



Appendix 3

Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document Consultation and Engagement Plan

May 2012



CONTENTS PAGE

1 INTRODUCTION

Background and Context
Role of this Consultation and Engagement Plan

2 CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

Statement of Community Involvement
Engaging the Community and Key Stakeholders
How we involved the Community and Key Stakeholders
Consultation Review

3 CONSULTATION PROGRAMME

Consultation Events and Activities

4 CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT FEEDBACK

Overview and Summary

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Representations:

- Table 1 – Statutory Consultation, 12 Sep 2011 to 24 Oct 2011
- Table 2 – Further Consultation, 8 Jan 2012 to 11 Feb 2012

1 INTRODUCTION

Background and Context

- 1.1 The Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy was adopted in September 2010, and sets out the spatial vision for development over the next 15 years, to help shape the future of Tower Hamlets (LBTH). There is now a need to formally recognise the work undertaken in the Bromley-by-Bow area. Work includes the draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan (2006), Land Use and Design Brief (2009), and other associated transport and connection studies, such as the Bromley-by-Bow Station Study (2011).
- 1.2 This work will be consolidated into the Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan, which will be taken forward as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan SPD (Masterplan SPD) will be a tool for implementing the objectives of the Core Strategy, and will provide the basis for the determination of planning applications in the area.
- 1.3 The Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC) will have planmaking and decision powers from 1 October 2012, for part of the Masterplan SPD boundary. The Masterplan SPD will also act as tool to influence MDC decision making in the area, to ensure positive benefits for the boroughs' residents.

Role of the Consultation and Engagement Report

- 1.4 The Masterplan SPD is subject to statutory preparation procedures under Regulations 16-19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. This Consultation and Engagement Report has been prepared to:
 - provide an engagement framework that describes the main consultation methods that have been used;
 - summarises the key issues raised by the community and stakeholders and;
 - set out the Council's response to representations received, and how they have help shape the Masterplan SPD.

2 CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

- 2.1 The approach to consultation has been developed to be in conformity with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2009). The overarching aim for consultation is to provide an opportunity for involvement from a wide range of local community groups and individuals.
- 2.2 In undertaking community involvement, the core principles which have governed the approach to consultation are provided below:
- **Appropriate** to the level of planning issue and the type of document being consulted on;
 - **From the beginning**, giving people the opportunity to shape the documents and make it their own;
 - **A continuous process** and not just a one off event;
 - **Clear and straightforward** by using methods suitable to the communities being consulted; and
 - **Planned** as a central part of the planning and plan making process.

How we involved the community and stakeholders

- 2.3 There are several distinct stages to consultation activities to progress SPDs. The table below sets out the stages in preparing the Masterplan SPD and identifies where the community and key stakeholders had the opportunity to get involved.

Table 1 – Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan SPD Consultation Process.

Stage		Method of Consultation/Engagement	How the community have their say
Stage 1 - Informal Consultation Community involvement and participation before developing a SPD.	<i>January 2011 to July 2011</i>	This stage comprises information gathering and generating options before developing the Masterplan through a series of consultation activities and meetings.	Previous comments and feedback from the earlier draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan (2006), and Land Use and Design Brief (2009) were used to feed into the drafting process.
Stage 2 - Statutory Consultation Community involvement and participation before adopting a SPD.	<i>12 September 2011 to 24 October 2011 (6 weeks)</i>	Undertaken for six weeks, before the finalisation and adoption of the Masterplan SPD. A series of events and activities, as well as the opportunity to submit formal written representations. Further consultation was undertaken on the proposed Building Height Plan, from 11 January to 8 February 2012 (4 weeks).	By writing to us and/or attending a meeting or workshop.
Stage 3 -	<i>May 2012</i>	Publish the Consultation and	N/A

<p>Adopting the SPD Informing the community on the adoption of the Masterplan SPD.</p>		<p>Engagement Plan and Adoption Statement. This is the final stage and those who have requested to be notified, will be sent the adoption statement.</p>	
---	--	--	--

2.4 Throughout the Masterplan SPD preparation process, consultation techniques and activities were carried out to ensure an effective and efficient engagement. Some of these included:

Meeting with Elected Members

Regular engagement with Lead and Ward Members to ascertain community priorities and aspirations, to ensure community issues were fed into the Masterplan SPD.

Public Workshops, Exhibitions and Drop-in Sessions

Events within or near the Masterplan SPD area, and in particular working closely local community groups and landowners to promote specific consultation events and increase awareness of the Masterplan SPD.

Landowner Meetings

Regular meetings with landowners to inform and update on the progress of the Masterplan SPD.

Internal LDF Working Group

Regular meetings with internal officers to inform and update on the progress of the document.

External Working Group

Regular meetings with partner agencies to inform and update on the progress of the document. Attendees included London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC), Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC), Design for London (DfL).

On-line updates

Regular updates on the Council's website to inform people of the progress of the document.

Advert and/or Article in local newspaper

Advert in the East End Life to inform people of consultation events and activities.

Posters in and around the Bromley-by-Bow area

Posters displayed in and around the area to inform residents, workers and visitors of consultation events and activities.

Email and Letters

Contacted those on the LDF Consultation database and listed addresses in the Masterplan SPD area via email and/or letter, to inform them of upcoming events and activities.

Consultation Review

- 2.5 The Council previously consulted on the adopted Core Strategy 2025, Community Plan refresh and is also undertaking public consultation on the Managing Development DPD. These documents have inter-related issues and where relevant, the comments arising from public consultation on these documents were considered and fed into the Masterplan SPD and vice versa.
- 2.6 Consultation was also undertaken for the initial draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan (2006) from 2006-2007 and the Bromley-by-Bow Land Use and Design Brief (2009), in 2008. The key issues raised from previous consultation events were also fed into the preparation of the Masterplan SPD, as per stage 1 – Informal Consultation, of the consultation process.

3 CONSULTATION PROGRAMME

Consultation Events and Activities

3.1 The table below outlines the programme of events and activities for stage 2 consultation. This includes preparation before and events held after the formal period of consultation.

Method/Type of Consultation	Aim/details	Target Groups	Date and Location
Preparation for Consultation			
Internal Drop-in Sessions and ongoing meetings	Dialogue with key Council officers to ensure full involvement in the Masterplan SPD production process, ascertain aspirations and key issues.	LBTH Officers	LBTH offices November - May 2011
Landowner meetings	To engage and update key landowners. Separate focused meetings with key landowners to discuss specific issues relating to the Masterplan SPD and their aspirations for their site.	Key landowners in the area.	LBTH offices November 2010 - January 2011
Mayor and Member Engagement	Briefing the elected Mayor, Lead Member for Housing and Ward Members on the Masterplan SPD.	Elected Members'	LBTH offices March – August 2011
Masterplan SPD media campaign. Publication on the website, East End Life (EEL), emails, letters, posters etc.	Publication on the website, EEL, emails, letters, posters etc, informing of consultation events and activities.	The general public. LDF database members. Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan residents, local business and landowners.	September - October 2011
Stage 2 Statutory Consultation			
Public Drop-in Sessions	To introduce and discuss the aims and objectives of the Masterplan SPD, and ascertain key issues and priorities in the area.	The general public. LDF database members. Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan residents, local business and landowners.	Bromley-by-Bow Centre 26 Sep 2011 and 3 Oct 2011 Marners Centre 5 Oct 2011

Method/Type of Consultation	Aim/details	Target Groups	Date and Location
Finalising the Masterplan			
SEA Screening Determination	To confirm that the Masterplan SPD does not require an SEA, in accordance with the requirements of regulation 9(1) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.	Statutory environmental bodies via email and post	Jan 2012
Further on the Building Height Plan Consultation	Opportunity for those who made representations on the draft Masterplan SPD to make further comments on a proposed Building Height plan. Notification on the web, email and letters.	Those who made comments on the draft Masterplan SPD and key landowners.	11 Jan – 8 Feb 2012
Stage 3 Adopting the Masterplan			
Member Engagement	Briefing the elected Mayor, Lead Member for Housing on the Masterplan SPD.	Elected Members'	LBTH offices Jan – May 2012

4 CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT FEEDBACK

- 4.1 This section of the Consultation and Engagement Plan summarises the feedback arising from the consultation on the Masterplan SPD. This includes representations and comments submitted, and the Council's response to these. The comments and representations received through the consultation process have been used to finalise the Masterplan SPD.
- 4.2 Over 30 people attended the consultation events held by the Council. In addition, 35 written representations were received from Members, local residents, statutory consultees, landowners and developers during both consultation periods:
- statutory consultation on the draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan SPD (Masterplan SPD) from 12 September 2011 to 24 October 2011, and;
 - further consultation on the proposed Building Height Plan, from 8 January 2012 to 11 February 2012
- 4.3 A summary of the key issues that were raised are detailed in the table below. For further detail on the representations received and the Council's responses to these, see Appendix A.

