

## Consultation Representation Summary: Bromley-by-Bow Land Use and Design Brief

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| General Public   |                           |  |   |                   |
| 00020 / 0001     | Support                   | Having a primary school healthcare and open space is good.   | Noted   | No change         |
| 00042 / 0011     | Not Stated                | Development should not only require to 'Achieve a minimum Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4' (page 19), but also aspire to meet level 5 or 6. All government funded housing sites are expected to exceed this level by 2010 and reach Code level 6 by 2013. | The 13th bullet point of section 6.0 refers to the need for new development to achieve a MINIMUM Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and BREEAM Excellent standards. This is in accordance with LBTH Interim Planning Guidance.  | No change         |
| 00016 / 0001     | Not Stated                | Access is prime importance to the success of the community hub Provide low level access by covering over section of motorway. . Site should connect with Bow Lock development.   | The proposed building heights are informed by a size and mass that creates an appropriate design response to the development constraints and opportunities of the site.<br><br>The Brief states that building height "should be" a proposed height and the diagram in section 5.4, identifies heights as "indicative". The acceptability of high rise housing will be further tested in terms of townscape and amenity impact and design quality at planning application stage. | No change         |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| 00015 /0003      | Not Stated                | Proposal should link the public space elements - shops, green areas, school etc.  | Section 5 of the Brief identifies urban design guidelines that new developments will be expected to achieve. Development will be required to achieve a layout of routes, streets and spaces of a high quality public realm which contributes to the creation of a successful new centre.  | No change         |
| 00019 /0003      | Not Stated                | Low density housing should be no more than 2 levels; higher density housing no more than 5 levels. Development should be built with character inline with the Heritage area and not a concrete jungle i.e. St Andrew's. | The height of new buildings will be expected to establish a positive relationship with the character and quality of the surrounding built and natural environment. The proposed heights in the Brief are indicative and to be used as guidance by developers.   | No change         |
| 00022 / 0001     | Not Stated                | Bus services improvements and access to the site should be included   | The Brief promotes the introduction of a new bus route that will serve new development directly and have the potential to be extended across the A12 to improve connections between communities either side of the A12. The LTGDC has commissioned the Bromley-by-Bow Station Improvement and Integration Study to consider the feasibility of a bus route crossing the A12 via a widened subway adjacent to the station. | No change         |

| <b>Representer Ref:</b> | <b>Nature of Representation:</b> | <b>Representation Summary:</b>  | <b>Response:</b>   | <b>Changes to Brief:</b> |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| <b>00019 /0002</b>      | Not Stated                       | The draft Brief will redevelop derelict sites and provide; potential for local retail; improved connections; station improvements; safer access to station and; safer canal routes. | In accordance with the Brief.  | No change                |
| <b>00021 /0001</b>      | Not Stated                       | More play areas; good access to the site; security /CCTV in the underpass.  | Development will be required to provide different types of well located, designed and usable amenity space, including private, semi-private and public open space and children's play space. The precise location, size and design of amenity space will be developed at planning application stage.<br><br>The Brief sets out a number of actions to address accessibility to and from the site including planned improvements to the existing underpasses. | No change                |
| <b>00036 / 0002</b>     | Not Stated                       | New developments will increase in noise levels in the site.   | The noise generated by new development will be assessed at detailed planning application.  | No change                |
| <b>00013 / 0001</b>     | Not Stated                       | The plans for the site should marry with the plans in London Borough of Newham.   | LBTH now has a regular update with LB Newham to ensure plans for each Borough are integrated. The LTGDC has commissioned the Sugar House Lane and Three Mills Masterplan and will seek to ensure compatibility between both policy documents.  | No change                |
| <b>00011 / 0001</b>     | Not Stated                       | All looks very positive - especially a new school. I would like to see the more provisions youths, café's, restaurants and cinema.  | The Brief requires redevelopment to provide a mix of retail,   | No change                |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
|                  |                           |   | commercial and community uses that would be characteristic of, and function as, a new centre for Bromley-by-Bow.   |   |
| 00008 /0001      | Support                   | The proposals for a new school and shopping facilities will benefit the area.   | Noted  | No change   |
| 00007 / 0001     | Not Stated                | Some information relating to other plans e.g. Tesco and St Andrews would have been useful.  | In the document, section 1.2 'Context' and the associated diagram identify other major development sites in Bromley-by-Bow, including St Andrews Hospital and Sugar House Lane. While the Brief relates specifically to the Imperial Street, Hancock Road and Three Mills Lane site, new development is required to integrate with existing, consented and planned surrounding development.  | No change   |
| 00006 / 0001     | Not Stated                | It is a restricted site to include the ideas suggested. There is an emphasis on improving access to the area and open space provision. However, will this be enough to encourage parents to put their children in a primary school east of the A12? | <p>Major interventions to the A12 are required to address its barrier effect and improve pedestrian, cyclist and public transport accessibility between existing communities and new development.</p> <p>This could involve the creation of a grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment. The Council is committed to working</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|
|                  |                           |   | with landowners, developers, the LTGDC and Transport for London to explore the feasibility of achieving this objective.   | will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following”<br>The following will replace the eighth bullet point;<br><br>“A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment.” |
