east end;
- Small Businesses – self build units, affordable, start up businesses on the eastern part of site;

##### A place to live:

- Sustainability - Eco-friendly housing is a priority;
- Mixed Community – genuine, real effort should be made given the scale of the development;
- Community facilities – need to provide social infrastructure / services;
- Mix of Uses - Licensing needed for night time activities;

##### Other general comments:

- Tall Buildings – more information needed on heights. How tall is tall?

#### Workshop 4 - Young People

<b>Date</b>	31 March 2009
<b>Time</b>	4.00 – 6.00pm
<b>Location</b>	Vacant shop unit in Spitalfields Market
<b>Attendance</b>	10 young people
<b>Organisations represented</b>	Tower Hamlets young Mayor
<b>Interested in more info?</b>	No specific requirement

##### A place to enjoy:

- Open space – Play area for children (miniature goods yards), themed landscaping responding to different local communities, space looks too small;
- Complementary uses – football pitches, sports facilities that are free for residents living close to site;
- Retail - shops near station;
- Walking – encourage pedestrians on the site;

##### A place to work:

- Support – Reopen a job centre, jobs for local people;
- Training – needed for local people to access jobs;

##### A place to live:

- Discounted travel to local residents;
- A nursery / crèche for young mums;

##### Other general comments:

- Planning ahead – positive to see Councils planning for next 10 years;
- Car parking – seems to be too little, cars bring revenue;

### Workshop 5 – Older people

<b>Date:</b>	27 March 2009
<b>Time</b>	12.00 – 2.00pm (lunch provided)
<b>Location:</b>	Rich Mix Centre, Bethnal Green Road
<b>Attendance</b>	7 people
<b>Organisations represented?</b>	Tower Hamlets and Hackney Age Concern
<b>Interested in more info?</b>	To be kept informed of next stages in the process

#### A place to enjoy:

- Open space – childrens' play area, mix of open space types, band stand;
- Complementary uses – swimming pool, market in the arches, art studios;

#### A place to work:

- Small businesses – furniture, cafes, street cafes, independent shops;
- Support - Affordable work places, subsidised rent;
- Alternative uses - Shoreditch Museum;

#### A place to live:

- Housing - Key workers, 4 storeys in height, high quality affordable housing, mix of houses and flats, views that face the sun
- Restricted parking;
- Public toilets – free of charge;
- Community facilities are a priority;

#### Other general comments:

- No particular comments

## APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

<b>Representation type</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Support	106	34.9%
Object	160	52.6%
Not stated	38	12.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>LPA response to objections</b>	
Agree	59.3%
Part agree	4.4%
Not supported	10.0%
Noted	26.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>