Table 3 – Consultation Feedback Summary

Vision Statement	
Key Issues	Council Response
<p>Further additional open space, should be promoted in Bromley-by-Bow north</p> <p>There are a number crossings which should be reinforced, such as Twelvetrees Crescent and Devas Street.</p>	<p>Pedestrian access routes to and from Bromley-by-Bow north site have been amended to enhance and reinforce north-south routes, which link to the wider area.</p> <p>New pedestrian crossings are further promoted at Twelvetrees Crescent and Devas Street.</p>
Setting the Scene	
Key Issues	Council Response
<p>The Masterplan SPD should be consistent with the OLSPG.</p> <p>Further information should be provided on the Council's emerging Managing Development DPD and relevance to the Masterplan SPD.</p>	<p>The role and function of the London Plan Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance (OLSPG) has been reinforced to provide a strategic context.</p> <p>Information on the Council's emerging Managing Development DPD has been updated, with greater emphasis provided on the role of the DPD relative to the Masterplan and their linkages.</p>

Regional Location	
Key Issues	Council Response
The boundary of the Mayoral Development Corporation should be highlighted, as it will be the new regeneration and planning agency for the area.	The London Mayoral Development Corporation boundary has been included.
Challenges and Opportunities	
Key Issues	Council Response
<p>Floodrisk and utilities are also key site constraints, which should be identified on the map</p> <p>Bridge principles and design need to be agreed with British Waterways.</p> <p>The proposed crossing on the A12 need to be agreed with TfL.</p>	<p>Infrastructure map has been updated to reinforce the A12, railway, waterways, utilities and floodrisk as key barriers.</p> <p>References have been included to confirm that any proposed waterway bridges and A12 crossings are to be agreed with British Waterways and TfL respectively.</p>
Design Principles	
Key Issue	Council Response
<p>There is lack of sustainability principles for the area.</p> <p>Further opportunities to utilise the waterways should be referenced.</p> <p>The Masterplan SPD would benefit from more detailed height guidance for the key sites.</p>	<p>Sustainability principles have been included, which reflect those of the Core Strategy and emerging Managing Development DPD.</p> <p>Text has been amended to promote and enhance mooring facilities.</p> <p>Height principles have been established for key sites within the area, with indicative upper limit thresholds provided to guide development.</p>
Key Sites	
Key Issue	Council Response
<p>The Masterplan SPD reflects the consented District Centre scheme, making a presumption that the scheme will get built. As such the Masterplan is predicated on the scheme and this is not considered to be 'plan led'.</p> <p>Further guidance is required on Bromley-</p>	<p>Reference to the development application for the district centre has been removed, and associated map has been updated to reinforce the principles established within the Bromley-by-Bow Land Use and Design Brief, Interim Planning Guidance.</p> <p>The importance of riverside development for</p>

<p>by-Bow North, including: connections; development elevation on the towpath and design of open space provision.</p> <p>The principle of developing Bow Locks for a secondary school needs to address key accessibility and connectivity issues as a priority.</p>	<p>Bromley-by-Bow North and high quality public open space have been reinforced.</p> <p>Bow Locks - The principle of redeveloping the site for a secondary school being dependent on improved pedestrian and cycle access has been reinforced.</p>
Public Realm Principles	
Key Issue	Council Response
<p>Further guidance required for: open space provision; green infrastructure; A12 and the towpath</p>	<p>Further detailed design principles have been provided for towpath and A12 crossings. The Masterplan already provides detailed guidance regarding new open space provision and green infrastructure, consistent with the Council's Open Space and Green Grid Strategies.</p>
Delivery	
Key Issue	Council Response
<p>There is the need to include a preferred phasing plan, which promotes the District Centre to come forward first, as it will provide most of the key infrastructure required to support the wider redevelopment of Bromley-by-Bow.</p>	<p>A phasing statement has been included to ensure the redevelopment of Bromley-by-Bow is coordinated in a comprehensive manner.</p>

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Representations

Table 1 - Statutory Consultation

No	Organisation	Chapter/Section	Representation Summary	Response
1	GLA	1.1 Vision Statement	The designation of Bow Locks for education use with the Masterplan SPD is not in conformity with PPS12. It would be useful to see the approach taken to identify this site, and to what extent this methodology has considered the London Plan.	<p>Bromley-by-Bow is an area of search for a secondary school within the adopted Core Strategy. The emerging Managing Development DPD, allocates Bow Locks for a secondary school, based on a methodology to match sites to uses. This methodology is published as part of the evidence base for the Managing Development DPD and the site selection process has been undertaken in accordance with national, regional policy and guidance, including the London Plan.</p> <p>The Masterplan SPD promotes the site for a secondary school, in accordance with the Managing Development and provides further design and access guidance to support the delivery of the site.</p>
2	LTGDC	1.1 Vision Statement	The requirement for the redevelopment of Bromley by Bow North to include a consolidated area(s) of green space should be illustrated.	Agree. Masterplan SPD has been updated to include opportunities for green local open space as part of the redevelopment of Bromley-by-Bow North. Map updated accordingly and other applicable maps in the document also updated.

3	LTGDC	1.1 Vision Statement	The number of east-west pedestrian routes bisecting the Bromley by Bow north site should be limited to the routes that provide access between the site and the District Centre and Sugar House Lane.	Agree. Pedestrian and access routes to and from Bromley-by-Bow north site has been amended to enhance and reinforce north-south routes, which link to the wider area.
4	LTGDC	1.1 Vision Statement	New pedestrian crossings should be promoted across the northern arms of Twelvetrees Crescent and Devas Street to facilitate improved access around the existing grade separated junction.	Agree. New pedestrian crossings are now promoted at Twelvetrees Crescent and Devas Street.
5	LTGDC	1.1 Vision Statement	The proposed bridge crossing of the Limehouse Cut should be deleted given its proximity to the A12 bridge and Twelvetrees Bridge Lea River Park proposals.	Agree. Proposed bridge connection has been removed and existing connections reinforced due to the proximity of nearby crossings.
6	LTGDC	1.1 Vision Statement	The Lea River Park should be added to the plan given its proximity to the Masterplan area and its role as a linear park for access and recreation.	Agree. Vision map has been updated accordingly.
7	LTGDC	1.1 Vision Statement	A distinction should be made between the blue arrows that denote new pedestrian/cycle crossings, bridges and towpath enhancements.	Agree. For ease of reference and to differentiate connections, a colour distinction has been applied.
8	DfL	1.1 Vision Statement	Brown shading for 'Key future public spaces' needs greater distinction – are these proposed / new / shared surfaces etc.?	Section 4.3 already provides further detail on new/improved/shared public spaces,. The Vision map summarises the key spaces in the area.
9	DfL	1.1 Vision Statement	Movement junctions, in particular the crossings at the A11/A12 junctions need to be clearer.	Agree. A11/A12 crossing amended to provide clarity and reinforce connections.
10	East Thames and Southern Housing	1.1 Vision Statement	Vision Statement and Introduction should include reference to the OLSPG and the status of that document and emerging	The OLSPG is already referenced in section 2.1, and the MDC boundary is also identified in section 2.2 and section 5. These sections provide the appropriate context to reference both OLSPG and the MDC.
11	Trad	1.1 Vision Statement	Given the issue surrounding land ownership and land assembly, the vision and remaining maps should avoid a prescription that any redevelopment	The landownership complexities is a potential redevelopment constraint. However, the role of the Masterplan SPD is to provide a tool for the

			proposals need to relate to the entire site.	Council, landowners and developers, to work collaboratively to deliver sites comprehensively, rather than piecemeal.
12	OPLC	1.1 Vision Statement	The two northern east and west routes in Bromley by Bow North do not need to be drawn/specified as they do not lead to anywhere specifically.	Agree. Map has been updated accordingly along with other applicable maps in the document.
13	OPLC	1.1 Vision Statement	There should be a connection highlighted from the Bow Interchange South East Corner to Bow Riverside directly. It is important that this entrance is preserved close to the Bow Interchange as it ensures the towpath both north and southbound is well connected.	Agree. Map has been updated accordingly along with other applicable maps in the document.
14	OPLC	1.1 Vision Statement	Different coloured arrows to specifically represent surface crossings and underpasses or bridges would be useful, given that the type of proposed crossing is known.	Agree. Map has been updated accordingly along with other applicable maps in the document.
15	OPLC	1.1 Vision Statement	The A12 front needs public realm improvements in the north as well as south. The map should show improved public realm along Hancock Road as is shown near Bromley by Bow Station.	Agree. Map has been updated accordingly along with other applicable maps in the document.
16	OPLC	1.1 Vision Statement	The north south arrows at Twelve Trees Crescent should line up with the footways.	Agree. Map has been updated accordingly along with other applicable maps in the document.
17	OPLC	1.1 Vision Statement	Map needs to show Bromley Riverside path and bridge.	Agree. Map has been updated accordingly along with other applicable maps in the document.
18	OPLC	1.1 Vision Statement	There is no route or connection shown through Twelvetrees crescent as was developed in the LTGDC's South East Quadrant Study.	Improving and widening the existing pedestrian pavement under Twelvetrees Crescent has been assessed by the Council's Highway team, and considered not acceptable. The route is dominated by HGVs, and the loss of road space to increase the pavement width for pedestrians and cyclist, will not provide

				sufficient road space for HGVs. An alternative pedestrian route has been further considered and identified in the document.
19	OPLC	1.1 Vision Statement	Planting improvements and the provision of large trees should be made on both sides of the A12 and not just one.	Agree. Map has been updated accordingly along with other applicable maps in the document.
20	OPLC	1.1 Vision Statement	Has there been any consideration for a surface crossing above the district line to the station?	Pedestrian crossings on the A12 have been thoroughly assessed throughout the Bromley-by-Bow masterplanning process and other supporting evidence base, such as the LTGDC A12 Capacity Study. The safest routes have been identified at Three Mills Lane and Devas St/Twelve Trees Crescent, which will both provide safe pedestrian access with minimal impacts on the traffic flow on the A12.
21	OPLC	1.1 Vision Statement	Identifying a mixed use approach within Bromley-by-Bow north would allow more possible combinations to deliver commercial, residential and green space.	Due to the area constraints, such as the A12, it is considered desirable for commercial activities to locate along the A12 to benefit from access as well as to act as an environmental buffer. Residential and open space should be set back from the A12 and benefit from the setting of the River Lea. The Masterplan SPD provides guidance on how this can be achieved, by stacking uses. However, other scenarios will be welcomed if they can achieve the above outcomes.
22	Lee Valley Regional Park	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	The three Themes and Key Objectives should reference the Regional Park	This section of the document refers to the immediate open green space. The Lee Valley Regional Park plays an important context and is referenced in section 2.2.
23	East Thames and Southern	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Paragraph 2.1.2 refers to the area having a “rich cultural and ethnic character” and the fourth bullet point under Theme 3 on page 5 refers to	Agree. Amendment to theme 3 has been made to state 'enhancing the cultural diversity of the area'.