| 00012 / 0001     | Not Stated                | Principles are ok, but a community hub? Need to remove barriers e.g. A12 and railway.   |   |   |
| 00014 / 0001     | Not Stated                | The density of the housing is too high; the max number of stories on the waterfront should be 2; max numbers of stories else where on the site should be 5.<br><br>The site should not be overdeveloped and lose its character. The Brief should provide an overall picture of what is happening in surrounding areas i.e. Sugar House Lane; St Andrews. These sites will have high density housing; keep this area low to add value to the area. | It is agreed that the site should not be overdeveloped. The storey heights proposed in the Brief are indicative and should be used as guidance.<br><br>In the document, section 1.2 “Context” and the associated diagram identify other major development sites in Bromley-by-Bow, including St Andrews Hospital and Sugar House Lane. While the Land Use and Urban Design Guidelines relate specifically to the Imperial Street, | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
|                  |                           |  | <p>Hancock Road and Three Mills Lane site, new development is required to integrate with existing, consented and planned surrounding development.</p>   |   |
| 00018 /0001      | Not Stated                | <p>If you are going to make this a community hub you have to improve pedestrian access over the tunnel approach with a green bridge that invites you across to the site.</p> | <p>Major interventions to the A12 could address its barrier effect and improve pedestrian, cyclist and public transport accessibility between existing communities and new development.</p> <p>This could involve the creation of a grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment.. The Council is committed to working with landowners, developers, the LTGDC and Transport for London to explore the feasibility of achieving this objective.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:"</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point</p> <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:                               | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| 00005 / 0001     | Not Stated                | Access to the site via bridge not an underpass/subway | <p>The redevelopment of the site will be expected to deliver major improvements to pedestrian accessibility into and out of the site. New development will be expected to deliver design solutions that contribute to and deliver this objective. New development will be required to contribute to or deliver improvements to the existing subways and/or the creation of a grade separated A12 junction across the A12, that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment.</p> | <p>quality urban environment."</p> <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:"</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point</p> <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| 00019 /0001      | Not Stated                | Proposal will result in; increased crime; congested major roads; high density housing; views lost from Island Hse; Heritage site feel lost; urban views/feeling lost; increased volume of traffic/people/lorries/buses.   | <p>The Brief promotes a type and shape of development that would provide high quality and safe public spaces; high quality and appropriate designed housing, development that responds to the constraints and opportunities of the site and development that preserves and enhances the setting of the Three Mills Conservation Area and its listed buildings.</p> <p>Any potential impact of an increase in traffic/people/lorries/buses would be considered in detail at planning application stage.</p> | No change         |
| 00004 / 0003     | Not Stated                | The area needs community facilities where you can praise the community for their efforts and projects to help the community and future generations.   | The Brief requires development to include a new primary school that provides flexible space for out-of-hours healthcare and community use.   | No change         |
| 00026 /0002      | Not Stated                | All plans should account for the continuous back-up of traffic on the A12 towards the Blackwall Tunnel, i.e. there is particularly limited entrance/exit to the Hancock Lane site most weekdays. The site should be provided with 1 direct link to the Twelve Tress Crescent / Devas Road to give some flexibility in terms of using local roads & avoiding the A12 for when higher density uses are adopted. | More detailed work is needed to address the impact of the A12. LTGDC has commissioned the A12 Transport Capacity and Access Study to consider the cumulative trip generation impact on operation of the A12 and develop a corridor-based strategy, mitigation and measures for addressing this impact that focuses on improving pedestrian/cycle/public transport and public realm/environmental improvements.   | No change.        |



| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 00019 / 0004     | Not Stated                | Bigger station to accommodate for the increased population in the area; improvements to the Blackwall Tunnel and A12 must be provided. | <p data-bbox="1240 201 1648 416">Major interventions to the A12 are required to address its barrier effect and improve pedestrian, cyclist and public transport accessibility between existing communities and new development.</p> <p data-bbox="1240 448 1648 815">This could involve the creation of a grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment.. The Council is committed to working with landowners, developers and the LTGDC and Transport for London to explore the feasibility of achieving this objective.</p> <p data-bbox="1240 847 1648 1398">LTGDC has commissioned (1) Bromley-by-Bow Station Improvement and Integration Study, a further piece of work to consider options for improving station capacity and accessibility and (2) the A12 Transport Capacity and Access Study to consider the cumulative trip generation impact on operation of the A12 and develop a corridor-based strategy, mitigation and measures for addressing this impact that focuses on improving pedestrian/cycle/public transport accessibility and public realm/environmental improvements.</p> | <p data-bbox="1682 201 2040 504">It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p data-bbox="1682 536 2040 632">It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p data-bbox="1682 663 2040 935">"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:"</p> <p data-bbox="1682 967 2040 1031">The following will replace the eighth bullet point.</p> <p data-bbox="1682 1062 2040 1278">"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| 00036 /0001      | Not Stated                | Any development on the opposite side of the canal would be looking directly into apartments with only the narrow waterway between; this is particularly sensitive as many of the windows facing the canal are bedrooms. Developments for a school and low level housing above should be developed a good distance from the canal. | At planning application stage, developers will be required to demonstrate that proposals will not have a significant impact on the amenity of existing and proposed residents in terms of privacy, outlook and sense of enclosure.   | No change         |
| 00002 / 0002     | Not Stated                | Services for the community need to be well thought out, coordinated, compliment and add to existing services not duplicate them.  | The new centre is proposed to be anchored by a new supermarket and include shopping facilities, a primary school, an out of hours healthcare facility and open space. The LBTH Interim Planning Guidance (Leaside Area Action Plan) and Draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan establish these objectives by identifying the site for mixed-use development to include a new neighbourhood centre comprising new retail, a primary school and open space. The design of and requirement for new community facilities will be developed at planning application stage. | No change         |
| 00020 / 0002     | Not Stated                | If private gardens are not possible, a children friendly communal garden is needed. You can improve teenager's environment in with an open area and make it a space of their own, they will respect the area which may deter vandalism.   | Development will be required to provide different types of well located, designed and usable amenity space, including private, semi-private and public open space and children's play space. The precise location, size and design of amenity space will be developed at planning application stage.   | No change         |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 00027 /0001      | Not Stated                | The proposals do not fulfil the aspiration for community services as the only community provision seems to be a school, shops and a health centre. There is clearly an absolute need that the youth of an area are catered for and put at the centre of community provision. | Noted. It is accepted that redevelopment of the site will require new community facilities.  | It is recommended that the sixth bullet point at Section 4.5 be amended to read:<br><br>'provide publicly accessible out-of-hours community space'   |
| 00002 / 0001     | Not Stated                | Need to ensure that access to and from the site is realistic.  | The Brief includes proposals to ensure redevelopment of the site achieves integration with its surroundings. LTGDC and LBTH are in discussions with Transport for London to achieve a comprehensive solution to address the severance and environmental impacts of the A12. It is accepted that major interventions to the A12, to enable improved east west movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, are necessary to address the existing barrier effect of the A12 and achieve integration between existing and new communities. This could involve the creation of a grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment. | It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.<br><br>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:<br><br>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:<br><br>The following will replace the eighth bullet point;<br><br>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:                        | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 00009 /0001      | Not Stated                | Need a bridge over the motorway for old people | <p>It is agreed that major interventions to the A12 are required to address its barrier effect and improve pedestrian, cyclist and public transport accessibility between existing communities and new development.</p> <p>This could involve the creation of a grade separated A12 junction. The Council is committed to working with landowners, developers, the LTGDC and Transport for London to explore the feasibility of achieving this objective.</p> | <p>movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> <hr/> <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:"</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point:</p> <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| 00026 / 0001     | Not Stated                | S2 bus route has been pulled from service, cutting off the area further. The redevelopment of the area should provide a bus route through the site.   | The Brief promotes the introduction of a new bus route that will serve new development directly and have the potential to be extended across the A12 to improve connections between communities either side of the A12. The LTGDC has commissioned the Bromley-by-Bow Station Improvement and Integration Study to consider the feasibility of a bus route crossing the A12 via a widened subway adjacent to the station.  | No change.   |
| 00003 / 0001     | Not Stated                | The subways are dangerous. New alternatives to improve safety and security are paramount to the success of the community. Transportation links and accessibility within the local area need major improvements. | The redevelopment of the site will be expected to deliver major improvements to pedestrian accessibility into and out of the site. New development will be expected to deliver design solutions that contribute to and meet this objective. New development will be required to contribute to or deliver improvements to the existing subways and/or the creation of a grade separated A12 junction across the A12, that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment.. | <p>t is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following;"</p> |

| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
|                     |                           |  |   | The following will replace the eighth bullet point;   |
|                     |                           |  |   | “ A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment.” |
| <b>00004 / 0004</b> | Not Stated                | Bromley-by-Bow Station is not in a good position and crossing the road is dangerous.   | Access to Bromley-by-Bow station from the east is reliant on the use of a pavement alongside, and subway under, the A12. The Brief requires this subway, and its eastern approach, to be enlarged and enhanced to create an improved pedestrian environment.                      | No change   |
| <b>00004 / 0005</b> | Not Stated                | This area is not far from Stratford and we will be attracting more tourists in the area. This should be a catalyst for growth and physical regeneration.   | The Brief acknowledges that Bromley-by-Bow is located within the Lower Lea Valley and is an area identified for significant physical and economic regeneration related to, and including, the Olympic and Paralympics Games, Stratford City, Canning Town and the Lea River Park. | No change   |
| <b>00026 / 0003</b> | Object                    | Hotel is not supported. It will generate yet more traffic through the area given proximity to City airport, A12, A11) and because potentially a low-grade hotel will de-stabilise the proposed family areas. | The Brief outlines the potential for redevelopment to include other commercial uses which could contribute to the creation of a new town centre. The hotel is   | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