	Housing		“improving the cultural diversity of the area”.	
24	East Thames and Southern Housing	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Support the general Themes 1, 2 and 3 and consider that their planning application for comprehensive development at BbBN (<i>text appears to be missing here</i>)	Noted.
25	East Thames and Southern Housing	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	It is considered that additional objectives could be added to this list in the SA Review such as: will it lead to more effective and efficient use of land? Will it provide new homes to meet the local needs? Will it provide new flexible employment floorspace to meet current requirements and stimulate employment opportunities?	These objectives are covered within the established three key themes and underlying objectives set out in section 1.
26	East Thames and Southern Housing	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Regeneration objectives are not dealt with very clearly within the draft document. There are references to regional land sub-regional guidance for the area and the position of the Brief within the LDF, but little seems to be said about the importance of the brief in terms of realising objectives for regeneration.	The section 1.1 sets out the role of the Masterplan. This is further explored in section 1.2 which provides key delivery objectives and themes. This is clear throughout the document, and applying the key themes in section 3 further provides clarity on how the vision will be delivered.
27	Poplar Harca	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	We support the designation of Bromley-by-Bow as a District Centre. We also encourage maximising social housing and creating job links in the area.	Noted.
28	Natural England	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Local authorities should consider the provision of natural areas as part of a balanced policy to ensure that local communities have access to an appropriate mix of green-spaces.	Noted. The Masterplan SPD acknowledges the need to create and enhance green open spaces, and identifies opportunities as part of new developments in the area.
29	Poplar Harca	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Welcome introduction of proposed improvements to Bromley-by-Bow station and new District Centre.	Noted.
30	Workspace Group Plc	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Theme 1: Workspace supports the creation of a new town centre in Bromley-by-Bow and the promotion of 1,500 to 2,500 new homes for the Bromley-by-Bow area.	Noted.

31	Workspace Group Plc	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Theme 2: It is considered that additional text should be added that states: "Improving pedestrian and cycling permeability with the neighbouring growth areas including Fish Island, Three Mills and Stratford High Street"	Connecting Bromley-by-Bow to the wider area is a key driver for regeneration, which is later acknowledged in section 3. The Masterplan acknowledges connections within the area are poor and require significant improvements, both within the Masterplan area itself and to the wider surrounding area.
32	British Waterways	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Theme 2: We do not agree with the description of the River Lea being a 'barrier'. The waterways in this area have acted as a catalyst for regeneration.	Agree. Text has been amended which change the word 'barrier' to 'severance'. It is acknowledged the Waterways provide a focal point to bring communities together and has been referenced in the Masterplan SPD.
33	Environment Agency	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Theme 3: Recommend point 5 is changed to include reference to biodiversity benefits	Agree. Text been replaced with 'enhancing the waterfront, opening up the River Lea for recreation, access and biodiversity benefits'
34	Natural England	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Theme 3: Biodiversity and the natural environment can lead to various opportunities, not just for wildlife activity and connection, but also health, recreation, contributing to climate change adaptation and improving quality of life.	Agree. The Council recognises the various opportunities. Text been updated to ensure the area's green infrastructure is designed to deliver a multiple of functions.
35	Trad	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	We are supportive of the key objectives, including station improvements, subway upgrade and the River Lea and A12 crossings.	Noted.
36	Resident	1.2 Themes and Key Objectives	Suggest rethinking Bow Locks - this is a site of a mixed leisure, retail, housing scheme which can make the most of the waterfront - certainly not a school.	Bromley-by-Bow is an area of search for a secondary school within the adopted Core Strategy. The emerging Managing Development DPD, allocates Bow Locks for a secondary school, based on a methodology to match sites to uses. This methodology is published as part of the evidence base for the Managing Development DPD and the site selection process has been undertaken in accordance with national, regional policy and

				<p>guidance, including the London Plan.</p> <p>The Masterplan SPD promotes the site for a secondary school, in accordance with the Managing Development and provides further design and access guidance to support the delivery of the site.</p>
37	English Heritage	2.1 Setting the Scene	Historic Context - We welcome the historic context which sets out an informative background to the proposals which follow in the SPD	Noted.
38	English Heritage	2.1 Setting the Scene	Historic Context - For clarity it might be useful, to explicitly state the legacies of the area's evolution which have implications for the SPD in planning terms - elements of value to be retained and urban design issues to be addressed, including its mixed post-war residential typologies and commercial/industrial setting etc.	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly.
39	Trad	2. Context 2.1 Setting the Scene	Policy - The Masterplan needs to be consistent with the OLSPG, and should not be progressed until this document is finalised.	The Masterplan SPD and the OLSPG, have been feeding into one another, as they progress. The finalisation of the Masterplan SPD is not dependent on the OLSPG, but is aligned to London Plan and the Council's adopted Core Strategy.
40	GLA	2.1 Setting the Scene	Policy - The Masterplan SPD should reflect the vision and objectives set out in the draft OAPF to ensure consistency and implementation of a shared strategic vision	Agree. Key vision for the Bromley-by-Bow area from the OLSPG has been reinforced within this section.
41	East Thames and Southern Housing	2.1 Setting the Scene	Policy - The content of the BbBM SPD should accord with the provisions of the OLSPG, which means that the preparation and final approval of the BbBM SPD should really follow the final approval and endorsement of the OLSPG.	The Masterplan SPD and the OLSPG, have been feeding into one another, as they progress. The finalisation of the Masterplan SPD is not dependent on the OLSPG, but is aligned to London Plan and the Council's adopted Core Strategy.

42	Natural England	2.2 Regional Location	Opportunities to link into and improve access to leisure and amenity facilities along the Lee Valley are welcomed and to be encouraged.	Noted.
43	Natural England	2.2 Regional Location	The Council should also look at the fragmentation of open spaces and the linking of them back to paths and other sites. This would also be in line with the council's aspiration to make the area "greener".	The Council has a Green Grid Strategy, which promotes greener links and open green space. This document has informed the Masterplan SPD, which has identified open space and the green link opportunities.
44	Lee Valley Regional Park	2.2 Regional Location	Include a reference to the Regional Park by including the Park boundary on Plan 2.2 'Regional Location'.	Agree. Reference to the River Lea Park has been included to the map.
45	GLA	2. Context 2.2 Regional Location	For consistency, indicate the town centre classification next to Stratford City and Roman Road.	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly.
46	British Waterways	2.2 Regional Location	The Lower Lea Valley Waterspace Strategy highlights the opportunities of the area's waterways in the context of the emerging development and regeneration.	Noted. Recognition of this strategy is highlighted in section 4.1.
47	DfL	3.1 Current Schemes	Number 7 of the anticipated major schemes does not have an anticipated scheme at present	The Masterplan SPD identifies key sites with potential redevelopment opportunities. Site 7 does not currently have any proposed scheme, but it is anticipated that the site could be redeveloped.
48	LTGDC.	3.1 Current Schemes	The image of the Bromley by Bow South Tesco scheme is incorrect and reflects the application as it was submitted as opposed to the consented scheme.	Agree. Image reference to the development application for the district centre has been deleted.
49	GLA	3.1 Current Schemes	It should be made clear that all new developments coming forward will have to consider their wider impacts and implications on neighbouring boroughs	Agree. Text has been updated to reinforce that all developments must consider wider impacts.
50	British Waterways	3.1 Current Schemes	Bows Locks name is confusing as it refers to the Lock on the River Lea Navigation.	Agree. Site name description has been amended to Bow Locks/Coventry Cross East.

51	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	3.1 Current Schemes	Para 3.1.2. Include reference to RLMT proposals to restore House Mill [Listed Grade I] and Millers House as major heritage/leisure/educational resource with support of Heritage Lottery Fund and other partners.	Agree. Map and text have been updated accordingly.
52	East Thames and Southern Housing	3.1 Current Schemes	The BbBN site is identified as site 2 on the plan on page 20. Paragraph 3.1.1 needs to be updated to refer to the submitted application scheme.	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly.
53	East Thames and Southern Housing	3.1 Current Schemes	Item 3.1 no longer forms part of the All Movements Junction scheme and this should be deleted.	The proposed junction on the A12 is illustrative. The detail of the junction will be later developed and agreed beyond the Masterplan SPD.
54	Lee Valley Regional Park	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	The waterside should be further exploited, such as leisure boat and commuter boat rides, which connect to the Olympics, Stratford and beyond.	Section 4 design principles, identifies key development requirements and considerations to ensure the waterside is fully integrated into new developments and opportunities are realised. A further amendment to the Masterplan is not considered necessary.
55	GLA	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Existing Land Ownership – The illustrative plan of all current sites and future uses on the map is not clear.	Agree. Map has been amended to only identify existing land uses that have been built.
56	East Thames and Southern Housing	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Existing Land Ownership - A number of the buildings within the central part of the BbBN site have been demolished and the site has been cleared.	Agree. Relevant maps have been updated accordingly.
57	LTGDC	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Social and Community Facilities - The two northern most east-west corridors within the Bromley by Bow North site should be deleted from the plan.	Agree. Plan has been updated accordingly.
58	DfL	3.2 Challenges	Social and Community Facilities - The shaded areas labelled 'A12 environs requiring	Agree. Plan has been amended to specifically reference "green infrastructure improvements

		and Opportunities	improvements along its length' should be more specific about the need for planting.	along the A12".
59	LandProp Holdings	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Social and Community facilities - Healthcare provision should be included in the wider context and not preclude people from registering with a GP because they live across the river.	The Masterplan SPD cannot determine who can register at the proposed health facilities.
60	British Waterways	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Social and Community facilities - Any new facilities should complement and not adversely affect those already available at Three Mills.	Agree. Reference has been made to "any new facilities should complement and not adversely affect those already available or proposed within the surrounding area".
61	Sport England	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Social and Community facilities - It is very important that the proposed schools should incorporate sports facilities designed for dual use by the school and community. This is best achieved through formal community use agreements for such facilities.	The Masterplan SPD makes reference to potential dual use of education use for other community uses.
62	DfL	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Barriers and Infrastructure - This map is more appropriate as an appendix. It is not clear in highlighting constraints and appears focused on gas holders.	Agree. The map illustrates the key barriers within the area, which are considered as the key challenges for redevelopment. The map has been updated to reinforce the A12, railway and waterways as key barriers.
63	Poplar Harca	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Barriers and Infrastructure - Support the opportunities contained within 3.2.4 and on page 33.	Noted.
64	LTGDC	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Barriers and Infrastructure - Review the title	Agree. The title has been amended to "Constraints and Infrastructure"
65	British Waterways	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Barriers and Infrastructure - Waterfront environment should not be considered as a barrier.	Agree. Reference has been made to the deficiency of bridge connections over the river, which causes a severance to connect communities together and the use of the