|                  |                           |  | identified as an example of a commercial use that could be accommodate in a tall building and provide an active ground floor.   |  |
| 00004 /0001      | Support                   | In support of new shops and a neighbourhood centre which provides local activities, jobs and volunteering jobs for the youth.  | Support welcomed  | No change  |
| 00001/ 0001      | Not Stated                | Not clear whether the provision of open space is based on the replacement or new open space  | Noted   | <p>There is currently no open space provision on the site, although there is within the Masterplan. As detailed in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Interim Planning Guidance (Leaside Area Action Plan and draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan), development will be required to provide a minimum of 1.2 hectares of open space. This requirement is set out in the Brief</p> <p>Open space provision will also be expected to be also allocated on a site by site basis. Planning applications will be based in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets existing policy.</p> |
| 00026 / 0004     | Not Stated                | The site will be competing with a number of existing and new developments in the area. There is the potential for a retail park proposed by Lendlease closer to the Olympic site. This could leave the retail space in 3 Mills dominated by Tesco's. The draft Brief should encourage other more "social" shops e.g. a post office? a dentist? Or more "specialist" shops / or a farmer's market to adjoin the craft market? An "eco" riverside restaurant | The Brief promotes the creation of a new town centre anchored by a relocated supermarket and including small retail units that would be characteristic of, and function as, a new town centre | <p>It is recommended that the first two paragraphs of section 4.1 be amended to read:</p> <p>The site will be redeveloped to provide a new town centre, accessed from the west by</p>  |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:                               | Response: | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|-----------|---|
|                  |                           | to act as a "draw" for the area in its unique design? |           | <p>improved subways and/or a potential new pedestrian, cycle and vehicular junction across the A12, and comprising a relocated supermarket, independent retail units, a new primary school and open space that are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. The new centre will provide a mix of uses within a high quality pedestrian environment that will provide a destination for existing and future communities on foot, bicycle or public transport. The new centre will be located at the southern end of the site to benefit from close proximity to Bromley-by-Bow Station and an upgraded existing A12 subway.</p> <p>The new town centre will be expected to accommodate an appropriate amount and type of retail floorspace to meet the need, demand and capacity of its existing and future catchment area in accordance with the relevant tests set out in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. The new town centre will be expected to complement the existing retail hierarchy and be capable of operating as a centre without having a detrimental impact on other existing or future town centres.”</p> |



| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| 00015 / 0005     | Not Stated                | Retail - small independent shops will get people coming from other areas (as river/canal side also attractive).  | Noted. The Brief promotes the creation of a new town centre anchored by a relocated supermarket and including small retail units that would be characteristic of, and function as, a new centre.  | No change         |
| 00020 / 0001     | Support                   | Having a primary school healthcare and open space is good.   | Noted   | No change         |
| 00016 / 0001     | Not Stated                | Access is prime importance to the success of the community hub Provide low level access by covering over section of motorway. Site should connect with Bow Lock development. | The proposed building heights are informed by a size and mass that creates an appropriate design response to the development constraints and opportunities of the site.<br><br>The Brief states that building height "should be" a proposed height and the diagram in section 5.4, identifies heights as "indicative". The acceptability of high rise housing will be further tested in terms of townscape and amenity impact and design quality at planning application stage. | No change         |
| 00004 / 0002     | Not Stated                | Would like to see more views and walks on the River Lea,   | The Brief proposes a form of development that creates views of, and extends the tow path along, the River Lea Navigation.   | No change         |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:                 | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| 00015 / 0004     | Not Stated                | Need better and safer transport access. | <p>Comprehensive and sustainable redevelopment will require better and safe access to and from new development within the site.</p> <p>Major interventions to the A12 are required to address its barrier effect and improve pedestrian, cyclist and public transport accessibility between existing communities and new development. The Brief includes the provision of a new bus route which will feed into the site and new neighbourhood street.</p> <p>LTGDC has commissioned (1) Bromley-by-Bow Station Improvement and Integration Study, a further piece of work, to consider options for improving station capacity and accessibility and (2) the A12 Transport Capacity and Access Study to consider the cumulative trip generation impact on operation of the A12 and develop a corridor-based strategy, mitigation and measures, for addressing this impact that focuses on improving pedestrian/cycle/public transport accessibility and public realm/environmental improvements.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point;</p> <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| 00005 /0002      | Not Stated                | Who will fund the community facilities?  | The primary school, open space and physical infrastructure improvements will be funded by value created by redevelopment of the site. The LTGDC will use its Planning Obligations Community Benefits Strategy to require developers to safeguard land, fund and/or deliver these requirements. Developers will be required to work with LBTH, LTGDC and other public sector agencies to facilitate the delivery of the community facilities. | No change         |
| 00015 / 0006     | Object                    | Not supportive of high rise housing.   | Noted. The Brief promotes the creation of a new town centre anchored by a relocated supermarket and including small retail units that would be characteristic of, and function as, a new centre.   | No change         |
| 00015 / 0002     | Not Stated                | The river should be accessible. The opportunity to link high quality, waterside and historic setting should be maintained. | The Brief proposes improved access to and along the River Lea Navigation and a type and form of development that seeks to preserve and enhance of the setting of the Three Mills Conservation Area and its Listed Buildings.   | No change         |

| <b>Representer Ref:</b> | <b>Nature of Representation:</b> | <b>Representation Summary:</b>   | <b>Response:</b>  | <b>Changes to Brief:</b> |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| <b>00015 / 0001</b>     | Not Stated                       | Strong consideration of landscaping towards the river and Heritage site needs to be maintained.        | The Brief proposes a type and form of development that seeks to preserve and enhance of the setting of the Three Mills Conservation Area and its Listed Buildings. Landscaping proposals will be developed at the planning application stage.   | No change                |
| <b>00036 / 0003</b>     | Not Stated                       | Three Mill Lane approach to the Island and the proposed green space should be well lit and maintained. | The Brief requires the careful management of new open space to ensure that it is well maintained and of maximum benefit. Development proposals will be expected to indicate how the open space will be managed and maintained. The open space will be designed at planning application stage. | No change                |
| <b>00036 / 0004</b>     | Not Stated                       | Car traffic could be deterred from the immediate area  | Section 5.8 of the Brief seeks to reduce the impact of vehicle movements on the quality of the environment and prioritise pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements. The proposed circulation strategy seeks to limit the extent to which vehicles enter the site.                     | No change                |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| 00026 /0005      | Not Stated                | The plans include some "levy" system for developers to encourage "community funding" e.g. for open spaces & to restore and then preserve the Mill House & Clock House itself. | Development will be required to make appropriate financial and in kind contributions towards the provision of community and physical infrastructure required supporting, and mitigating the impact of, the type and quantum of development proposed in the Brief. These contributions will be secured through Section 106 Agreements. The level of financial and in kind contributions will be based on the requirements of the LTGDC Planning Obligations Community Benefit Strategy. | <p>It is recommended that paragraphs 1-3 of Section 7 be amended to read:</p> <p>Development will be required to make appropriate financial and in kind contributions towards the provision of physical infrastructure and community facilities required to mitigate the impact of the type and density of development proposed in the Brief. These contributions will be secured by S106 Agreement in accordance with the LTGDC's Planning Obligations Community Benefit Strategy (POCBS).</p> <p>The POCBS requires payment of a standard charge of £22,600 per residential unit towards the infrastructure needs in the Lower Lea Valley. Developers will be required to enter into S106 Agreements that will require new development to contribute a discounted standard charge of £10,000 per unit and include mechanisms to secure deferred charge payments up to £22,600 per residential unit in the event that realised sales values increase above a previously agreed baseline.</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response: | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|-----------|-------------------|
| 00026 / 0006     | Not Stated                | Alternatively, instead of using a 2006 report, its recommended to use the MET's new on-line crime maps perhaps?   | Noted     | No change         |
| 00026 /0007      | Support                   | Agree that plans for open spaces need to include ideas on ongoing funding and that developers need to show awareness of security issues in their plans. | Noted     | No change         |

| Representer Ref:     | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief: |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| <b>Public Sector</b> |                           |  |   |                   |
| 00025/0001           |                           | No specific comments   |   |                   |
| 00034 / 0012         | Not Stated                | There is a lack of comprehensive design guidelines provided throughout the document, though the document does given some basic illustrative examples of best practice. This document should be used to provide a more comprehensive guide to   | The purpose of the Brief is to provide guidance on what is considered to be an acceptable type and form of development. The Brief provides a level of guidance that enable developers and landowners to understand what is considered to be an appropriate land use arrangement and building form and height across the site. Scheme designs will be worked up at planning application stage. | No change         |
| 00034 / 0006         | Support                   | Support the proposed commercial/business adjacent to the side of the A12 as a way of shielding the residential development on the waterfront from the A12.   | Support welcomed  | No change         |
| 00034 / 0001         | Support                   | We support the proposal that new development must not be piecemeal but that the area should be developed as a whole. We also agree that comprehensive development at Bromley-by-Bow should not create an isolated, self sufficient community; rather one that benefits from much improved east-west connections. | Noted   | No change         |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| 00034 / 0004     | Not Stated                | <p>Breaking the A12 barrier plays an important part in connecting the new community to existing opportunities and vice versa. The brief recognises this but needs to go further to provide opportunities to solve the problem in partnership with bodies such as TfL.</p> | <p>The Brief sets out a number of proposals to address the site's integration with its surroundings. LTGDC and LBTH are in discussions with Transport for London to achieve a comprehensive solution to address the severance and environmental impacts of the A12.</p>   | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> |
|                  |                           |   | <p>It is accepted that major interventions to the A12, to enable improved east west movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, are required to address the barrier effect the A12 and achieve integration between existing and new communities. This could involve the creation of a grade separated A12 junction.</p>   | <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p>   |