				waterways as a focal point.
66	British Waterways	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	The A11 “Fly-under” walkway has been recently completed, allowing access under the flyover and removing the need for pedestrians to navigate the busy road intersection.	The Masterplan SPD identifies the north-south towpath link as part of a key pedestrian and cycling route in the area.
67	British Waterways	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Support the description of the River Lea in Theme 3, being “at the heart of the neighbourhood”. We also support the following point 5.	Noted.
68	National Grid	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Barriers and Infrastructure - The north east part of the Masterplan area, identified for residential and commercial development, is crossed by one of National Grid’s high voltage underground electricity transmission cables. Amend Map to reference	Agree. Utility infrastructure has been added to plan to as a constraint.
69	Thames Water	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Barriers and Infrastructure - Reference to utility infrastructure as a key consideration.	Agree. Utility infrastructure has been added to plan to as a consideration.
70	DfL	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - An improved walking and cycling route along the A12 is very important.	Opportunities for improving walking and cycling routes along the A12 have been identified, and further detailed for each key site.
71	DfL	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - It would also be useful to see which of these new transport links are new.	Agree. New routes have been separately identified.
72	LTGDC	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - The potential to introduce pedestrian and crossing facilities as part of new junction along the A12 at Three Mill Lane and Devas Street/Twelvetrees Crescent should be clearly referenced.	Agree. New pedestrian crossings have been reinforced in the plan and text at Twelvetrees Crescent/Devas Street and A12/Three Mills Lane
73	LTGDC	3.2 Challenges	Transport and Connections - The two northern most east-west corridors within the Bromley by	Agree. Pedestrian and access routes to and from Bromley-by-Bow north site amended to

		and Opportunities	Bow North site should be deleted from the plan.	enhance and reinforce north-south routes, which link to the wider area
74	British Waterways	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - The proposed bridge crossing at Gillender Street and Bow Locks appears to be impossible, while providing necessary height for navigation and keeping the road access to Bow Locks clear. We therefore resist this proposal without further information.	Agree. Proposed bridge connection has been removed and existing connections reinforced due to the proximity of nearby crossings.
75	British Waterways	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - Bridges should be considered carefully to avoid the adverse impacts and agreed with BW.	Agree. Reference has been made to acknowledge that proposed bridge principles and design will need to be agreed with British Waterways.
76	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - Signage in the area is poor, particular at present signage to/from Three Mills is totally inadequate from all directions.	Agree. Additional bullet point has been included to acknowledge the opportunity to improve signage in the area, linking into the Legible London scheme.
77	East Thames and Southern Housing	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections: Document should identify the importance and benefits of proposed improvements to connections within the Masterplan area in relation to the wider context, including access routes through to Pudding Mill Land as well as to Stratford.	Agree. Proposed connections, such as Pudding Mill Lane/A11 crossing have been identified on the map, to reinforce wider connections. Supporting text has also been updated accordingly.
78	TfL	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - The improvement of transport connections is welcomed as are the improvements of access and capacity of Bromley-by-Bow station.	Noted.
79	TfL	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - Other London Plan priorities, such as smoothing traffic flow, should be acknowledged as it will be important to balance these issues when alterations to the highway are being considered.	Agree. Text has been updated to highlight the London Plan priority.
80	TfL	3.2 Challenges	Transport and Connections - Omit reference to the complex bus routine that currently exist, due to the	Agree. Reference has been amended and the opportunity to provide north-south movements

		and Opportunities	barriers to movement the bus can only serve parts of the area in one direction.	has been reinforced.
81	TfL	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - Reference the need to minimise car parking and vehicular trip generation to and from any new developments.	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly.
82	TfL	.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - Cycle super highway has been implemented on the A11. The document should identify where improved cycle connections to CS2 can be made.	The Masterplan already identifies a number of new/improved cycle connections, which link into the wider cycle network.
83	GLA	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - There is a concern over the conflict with access routes for cyclist and HGVs. Also prioritising HGVs near a school is not encouraged. The map on page 32 highlights both 'priority private car routes' and 'priority private car/HGV route'. It is suggested that priority car routes and HGV routes are shown separately for clarity.	Agree. The routes identified on the map have been amended to ensure pedestrians and cyclists do not conflict with the HGVs/cars.
84	LandProp Holdings	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - In support of the improved connections over the A12 and River Lea.	Noted.
85	GLA	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - Not all links shown on the map are in accordance with the OLSPG. The Masterplan will need to ensure that both documents are proposing all links.	The Masterplan SPD captures the key links identified within the OLSPG. The additional key links included within the Masterplan are considered to provide a comprehensive connection network, which link into the wider area.
86	Lee Valley Regional Park	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	The number of bridge crossings will need to be considered in terms of the impact on the waterway corridor and its ecology, and the recreational use of waterside open space.	Agree. Masterplan SPD now includes additional bullet point to acknowledge the potential impact of the bridges on the waterways and ecology.
87	Environment	3.2	Transport and Connections - Concerns with new	Masterplan SPD makes a clear justification for

	Agency	Challenges and Opportunities	bridges proposed, all new bridges should be justified to ensure there are no adverse impacts to the river from shading / encroachment into the river.	new bridges. It has been reinforced within the text, that the proposed bridge principles and design will need to be agreed with British Waterways.
88	Natural England	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - The Council should consider the potential for Green Infrastructure to help assist in the delivery of walking and cycling paths.	This is already considered within Theme 3 - high quality neighbourhood.
89	Natural England	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections - Section 3.2.4 refers to opportunities to enhance access to the River Lee which are broadly welcomed.	Noted.
90	Martin and Fiona E14	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections -Need additional crossing to get to the new district centre. Devas Street gets very busy because of the A12 and priority should be given to improvements on this junction.	The Masterplan SPD already promotes crossings over the A12 and improvements to the existing subways. These will come forward as new developments are built, which will consider key priorities, to support development within the area.
91	Martin and Fiona E14	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Transport and Connections: The area requires further modelling work.	The Council and a number of stakeholders have already undertaken A12 modelling work, which has identified a number of crossings or improvements to accessibility or connections. These are promoted in the Masterplan SPD.
92	Environment Agency	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Flood Risk should be included as a challenge.	Flood Zones have already been included as a key barrier in 'Constraints and Infrastructure'
93	Environment Agency	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Heritage Assets - Land contamination could also be included as a challenge in this section, due to the previous industrial uses of the area this is an important consideration and should be dealt with appropriately.	Agree. Reference has been made to acknowledge the legacy of industrial uses and that new development will be required to investigate site contamination.
94	English	3.2	Heritage Assets - We are pleased to see a section	Noted.

	Heritage	Challenges and Opportunities	devoted to the historic environment, and welcome stated need to respect the Three Mills Conservation Area in particular	
95	English Heritage	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Heritage Assets - All the conservation areas surrounding the SPD boundary should be included.	Agree. Adjacent conservation areas surrounding the Masterplan SPD boundary have been identified.
96	English Heritage	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Heritage Assets - This section does not identify archaeological priority areas (APAs) within the SPD area. Under PPS5 APAs are considered designated heritage assets and should be recognised and managed through the SPD.	Recommendation endorsed. Text has been updated to acknowledge the need to manage areas of archaeological potential in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. The map now identifies whether the area is within APAs.
97	English Heritage	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Heritage Assets - Paragraph 3.2.6 should refer to heritage assets, rather than historic assets, to be consistent with the terminology used in PPS5.	Recommendation endorsed. Reference made to heritage assets, rather than historic assets.
98	English Heritage	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Heritage Assets - Support the opportunities that new developments in protecting and enhancing developments.	Noted.
99	East Thames and Southern Housing	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Building heights - It is suggested that the last bullet point of paragraph 4.3.6 should be amended to read “an indicative height of seven to 10 storeys adjacent to the A12 stepping down to four to six storeys alongside the waterfront with potential for some taller elements is broadly acceptable.”	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
100	Environment Agency	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Building Heights - Taller buildings will be more appropriate away from the river edge because shading of the watercourse and corridor will have a detrimental impact on species that live or migrate through these areas.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
101	Workspace Grp Plc	3.2 Challenges	Building Heights - Tall buildings should be part of a strategic approach to regeneration at key locations	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to

		and Opportunities	within the Masterplan area and it is possible that well designed schemes will not be harmful within their context.	manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
102	GLA	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Building heights - The height threshold set out for each key site will need to reflect the building heights identified, in line with the emerging OLSPG.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. The OLSPG was also considered when developing the height plan. Further consultation undertaken.
103	Workspace Group	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Building Heights - Tall buildings should be considered to enable the delivery of modern economic floor space within mixed-use developments.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
104	DfL	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Building Heights - Taller buildings should be located closer to Bromley by Bow station and centre.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
105	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Building Height, Scale and Massing – Stepping down development schemes to take account of Conservation Area guidance for Three Mills is endorsed.	Noted.
106	LTGDC	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Public Realm and Open Space - The two northernmost east-west corridors within the Bromley by Bow North site should be deleted from the plan.	Agree. Plan updated accordingly.
107	Resident E14	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Public Realm and Open Space - Need more green spaces for multiple functions and uses for the enjoyment of the community.	Masterplan already identifies opportunities for new green open spaces within the area, and links to existing and proposed green open spaces within the wider area.
108	Natural England	3.2 Challenges	Public Realm and Open Space - Council should also seek provision of green chains/links, which	Agree. Green pedestrian links have been reinforced to ensure tree planting on both sides

		and Opportunities	could in turn provide the potential for walking and cycling routes proposed.	of the A12, to create visual green links. Reference has also been made that areas of green infrastructure should be designed to deliver a multiple of functions.
109	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Public Realm and Open Space - New green spaces and building heights and service parking/drop off/pick up in the vicinity of the House Mill and Millers House should have appropriate signage.	Agree. Opportunities for signage has been reinforced within the transport and connections section.
110	British Waterways	3.2 Challenges and Opportunities	Public Realm and Open Space - Welcome more passive surveillance of the waterway environment through design of new development.	Agree. Reference has been made to enhance biodiversity and passive surveillance of the waterway environment through design of new development.
111	DfL	3.3 The Key Interventions	This drawing is difficult to read and in many instances the highlighted projects require an indication of scale and extent.	The associated table provides further detail on the key interventions, which are also later covered within the Guidance for Key Sites section.
112	East Thames and Southern Housing	3.3 The Key Interventions	Items 2.7 and 2.8 on the list, these bridges will be implemented as part of the proposed development at Sugar House Lane. This point should be made clear.	Agree. Text updated to reference that the interventions will be delivered by Sugar House Lane in LB Newham.
113	East Thames and Southern Housing	3.3 The Key Interventions	Item 3.1 , which identifies a crossing is not part of the All Movement Junction.	The Masterplan SPD provides guidance to illustrate potential crossings on the A12. Further work would be required beyond the Masterplan SPD to finalise the detail of the proposed all movement junction.
114	TfL	3.3 The Key Interventions	Item 5.4 TfL does not consider the provision of an at grade crossing at Twelvetrees Crescent feasible.	The Masterplan SPD identifies a number of short term accessibility improvements at Devas Street/Twelvetrees Crescent/A12'.. However, it is a long term aspiration for the Council to undertake further work to scope out whether a crossing is feasible. This will be undertaken in partnership with TfL and other key

				stakeholders. The Masterplan SPD has been updated to note 'accessibility improvements'.
115	British Waterways	3.3 The Key Interventions	Item 6.2 Subway should also incorporate appropriate lighting	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly.
116	British Waterways	3.3 The Key Interventions	Maintenance of the towpath would help BW to maintain this stretch to the high standards that new residents and visitors will expect.	Contributions towards the public realm and the towpath will be negotiated during the application stage.
117	East Thames and Southern Housing	4.1 Land Use Principle	The identification of the major part of the BbBN site for residential use with proposed commercial use and residential above along the A12 frontage of the site is supported in strong terms.	Noted.
118	Poplar Harca	4.1 Land Use Principle	The Bow Locks site is not considered to be an appropriate location for a school and a more suitable location should be found.	Bromley-by-Bow is an area of search for a secondary school within the adopted Core Strategy. The emerging Managing Development DPD, allocates Bow Locks for a secondary school, based on a methodology to match sites to uses. This methodology is published as part of the evidence base for the Managing Development DPD and the site selection process has been undertaken in accordance with national, regional policy and guidance, including the London Plan. The Masterplan SPD promotes the site for a secondary school, in accordance with the Managing Development and provides further design and access guidance to support the delivery of the site.
119	LTGDC	4.1 Land Use Principle	The requirement for the redevelopment of Bromley by Bow North to include a consolidated area(s) of green space should be illustrated.	Agree. Masterplan SPD has been updated to include opportunities for green local open space as part of the redevelopment of Bromley-by-Bow North. Map updated accordingly as well as other applicable maps in the document.

120	LTGDC.	4.1 Land Use Principle	The image of the Bromley by Bow South Tesco scheme is incorrect and reflects the application as it was submitted as opposed to the consented scheme.	Recommendation endorsed. Image reference to the development application for the district centre has been deleted.
121	LTGDC	4.1 Land Use Principle	The “New District Centre” text at paragraph 4.1.2 should read “...the area will benefit from a new District Centre comprising a relocated food store and independent retail units, IDEA store or similar community use, primary school and open space, complemented by new housing, open space and access and public realm improvements”	Agree. Text updated accordingly.
122	LTGDC	4.1 Land Use Principle	The “New Primary and Secondary School” text should read “River Lea Navigation” instead of “towpath”.	Agree. Text updated accordingly.
123	LTGDC	4.1 Land Use Principle	The “Commercial Uses” text should refer to such uses fronting the A12 and being provided within the Bromley by Bow North and District Centre sites.	Agree. Text updated accordingly.
124	LTGDC	4.1 Land Use Principle	The “Residential Uses” text refers to residential uses being delivered within the district centre and oriented towards the River Lea Navigation.	Agree. Text updated accordingly.
125	DfL	4.2 Design Principles	The Design Principles section (4.2) is useful but could be developed in considerably more detail.	Agree. The Masterplan SPD is not prescriptive, but provides further detailed guidance to support the delivery of key sites. The design principles section provides a level of detail to ensure development respond to the key issues and opportunities. The design principles section has been further updated to strengthen the key opportunities and interventions for the key sites.
126	English Heritage	4.2 Design Principles	A different image is used on page 46, which is more reflective of the building heights established in the text.	Agree. Associated image caption has been updated to reference high quality design, rather than scale and massing.

127	English Heritage	4.2 Design Principles	Urban Grain and Architecture - For consistency with PPS5 the fourth bullet should include protection of heritage assets <i>and their settings</i> .	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly.
128	British Waterways	4.2 Design Principles	Urban Grain and Architecture - add "waterfront development design should start at the water to ensure it integrates with the waterway environment, and this is not just seen as the backdrop or setting for a development".	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly.
129	Environment Agency	4.2 Design Principles	Urban Grain and Architecture - It should be noted here that bedrooms should be set above the surface water and breach flood water level and buildings below these have a suitable higher level refuge area.	Agree.. Text has been updated to reinforce that building design, should response to floodrisk mitigation and management.
130	LandProp Holdings	4.2 Design Principles	Support the emphasis on improving the quality of the experience on the towpath.	Noted.
131	OPLC	4.2 Design Principles	The Waterfront - Support the aspirations for the river and making it as active as possible with a built edge with doors fronting it to activate it.	Noted.
132	Lee Valley Regional Park	4.2 Design Principles	The Waterfront - under 4th bullet replace with ' Development sites will be required to deliver a continuous walkway along the towpath, making it a safe and publicly accessible route together with an associated area of public green space to support the recreational use of the towpath'.	Agree. Text has been amended to reference development will be required to improve existing walkways, that are safe and publicly accessible, and where appropriate in agreement with British Waterways, provide new towpath opportunities.
133	British Waterways	4.2 Design Principles	The Waterfront - We would not support the statement requiring developments to provide a continuous walkway where this involves the creation of a new path. We would support contributions via works in kind etc towards managing and enhancing the existing towpath environment.	Agree. Text has been amended to reference development will be required to improve existing walkways, that are safe and publicly accessible, and where appropriate in agreement with British Waterways, provide new towpath opportunities.
134	British Waterways	4.2 Design Principles	The Waterfront - The water itself provides an excellent opportunity for other activities, including,	Agree. Text has been amended to encourage and enhance mooring facilities, floating

			moorings café boats, and gallery boats, puppet barges, the Floating Classroom and other visiting uses.	commercial vessels such as cafes and restaurants, floating classroom and other visiting uses.
135	British Waterways	4.2 Design Principles	The Waterfront - Include ref 'Buildings built up to the edge of the waterfront should make the best use of the waterside, and avoid blank facades and storage/refuse bins up against it. Where appropriate, opportunities for moorings should be explored'.	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly
136	Environment Agency	4.2 Design Principles	The Waterfront - Buildings should be set back from the river wall by a minimum of 8 metres to allow for future maintenance.	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly
137	Environment Agency	4.2 Design Principles	The Waterfront - "Proposals should ensure that the river walls are repaired or replaced to provide appropriate flood protection. Opportunities to set-back the flood defences and provide a softer river-edge should be incorporated where possible"	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly
138	Natural England	4.2 Design Principles	The Waterfront - Natural England welcomes the opportunities to enhance the biodiversity of the towpath and waterfront area, which can be used to provide a green chain for walking and cycling.	Noted.
139	Natural England	4.2 Design Principles	Public Realm - Natural England encourages the Council to include the provision of "soft" landscaping, where appropriate. This can help meet this objective together with contributing towards climate change mitigation/adaptation.	The Masterplan SPD already refers to the Green Grid Strategy which aims to improve and promote a greener borough by tree planting, soft landscaping etc. Developments within the area will be expected to meet the objectives established within the Green Grid Strategy.
140	Lee Valley Regional Park	4.2 Design Principles	Public Realm - Masterplan should provide guidance to ensure this new open space is designed and managed to enhance the setting of the adjoining heritage assets and promote entry onto Three Mills Island and into the Regional Park.	Agree. Title has been amended to "Public Realm and Open Space". Bullet point has been added to reference that new and improved open space should be designed and managed to enhance the setting of the adjoining heritage assets and links to surrounding open space.