|                  |                           |   | <p>LTGDC has commissioned (1) Bromley-by-Bow Station Improvement and Integration Study, a further piece of work to consider options for improving station capacity and accessibility, including bus interchange and (2) the A12 Transport Capacity and Access Study to consider the cumulative trip generation impact on operation of the A12 and develop a corridor-based strategy, mitigation and measures for addressing this impact that focuses on improving pedestrian/cycle/public transport accessibility and public realm/environmental.</p> | <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:"</p>      |
|                  |                           |   |   | <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point;</p>   |
|                  |                           |   |   | <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p>  |



| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| 00034 /0002      | Not Stated                | The Brief should go much further to show the huge opportunity there is for Bromley-by-Bow underground station to play a significant part in integrating the site across the A12. It is important that the outcome of this work informs the final Land Use and Design Brief.       | <p>The Brief requires redevelopment of the site to improve the existing subway adjacent to Bromley-by-Bow Station to facilitate pedestrian access to and from the station and movement across the A12.</p> <p>The LTGDC has commissioned the Bromley-by-Bow Station Improvement and Integration Study to consider the feasibility of options for improving station capacity and accessibility.</p> | No change         |
| 00034 / 0003     | Not Stated                | Development proposals being brought forward on a scale that can generate sufficient income to deliver the major infrastructure improvements necessary whilst contributing to the vibrancy that this waterfront location requires.   | Noted  | No change         |
| 00034/ 0005      | Support                   | The Brief does little to provide examples of the appropriate development that may be sensitive to the surrounding environment. There is a huge opportunity to transform the quality of the environment including realising the potential of the areas historic waterways network. | The Brief identifies a set of design guidelines that seek to promote a form of development that will be sensitive to the surrounding built and natural environment.  | No change         |
| 00034 / 0011     | Support                   | We support the proposals particularly the suggested linear green spaces network along the waterfront with a mix of private and public open spaces.  | Support welcomed   | No change         |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| 00034 /0010      | Not Stated                | The scale of retail and community uses, whilst desirable, will need the population base and connectivity to support them. It is part of Poplar HARCA's ambitions for the wider regeneration of the area to have new services particularly fostering education and healthcare. | Noted. The precise amount and type of industrial/commercial floorspace will be determined at planning application stage. | <p data-bbox="1682 161 2047 252">It is recommended that the first two paragraphs of section 4.1 be amended to read:</p> <p data-bbox="1682 284 2047 1086">"The site will be redeveloped to provide a new centre, accessed from the west by improved subways and/or a potential new pedestrian, cycle and vehicular junction across the A12, and comprising a relocated supermarket, independent retail units, a new primary school and open space that are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. The new centre will provide a mix of uses within a high quality pedestrian environment that will provide a destination for existing and future communities on foot, bicycle or public transport. The new centre will be located at the southern end of the site to benefit from close proximity to Bromley-by-Bow Station and an upgraded existing A12 subway.</p> <p data-bbox="1682 1118 2047 1455">The new town centre will be expected to accommodate an appropriate amount and type of retail floorspace to meet the need, demand and capacity of its existing and future catchment area in accordance with the relevant tests set out in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. The new town centre will be expected to</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| 00034/0009       | Support                   | We support the provision for Industry. It remains to be seen which types of commercial/industrial services remain or are attracted to the site and how these will operate alongside family and non-family housing.                      | Noted. The precise amount and type of industrial/commercial floorspace will be determined at planning application stage.   | complement the existing retail hierarchy and be capable of operating as a district centre without having a detrimental impact on other existing or future town centres.”<br><br>It is recommended that the first paragraph (second sentence) of section 4.3 be amended to read:<br><br>"The LLVOAPF requires the redevelopment of land north of Three Mills Lane to incur no net loss of industrial capacity. Industrial capacity is defined as the overall space comprising internal floor areas and all functional external areas. The existing industrial capacity of these sites is 22,500sqm. New development will be expected to target a replacement industrial capacity unless an assessment of market demand and development viability justifies a reduction in industrial capacity." |
| 00034 / 0007     | Support                   | Generally support the retail proposals in the draft Brief. There are plans for the redevelopment of the neighbourhood retail centre at Stroudley Walk. New retail provision should not compete with this existing neighbourhood centre. | The Brief promotes the creation of a new town centre anchored by a relocated supermarket and including small retail units that would be characteristic of, and function as, a new district centre without having a detrimental impact on existing centres. | It is recommended that the first two paragraphs of section 4.1 be amended to read:<br><br>"The site will be redeveloped to provide a new centre, accessed from the west by improved subways and/or a   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary: | Response: | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|--|