141	TfL	4.2 Design Principles	Access - Reference to be made for the need to minimise car parking and vehicular trip generation and to and from any new development. This is particular important given the nature of the A12,	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly
142	LTGDC	4.2 Design Principles	A plan should be introduced which indicates proposed building heights on key sites. This should be informed by the Bromley by Bow Land Use and Design Brief.	Agree. Building height plan was developed, which reflect the principles set out in the Land Use and Design Brief. Further consultation undertaken
143	OPLC	4.2 Design Principles	Building Heights Scale and Massing - It is not necessary that buildings must step down to the water. We also feel taller buildings would be better located nearer the station taking a lead from the St Andrews development.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
144	English Heritage	4.2 Design Principles	Building Heights Scale and Massing - We welcome the provision of a section to manage building heights within the SPD area, and the checklist for development management.	Noted.
145	English Heritage	4.2 Design Principles	Building Heights Scale and Massing - We would wish to see a stronger, plan-led approach to tall buildings set out in this section.	Agree. Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
146	English Heritage	4.2 Design Principles	Building Heights Scale and Massing - Refer to English Heritage/CABE's Guidance on Tall Buildings (2007) as part of the checklist.	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly
147	DfL	4.2 Design Principles	Building Heights Scale and Massing - It should be made clear that taller buildings should be located closer to Bromley by Bow station and centre.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
148	DfL	4.2 Design Principles	Building Heights Scale and Massing - An indication of building heights would be useful.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new

				developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
149	Environment Agency	4.2 Design Principles	Housing Design - All proposals should be aiming for the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.	Agree.. Reference has been made to the Sustainable Homes requirement.
150	English Heritage	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Stroudley Walk - The opportunities outlined for taller buildings are not clearly detailed or justified. This should be made more explicit.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
151	English Heritage	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Stroudley Walk - New development should respect the setting of the listed building, rather than the listed building being integrated into new development.	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly
152	GLA	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Stroudley Walk - Include indicative retail floor spaces as per Core Strategy.	Noted. There are no specific floor space requirements for a neighbourhood centre. However, they typically contain a range of shops including essential uses that serve the local community. This has been reinforced within this section.
153	TfL	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Stroudley Walk - Development should contribute towards improved pedestrian crossing facilities at the junction of the A11 with Bromley High Street	Agree. Bromley High Street and A11 have been added as a key intervention project.
154	Poplar Harca	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Stroudley Walk - Support the principal of consolidating and reinforcing the Stroudley Walk neighbourhood centre.	Noted.
155	Poplar Harca	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Stroudley Walk - The proposed retail frontages should not be extended south (along the east and western side) to Arrow Road	The Council considers that an active frontage is essential to support the delivery of a vibrant local centre. The active frontage will be a natural surveillance for the area and proposed open green space.
156	Poplar Harca	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Stroudley Walk - Disagree that the proposed redevelopment should be generally two to four storeys to match the existing character.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new

				developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
157	Poplar Harca	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Stroudley Walk - The improvements to Bromley High Street should not be included within the Stroudley Walk site.	This section also takes into account surrounding implications to aid comprehensive delivery. Bromley High Street is considered a vital element to the delivery of Stroudley Walk.
158	Poplar Harca	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Stroudley Walk - The public footpath between Jolles House and Cobin House is shown as priority pedestrian route. This route is now a public garden. The Masterplan should show a footpath running to the west of Canterbury House.	Agree.. Map has been updated accordingly.
159	Resident	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Stroudley Walk - Do not agree with opening up Stroudley Walk to vehicles	The Masterplan SPD has considered options and opening up the street will create natural surveillance and deter anti-social behaviour. It will also add to the vibrancy of the area to create a welcoming neighbourhood. Traffic measures will be promoted to deter rat runners.
160	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway -The image of the Bromley by Bow South Tesco scheme is incorrect and reflects the application as it was submitted as opposed to the consented scheme.	Agree. Image reference to the development application for the district centre has been deleted.
161	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway -The plan needs to identify and emphasise the importance of the A12 All Movements Junction in providing pedestrian and cycle access across the road and releasing the development potential of this and the Bromley by Bow North site.	Agree. Map has been updated to reinforce A12 all movement junction.
162	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway - The Primary School legend needs to be amended as it currently identifies a design principle rather than identify the location of the school.	Agree. Legend has been updated accordingly.
163	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway - The key routes across Three Mills Park should be diagonal	Agree. The Plan has been updated accordingly.

			that meets the existing Three Mills bridge and the pedestrian routes across the A12 should be a straight-arm crossing as part of the planned All Movements Junction.	
164	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway - The All Movements Junction should be better identified on the plan.	Agree. The Plan has been updated accordingly.
165	English Heritage	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway - It would be useful to identify relevant heritage assets.	Agree. - Heritage assets have been identified on the plan.
166	English Heritage	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway - We question why no building heights are established for this site as they are, for example, for Stroudley Walk.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
167	Lee Valley Regional Park	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway - Authority supports detailed guidance which aims to improve the tube station subway.	Noted.
168	Lee Valley Regional Park	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway - How the new Three Mills park integrates with this route and the adjoining open spaces within the Regional Park is not clearly demonstrated.	Agree. The Masterplan SPD has been amended to acknowledge that new green spaces will be required to integrate with joining routes and open spaces to deliver green links. Guidance further set out in the Design Principle section.
169	GLA	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway - Include indicative retail floor spaces as per Core Strategy.	Agree. Indicative floorspace included.
170	British Waterways	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway - Paths appear to have been left outside of the development proposals. It appears to cut the sites off from the waterspace, failing to integrate the development with this valuable local asset.	Agree. Developments will be required to deliver and maintain new accessible towpaths which contribute toward public realm improvements and waterspace infrastructure. Text and map has been updated accordingly.
171	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	District Centre and Station Gateway – Some vehicle parking/drop off/pick up facilities will be necessary for the House Mill and Miller’s House to	This level of detail is not provided in the Masterplan SPD. Vehicle parking/drop off/pick up facilities will be further considered during the

			meet their full potential as a heritage and leisure destination and consideration should be given as to how this could be provided through new development.	proposal stage. The Masterplan SPD does provide guidance on access and key routes, which may influence appropriate locations for parking, drop, off/pick up facilities.
172	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley By Bow North - The potential to introduce pedestrian and crossing facilities as part of new junction along the A12 at Three Mill Lane and Devas Street/Twelvetrees Crescent should be clearly referenced.	Agree. Text updated accordingly.
173	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley By Bow North - The plan should identify Hancock Road and the towpath as the key north-south routes linking the District Centre with Sugar House Lane, the Olympic Park and planned improved pedestrian and cycle facilities at Bow flyover	Agree. Plan updated accordingly.
174	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley By Bow North - The plan and legend should emphasise the importance of placing an appropriate scale of built form, with residential entrances, along the River Lea Navigation edge and a residential typology within the site that creates a human scale and high quality public open and semi private amenity space.	Agree. Plan updated accordingly.
175	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley By Bow North - The pedestrian route across the A12 should be a straight-arm crossing as part of the planned All Movements Junction.	Agree. Plan updated accordingly.
176	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley By Bow North - A distinction should be made between the function of the northern and southern bridge crossings;	Agree. Plan updated accordingly.
177	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley By Bow North - The accompanying text (paragraph 4.3.6) should require new development to manage the transition in scale between the building sites in the area.	Agree. Text updated accordingly.
178	Environment	4.3 Guidance	Bromley By Bow North - Recommend a small area	The site will be expected to respond to floodrisk

	Agency	for Key Sites	of open space is included to ensure floodplain is preserved and ensure ground floor uses are limited to 'less vulnerable' classes such as commercial development.	mitigation and management through design. A number of principles are already identified within the section 3, to ensure developments achieve this.
179	Lee Valley Regional Park	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-by-Bow North - More detail is required to show how the towpath, integrates with new developments.	Agree. Masterplan SPD has been amended to ensure that development maintain an open and inviting public realm on the towpath, avoiding walls, fences or other divides between buildings and the waterfront.
180	DfL	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-by-Bow North - The quantity of routes throughout the site, do not demonstrate usable routes. - Stronger perimeter blocks would be more appropriate. - The route and new bridge linking the A12 to Sugarhouse lane should be straight. - The proposed footbridge further south within the site should be orientated and designed to link the major east-west routes within Sugar House Lane. - Crossing points around the A11/A12 junction should be as close to the junction as possible. - It is important to show the necessary link between the street and the towpath at the northern point of Bromley by Bow North. - This should show scope of building footprints.	Agree.. Amendments have been made to the map to reflect comments, including: reinforcing north-south connections; bridge locations; building footprints; and colour distinction for the towpath and subway.
181	OPLC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-by-Bow North - Crossings should be shown at Bow Interchange.	The Masterplan SPD already identifies possible pedestrian crossing at Bow Interchange.
182	East Thames and Southern Housing	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-by-Bow North - Objections raised to the route shown running in an east-west route from the A12 to the River through the middle section of the BbBN site. Given the close proximity of the other routes/connections and the proposed level of permeability through the application scheme, this	Agree.. The east-west pedestrian routes through Bromley by Bow north site have been updated. Specifically, the towpath and Hancock Road have been reinforced as key routes.

			route should be deleted	
183	East Thames and Southern Housing	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-by-Bow North - The 'key pedestrian routes' have been greatly expanded into three very wide corridors for 'new significant high quality green spaces' and tree planting linking the A12 to the River Lea. The word 'significant' should be deleted from the Key in relation to 'new high quality green spaces'.	Agree. The east-west pedestrian routes through Bromley by Bow north site have been updated. Specifically, the towpath and Hancock Road have been reinforced as key routes. The site is required to provide local open space to meet the population needs; this reference has been amended on the map.
184	East Thames and Southern Housing	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-by-Bow North - map to acknowledge the potential for an A3/A4 use to be located in the south east corner of the site adjacent to the River and tow path.	The Core Strategy and emerging Managing Development DPD town centre retail policies promote A3/A4 uses within a town centre boundary, to ensure retail uses outside the town centre do not detract from its role and function. Proposals promoting retail uses outside the town centre would need to meet the criteria set out in policy DM2 of the Managing Development DPD.
185	East Thames and Southern Housing	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-by-Bow North - The last bullet point of paragraph 4.3.6 should be amended to read "an indicative height of seven to 10 storeys adjacent to the A12 stepping down to four to six storeys alongside the waterfront with potential for some taller elements is broadly acceptable."	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
186	East Thames and Southern Housing	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-by-Bow North - BbBN will not be contributing to the provision and delivery of the bridge links. This should be made clear.	Agree. Reference has been made to safeguard of land to enable development through the Sugar House Lane development.
187	East Thames and Southern Housing	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-by-Bow North - The proposed pedestrian crossing at Talwin Street (item 3.1) no longer forms part of the All Movements Junction scheme and this should be deleted from paragraph 4.3.7 and from the table at Section 5.3	The Masterplan SPD provides guidance to illustrate potential crossings on the A12. Further work would be required beyond the Masterplan SPD to finalise the detail of the proposed all movement junction.
188	East	4.3 Guidance	Bromley-by-Bow North - The subway	Developments will be required to deliver or

	Thames and Southern Housing	for Key Sites	improvements (item 3.2) formed part of the S106 for the District Centre and will be implemented as a requirement of the delivery of that development. Accordingly, item 3.2 should be deleted from paragraph 4.3.7	contribute to the delivery of key projects to enable development and mitigate the impacts. Although projects maybe subject to existing S106, if these are not implemented, it may also be considered as part of other development coming forward.
189	English Heritage	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-By-Bow North - Identify relevant heritage assets on the map (for example, the Three Mills and Sugar House Lane conservation Areas) whose settings should be considered in development proposals.	Recommendation endorsed. Heritage assets have been identified on the plan.
190	River Lea Tidal Mill	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-By-Bow North - New waterside development in the vicinity of the House Mill should step down to 2-3 storeys to have regard to the building heights and open space.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
191	River Lea Tidal Mill	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-By-Bow North - A new waterside green space should be added on the north side of Three Mills Lane	The Masterplan SPD promotes the delivery of new green spaces in Bromley-by-Bow North.
192	TfL	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-By-Bow North - Consider how the proposed improvements across the A12 will be phased and delivered, and what alternative access strategy would be implemented should the all movement junction not be feasible.	Agree. Reference has been added to ensure developers demonstrate an alternative access strategy should the All Movement Junction not be implemented, and ensure that the phasing of development addresses accessibility and connectivity improvements.
193	British Waterways	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bromley-By-Bow North - Connections across the River Lea require maintenance, and can create overshadowing of the towpath and waterspace, hiding places and attract anti-social behaviour. We therefore resist this proposal without further information.	Noted. The Masterplan SPD sets out principles for delivering connections, such as safeguarding land, ensuring they integrate into development, and minimal impact on the waterspace environment. Further design development will be undertaken during the proposals stage for key sites.
194	British	4.3 Guidance	Bromley-By-Bow North - Bow Free Wharf is	Agree. Reference to Bow Wharf has been

	Waterways	for Key Sites	located at the north of the Masterplan boundary and is a vital wharf location for waterborne transport – the Masterplan should make reference to it.	identified on the map and the need to retain the use/access.
195	English Heritage	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - We question why no building heights are established for this site as they are, for example, for Stroudley Walk.	Building height plan has been further developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
196	English Heritage	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - Identify relevant heritage assets (for example, Twelvetreets Crescent bridge and the Limehouse Cut Conservation Area) whose settings should be considered in development proposals.	Agree. Heritage assets have been identified on the plan.
197	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - Greater emphasis on the principle of redeveloping the Bow Locks site with a secondary school to be predicated on improved pedestrian and cycle access.	Agree.. Accessibility principles have been reinforced to ensure access is a key priority for the redevelopment of the site.
198	LTGDC	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - The proposed river crossing linking Bow Locks and Sun Wharf is unexplained and appears redundant.	Agree.. The proposed bridge crossing has been deleted from the map.
199	British Waterways	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - This is a misleading name for this site, as the adjacent locks between Bow Creek and the River Lea/Limehouse Cut are also called Bow Locks	Agree.. Reference to the site has been amended to Bow Locks/Coventry Cross East.
200	British Waterways	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - We do not support the development of a Secondary school in this location, which cuts off the waterside and provides no interaction with the waterspace.	The Masterplan SPD promotes the site for a secondary school, in accordance with the Managing Development DPD and provides further design and access guidance to support the delivery of the site. Should a secondary school come forward, the Council will require new developments to adhere to the design principles set out within

				the Masterplan SPD and DM12 (Managing Development), to protect and enhance the setting of the waterways.
201	British Waterways	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - We do not generally support offside walkways where a towpath exists, and would request consideration be given to its maintenance including the management of anti-social behaviour and litter.	Agree. Text and map has been amended to acknowledge potential opportunity to deliver and maintain a key public space as part of the redevelopment.
202	GLA	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - The suitability of the school on Bow Locks is questionable. This needs to consider accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists in accordance with the Core Strategy and London Plan policies. The site is bounded by the A12 and the River Lea, which raises concerns of inclusive accessibility and inactive frontages on the towpath. Predicating the delivery of the site on improved crossings, raises the question of whether such a use is acceptable.	<p>The Core Strategy identifies Bromley-by-Bow as an area of search for a secondary school. The Managing Development DPD allocates Bow Locks for a secondary school, following a robust site selection process.</p> <p>The Masterplan SPD provides further design and access guidance, and specifically highlights the key interventions required to redevelop the site.</p>
203	GLA	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - The relationship between the proposed school and the permitted hotel needs to be carefully considered. TfL does not consider the provision of an at grade crossing at Twelve Trees Crescent feasible.	Noted. Text has been amended to highlight the need for all three key development sites to consider cumulative impacts on accessibility and use. The map has also been updated to reinforce this area requiring accessibility improvements, rather than referring to a crossing.
204	David Mc Cready (Landowner)	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - Boundary of school does not take in account private land ownership. Update boundary in accordance with submitted land registry map	<p>The Core Strategy identifies Bromley-by-Bow as an area of search for a secondary school. The Managing Development DPD allocates Bow Locks for a secondary school, following a robust site selection process.</p> <p>The Masterplan SPD further identifies this site in accordance Managing Development DPD.</p>

205	DfL	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - Bromley by Bow South site should not be labelled as appropriate for education until further studies into the accessibility of the site are conducted.	<p>The Core Strategy identifies Bromley-by-Bow as an area of search for a secondary school. The Managing Development DPD allocates Bow Locks for a secondary school, following a robust site selection process.</p> <p>The Masterplan SPD provides further design and access guidance, and specifically highlights the key interventions required to redevelop the site.</p>
206	DfL	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - Further studies into the accessibility of this site should be conducted before it is labelled as appropriate for education uses.	Previous detailed connectivity work has been undertaken in the area, which informed the proposed access interventions. Further investigation would be expected when developing a proposal for the site.
207	Poplar Harca	4.3 Guidance for Key Sites	Bow Locks - The use of Bow Locks as a school is not appropriate due to health and well being of students. Alternative sites should be considered, such as Empson Street or Coventry Cross West	<p>The Core Strategy identifies Bromley-by-Bow as an area of search for a secondary school. The Managing Development DPD allocates Bow Locks for a secondary school, following a robust site selection process.</p> <p>The Masterplan SPD provides further design and access guidance, and specifically highlights the key interventions required to redevelop the site.</p>
208	Poplar Harca	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Supports the principals of good design, however the document should be careful about being to prescriptive.	Noted.
209	East Thames and Southern Housing	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Fundamental Principles - High quality environment can be secured through various scheme options and through the use of a wide variety of materials and not just those that are identified within the draft document. This should be acknowledged.	Agree. Text has been updated to acknowledge that that suggested materials provide guidance. This does not limit innovation or the use of other high quality materials which can be demonstrated to meet the same design

				objectives.
210	OPLC	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Public Realm Background - The photos showing the different types of materials in the document should represent the types of material described.	Agree. Photos updated accordingly.
211	OPLC	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Public Realm Background - Natural Stone in all locations is not viable/affordable, suggest an appropriate affordable alternative as guidance.	Noted. The proposed of materials in this section should be applied as guidance. Other materials are welcomed if they achieve the key objectives to deliver high quality public realm.
212	River Lea Tidal Mill Trust	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Public Realm Background – Reference the need for an adequate local signage strategy.	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly.
213	Environment Agency	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Public Realm Background - The paving mentioned should be identified as preferably being permeable.	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly.
214	British Waterways	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Public Realm Background - Welcome enhancements where these do not hinder navigation or use of the towpath.	Noted.
215	Poplar Harca	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Special Place 1. The subway needs a full upgrade not a just a refurbishment option.	Improvements to the underpass are encouraged to be redeveloped as a part of the proposed District Centre and Bromley-by-Bow station.
216	Lee Valley Regional Park	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Special Place 2. Green spaces could be multifunctional, designed and managed to benefit biodiversity, flood management and leisure.	Agree. Text has been amended accordingly.
217	Lee Valley Regional Park	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Special Place 2. Green spaces by the river could also act as flood storage benefits and terracing for biodiversity.	Agree. Text has been amended accordingly.
218	Lee Valley Regional Park	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Special Place 3. Keen to see an active frontage along the waterside, to provide surveillance and support a sustainable and welcoming environment.	Agree. Text has been updated top promote opportunities for active frontage.
219	LTGDC	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Special Place 3. The towpath section should be strengthened to identify the need for new development to establish a positive relationship to	Agree. Section has been updated to reinforce the nature of development against the building edge.

			the River Lea Navigation.	
220	LTGDC	4.4 Public Realm Principles	Special Place 4. The A12 section should be strengthened to identify new at grade pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities provided as part of new junction arrangement at Three Mills Lane and Devas Street/Twelvetrees Crescent.	Agree. Section has been updated to reinforce crossing facilities on the A12.
221	British Waterways	4.5 Trees	River Environment - Trees should not be located close to the towpath, and should be appropriately contained so as not to cause root damage.	Agree. Reference has been included.
222	Thames Water	4.5 Trees	Recommend that trees are not planted on or adjacent to water or sewer mains, as they could damage the integrity of our mains.	Agree. Reference has been included.
223	LTGDC	5.1 Project Delivery	Need for a preferred phasing plan which promotes the redevelopment of the District Centre as a first phase, followed by the redevelopment of Bromley by Bow North, from south to north, as a second phase. Reference should also be made to the need for development to deliver or fund the timely provision of infrastructure required to meet the demands of new development.	Agree. Phasing guidance has been provided to ensure that development and supporting infrastructure are delivered in a comprehensive and phased manner.
224	LTGDC	5.1 Project Delivery	The "LTGDC tariff" (section 5.1.2) should read the "LTGDC Planning Obligations Community Benefit Strategy".	Agree. Text has been updated accordingly.
225	Poplar Harca	5.1 Project Delivery	Whilst some S106 should go towards the proposed public realm improvements, this should be considered in context with the application proposal	Noted. Reference has been updated to acknowledge that development will be considered in context to the impacts and mitigation measures.
226	Trad	5.1 Project Delivery	The Masterplan indicates that S106 contributions will be required from all development sites. It is entirely unreasonable for the Masterplan to make this assertion.	Noted. Text has been updated to clarify that where necessary, developments will be required to make S106 contributions to support the redevelopment of the site and mitigate the impacts.
227	TfL	5.1 Project	Masterplan needs to consider the phasing of key	Agree. Phasing guidance has been provided to

		Delivery	sites, particular Sugar House Lane.	ensure that development and supporting infrastructure are delivered in a comprehensive and phased manner.
228	Thames Water	5.1 Project Delivery	Reference within the document to phasing of development.	Agree. Phasing guidance provided to ensure that developments and supporting infrastructure are delivered in a comprehensive and phased manner.
229	OPLC	5.1 Project Delivery	The MDC statutory role has yet to be confirmed, and it is likely to have more of a similar role to the current role of the LTGDC with the addition of plan making powers. This section should be updated to reflect this.	Noted. Further information on the nature and proposed powers have been updated in this section.
230	OPLC	5.2 Key Partners	The MDCs statutory role has yet to be confirmed; therefore the current status should be reflected in the document.	Noted. Further information on the nature and proposed powers have been updated in this section.
231	British Waterways	5.2 Key Partners	BW is also a key partner in this area and should be involved in the delivery of the Masterplan.	Agree. British Waterways are now included as a key delivery partner.
232	TfL	5.2 Key Partners	Masterplan should reference TfL as the highway authority for the A12 and A11	Agree. Reference has been made within text.
233	DfL	5.3 Project Summary	It would be useful to indicate the prioritisation of projects.	The projects identified are linked to the key sites and prioritisation of the projects is dependent on the phasing for development.
234	Resident (former Cllr Abdul Sardar)	General Comments	The Masterplan should include more provision for local employment. Would like to see more independent retailers to support the local community.	Noted. The Masterplan SPD promotes two centres which will provide a range of retail unit sizes, and employment opportunities.
235	Councillor Helal Uddin	General Comments	Ensure the document promotes good connections, green spaces and employment opportunities.	Noted. These are the key objectives for the Masterplan SPD.
236	Councillor Khales Uddin Ahmed	General Comments	Agree with the main thrust of the document. In particular the need for community facilities such as youth, health and children's facilities in the area.	Noted.
237	GLA	General	A number of sites in the Masterplan SPD area	There are several key sites which are currently

		Comments	appear to be subject to current planning permission. Therefore the Masterplan has not been plan led, which has resulted in a Masterplan vision which is piecemeal and not comprehensive.	at different stages in the planning process, many of which require further detailed guidance, through an Masterplan SPD.
238	GLA	General Comments	If the Masterplan SPD precedes the Managing Development DPD, a question could be raised regarding process and planning guidance.	The Masterplan SPD promotes land uses consistent with the Managing Development DPD (MD DPD), which is currently progressing through the adoption approval process. At this stage the SPD only needs to have regard to the Core Strategy but once the MD DPD is adopted it would be appropriate to review the SPD to ensure that it is consistent. If inconsistencies arose it would be appropriate to amend the SPD as per the regulations.
239	GLA	General Comments	Consideration should be given to the East London Green Grid Framework SPD	The Masterplan makes reference to the Boroughs Green Grid Strategy, which is in accordance with the East London Green Grid SPD
240	GLA	General Comments	The SPD makes no reference or guidance concerning the delivery of climate change mitigation within the area and is devoid of any reference to sustainable design and construction methods expected on key sites.	Agree. Masterplan SPD has been updated to include section on sustainability.
241	London Gypsy and Traveller Unit	General Comments	The area is a good location for a Travellers site as it's within a reasonable distance to the existing Eleanor St. When considering residential development, the provision for Travellers sites should be included.	In accordance with the Planning policy for traveller sites (2012) the Managing Development DPD has taken due consideration of the surrounding densities of five potential sites. The provision of Traveller accommodation will be managed in accordance with Core Strategy and development management policies, specifically through the criteria set out in the Core Strategy (2010).
242	DfL	General	The absence of 3D representation misses an	Building height plan has been further

		Comments	opportunity to be clear about intentions of height and locations of taller buildings within Bromley-by-Bow.	developed for key sites within the area to manage the transition in scale between new developments and adjoining sites. Further consultation undertaken.
243	DfL	General Comments	The document could benefit from a drawing highlighting the key sites within the boundary and what the development potential for each site is.	The Guidance for Key Sites section has identified the key sites within the area with potential redevelopment opportunities.
244	Environment Agency	General Comments	A sequential approach is still required within the area in order to ensure residential areas are in the most appropriate location with regard to flood risk.	Agree. Requirement has been included in the new sustainability section.
245	Environment Agency	General Comments	There should be reference to green roofs which offer benefits to adapting to climate change as well as form an essential part of SuDS schemes.	Agree. Requirement has been included in the new sustainability section.
246	Environment Agency	General Comments	All new non household development, including refurbishments should also achieve a water efficiency standard of BREEAM 'excellent' this should be incorporated in this section.	Agree. Requirement has been included in the new sustainability section.
247	Circle Housing	General Comments	Supportive of the plans to improve connectivity across the A12 and to provide additional affordable housing in the area.	Noted.
248	Resident	General Comments	The proposal to introduce mixed use schemes, community facilities that are to replace the dilapidated industrial premises and to create new pedestrian and cycle routes, including improvements to the towpath along the River Lea are all view favourably.	Noted.

Table 2 – Further Consultation

No	Organisation	Representations	Response
1	English Heritage	The lack of an upper limit for tall buildings in the Stroudley Walk and the District Centre and Station Gateway areas could lead to inappropriately tall development. It would be useful to provide upper limits for the sites identified for 8+ storeys.	Recommendation endorsed. Upper limit has been set for Stroudley Walk and the Neighbourhood Centre.
2	English Heritage	In respect of Stroudley Walk, where it states 'opportunities exist for taller buildings', a cross-reference to the tall buildings plan would help clarify that a location has been identified for this taller element, and that it does not necessarily apply to the area as a whole.	Recommendation endorsed. Reference to opportunities has been removed.
3	David Mc Cready (Landowner)	Buildings to the West of Bow Locks be kept to a height of not more than 3 stories above existing ground level	The indicative heights proposed for the area are in relation to the scale and massing of existing buildings and wider context in terms of character and setting.
4	Natural England	Welcome the setting/massing of taller building heights away from the River Lee and Lee Valley.	Noted.
5	George Morgan	The zone shown for 7-8 storey and 8+ storey development immediately to the east of the A12 is in the wrong place. The proposed building height plan is too restrictive and is contrary to policies within the London Plan and the Core Strategy.	The building heights proposed in the plan are indicative and should be applied as a guidance. Development will also be expected to be assessed in relation to relevant guidance and policy contained within the Managing Development DPD.

6	TRAD (Landowner)	A more generic plan for building heights should be applied across the area. Specifically, height immediate adjacent to River Lea navigation should be 4-6 and the remaining land, including the Trad and Crowley site should be shown as capable of greater heights.	The building heights proposed in the plan are indicative and should be applied as a guidance. Development will also be expected to be assessed in relation to relevant guidance and policy contained within the Managing Development DPD.
7	Lee Valley Park	An additional bullet point should also be added in the section stating: "Appropriate response to the context of the waterside environment." It would also be helpful if the difference in the colour of the shading used could be made more obvious.	Reference to the relationship and treatments of buildings and the waterways are already detailed in the design principles guidance. The colours to differentiate the proposed building heights have been made stronger for clarity.
8	Big Yellow Storage (Landowner)	Amend to show height ranges consistent with that shown in the submitted East Thames and Southern application and the approved Tesco application. It may also be appropriate to have an interim range between the two height ranges shown across the application site, which recognises that it may be appropriate for building heights to step down from the A12 to the river and from the centre of the site towards the north-east corner of the site. It should be made clear that the heights shown on the building heights plan are indicative only and that higher buildings may be appropriate where they can be justified by design and access statements, the existing context and PTAL ratings.	The building heights proposed in the plan are indicative and should be applied as a guidance. Development will also be expected to be assessed in relation to relevant guidance and policy contained within the Managing Development DPD.
9	Environment Agency	We suggest an additional bullet point for the checklist highlighted to read: Protection and enhancement of ecological value along the watercourse	Reference to the ecological value along the watercourse is already detailed in the design principles guidance.

10	GLA	Lower heights towards the waterfront is welcomed, however, the height thresholds set out should accord to the building heights identified in the emerging OAPF.	The building heights proposed in the plan are indicative and should be applied as a guidance. Development will also be expected to be assessed in relation to relevant guidance and policy contained within the Managing Development DPD and OAPF.
11	GLA	Justification for height parameter of 8+, which could lead to very tall buildings.	Agree. There is now an upper limits threshold for 8+ sites, to manage the building heights in the area.
12	GLA	It would be useful if the building height plan gave an indication on the existing heights in the area, and also give indicative heights for the whole of the area, not only the key sites identified.	Existing heights for the area have already been identified in chapter three. The proposed indicative heights have only been considered for the key sites in the area, as they require additional guidance to coordinate delivery. The Managing Development DPD also includes a policy on building heights which all proposals will need to have regard to.