|                  |                           |                         |           | <p>potential new pedestrian, cycle and vehicular junction across the A12, and comprising a relocated supermarket, independent retail units, a new primary school and open space that are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. The new centre will provide a mix of uses within a high quality pedestrian environment that will provide a destination for existing and future communities on foot, bicycle or public transport. The new centre will be located at the southern end of the site to benefit from close proximity to Bromley-by-Bow Station and an upgraded existing A12 subway.</p> <p>The new town centre will be expected to accommodate an appropriate amount and type of retail floorspace to meet the need, demand and capacity of its existing and future catchment area in accordance with the relevant tests set out in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. The new town centre will be expected to complement the existing retail hierarchy and be capable of operating as a district centre without having a detrimental impact on other existing or future town centres.”</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| 00034 / 0013     | Not Stated                | Although the document recognises the severance caused by the A12 and several references are made to the barriers that restrict the area the brief fails to act on the problem. | <p>Addressing the barrier effect of the A12 is required to enable the existing community west of the A12 to access new development east of the A12. LTGDC and LBTH are in discussions with Transport for London to achieve a comprehensive solution to address the severance and environmental impacts of the A12. It is accepted that major interventions to the A12, to enable improved east west movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, are necessary to address the existing severance of the A12 and improve integration between existing and new communities. This could involve the creation of a grade separated A12 junction.</p> <p>LTGDC has commissioned the A12 Transport Capacity and Access Study to consider the cumulative trip generation impact on operation of the A12 and develop a corridor-based strategy for addressing, mitigation and measures this impact that focuses on improving pedestrian/cycle/public transport accessibility and public realm/environmental improvements.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following"</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point:</p> <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 00034 /0014      | Not Stated                | The draft Brief together with the draft Masterplan misses the opportunity to create a much more exciting urban waterfront, in part because it fails to examine the opportunities on the eastern side of the river/canal. As a result, water-stimulated development and activity have not been maximised, it does not do enough for example to ensure a continued, connected path along the navigation for cyclist and pedestrians. | <p>Section 5.7 identifies the need for development to enhance the existing waterfront.</p> <p>The opportunities for redevelopment east of the River Lea Navigation are being considered as part of the LTGDC commissioned Sugar House Lane and Three Mills Masterplan.</p> <p>Section 5.0 of the Brief identifies the requirement to provide a continued and connected path along the River Lea Navigation</p> | <p>It is recommended that Section 5.7 be amended to read:</p> <p>“Development will be required to retain and extend the existing tow path and make active use of the waterfront. Mooring points, slipways, canal basins and ecology zones should be incorporated which enhance the setting and amenity and biodiversity value of the waterfront.</p> |
| 00034 / 0008     | Not Stated                | The housing element on the site should be at higher densities, especially along the high value frontage toward the river.  | The proposed building heights are informed by a size and mass that creates an appropriate urban design response to the development constraints and opportunities of the site. The Brief states that building height "should be" a proposed height and the diagram identifies heights as "indicative".  | No change  |
| 00034/0015       | Support                   | We generally support the Energy and Sustainability proposals.  | Support welcomed   | No change  |
| 00028 / 0001     | Not Stated                | Policing facilities are included within the definition of community facilities, and that provision can be on a financial or in-kind basis in the form of floorspace.   | Noted  | It is recommended to include 125sqm within the new school to accommodate a Safer Neighbourhood Team Base in section 4.6 of the Brief.  |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 00028 / 0002     | Not Stated                | The objective regarding design outlined in Section 1 should make reference to 'Secured by Design' principles.  | Development would be expected to achieve design excellence as outlined in Section 1 of the Brief, including secured by design principles.<br><br>Design standards will also be expected to meet the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Interim Planning Guidance and existing policy. | No change  |
| 00028 / 0003     | Not Stated                | The criteria list for the primary school be updated to reflect the need for 125sqm to accommodate a Safer Neighbourhood Team Base to ensure that there is provision of local policing to work with the community to identify and tackle issues of concern within | Noted.   | It is recommended to include 125sqm within the new school to accommodate a Safer Neighbourhood Team Base in the neighbourhood. |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| Landowners       |                           |   |  |  |
| 00023 / 0001     | Support                   | It is considered that the proposals for the subject site are suitable in terms of planning, land use and environmental considerations. Therefore support the general aims and designations as expressed by the draft BBB Land Use and Brief.  | Support welcomed   | No change  |
| 00032 / 0004     | Object                    | The two-tier phasing should be deleted or amended to allow for proposals to come forward on the north of the site in advance of those on the south.   | Noted  | It is recommended that section 2.1 of the Brief is amended to state a preference [as opposed to requirement] that redevelopment is phased from south to north. |
| 00032 / 0002     | Object                    | The general allocation of semi-private public space on the diagram should be deleted and a general policy put in with regard to its provision.  | The reference to "semi-private" open space is expressed indicatively and in associated with the location of preferred housing typologies.  | No change  |
| 00032 / 0001     | Object                    | The northern quarter of the site should have at least the same height proposals as the remainder of the western boundary of the site. There should only be reference to high buildings along this side of the site and the reference to eight stories should be removed as there is no justification for that particular height. The proposals for low density development along the eastern side of the site adjoining the canal should be deleted to ensure that the best use is made of this land and if necessary there can be a set of design criteria within the document in relation to this land. | The proposal to locate low density, smaller residential blocks along the River Lea Navigation is response to the site context and setting. The western edge is dominated by visual presence and noise associated with strategic road infrastructure. The eastern edge is dominated by a narrow canal. These conditions required different building design responses. | No change  |



| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>00032 / 0003</b> | Object                    | The cycle/footpath connection, running north across the 'French Connection' site should be deleted.  | The intention of the Brief is to provide clear guidance and provide a framework for the comprehensive physical and economic transformation of the site. In order to meet the objectives it is considered necessary to outline indicative network of routes and streets within the site as guidance. The cycle/footpath extension north provides an important link across the River Lea Navigation to Sugar House Lane and Stratford High Street. | No change  |
| <b>00033 / 0004</b> | Not Stated                | The phasing of development in the area should not be constrained by the need to redevelop its southern section first.  | The Brief identifies an opportunity to develop the site in two phases: a first phase south of Three Mills Lane, and a second phase north of Three Mills Lane. While this would be preferred, redevelopment of the site is not predicated on this phasing plan.   | It is recommended that Section 2.1 of the Brief is amended to state a preference [as opposed to requirement] that redevelopment is phased from south to north. |
| <b>00033 / 0002</b> | Support                   | The principle of introducing higher density residential accommodation alongside enhanced employment generating floorspace is supported, though the brief should provide greater flexibility in terms of residential density and mix. | The housing density and mix guidelines are in general conformity with London Plan and London Borough of Tower Hamlets Interim Planning Guidance.   | No change  |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| 00033 /0007      | Not Stated                | <p>The Land Use and Design Brief is not supported by a financial framework upon which to assess the viability of the land use mix, development quantum and infrastructure works. It is critical for the area's long term economic sustainability that the brief is underpinned by a robust and responsive financial framework. A publicly available appraisal should be produced as an integral part of the consultation process.</p> | <p>The objective of the brief is to provide guidance on what is considered to be an appropriate type and form of development on the site. The extent to which redevelopment of the site in accordance with the Brief is commercially viable will be taken into account at planning application stage when it is expected that the appropriate information is made available.</p> | No change         |
| 00033 / 0009     |                           | <p>The layout of development indicated should be dictated by the opportunity to deliver well designed buildings and a high quality public realm, rather than the configuration of deep level sewer runs.</p>  | <p>The proposed development is not based on the alignment of existing sewers. The primary route through the new town centre is on a natural movement and visual desire line between Bromley-by-Bow Station and the Lea River Navigation bridge crossing to the Three Mills and beyond.</p>   | No change         |
| 00033 /0003      | Not Stated                | <p>The height and scale proposed under the brief under performs in urban design terms and in relation to the creation of a sustainable and balanced community. The brief should incorporate greater flexibility in terms of density. It should be revised to include a higher estimated capacity for this area.</p>   | <p>The proposed building heights are considered to create design that will respond suitably to the development constraints and opportunities of the site. The Brief states that building height "should be" a proposed height and the diagram identifies heights as "indicative".</p>  | No change         |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| 00033 /0001      | Support                   | General principles of the draft Brief are closely aligned with Cleveland Regeneration Ltd objectives for the Bromley by Bow area.   | Noted  | No change   |
| 00033 / 0008     | Not Stated                | The brief should incorporate greater flexibility in its interpretation of industrial capacity. Retained employment capacity should be defined in terms of intensity of use, employment projections, financial viability and local market demand. The brief should provide a clearer definition of the specific types of employment uses that will be promoted in the area   | Noted  | It is recommended that the first paragraph (second sentence) of section 4.3 be amended to read: "The LLVOAPF requires the redevelopment of land north of Three Mills Lane to incur no net loss of industrial capacity. Industrial capacity is defined as the overall space comprising internal floor areas and all functional external areas. The existing industrial capacity of these sites is 22,500sqm. New development will be expected to target a replacement industrial capacity unless an assessment of market demand and development viability justifies a reduction in industrial capacity." |
| 00033 / 0006     | Not Stated                | The draft Brief does not indicate how the regeneration of Bromley-by-Bow will be coordinated with development in the Sugar House Lane area and Stratford beyond. The relationship between the Bromley-by-Bow framework and the emerging framework for Sugar House Lane remains unclear and should be clarified in the draft Brief. The Bromley-by-Bow area is confined by barriers and the draft Brief does not adequately set out how these barriers will be overcome. As such, it does not comprise a comprehensive and integrated approach in a strategic sense. | There are clear opportunities to integrate development at Bromley-by-Bow and Sugar House Lane. However, the Brief is not intended to provide guidance on how redevelopment of the site will be coordinated or phased with other developments in the area. Bridge links are proposed to ensure that the development potential of Sugar House Lane is maximised. | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| 00033 /0005      | Not Stated                | <p>The Brief fails to provide deliverable solutions to overcoming the area's transport and movement constraints. The brief notes that 'major interventions' are required in the area, though fails, on several levels, to identify both the scale of these interventions and the need for multi-agency working and support to agree and then deliver them. Indeed, one of the principal concerns in highways and transport terms, is that the brief does not recognise the role of other agencies/stakeholders in the agreement, management, funding and delivery of the necessary transport works in this area.</p> | <p>It is agreed that major interventions to the A12 could address its barrier effect and improve pedestrian, cyclist and public transport accessibility between existing communities and new development.</p> <p>This could involve the creation of a grade separated A12 junction. The Council is committed to working with landowners, developers and the LTGDC and Transport for London to explore the feasibility of achieving this objective.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following"</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point;</p> <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| 00035 / 0003     | Not Stated                | The scale and quantum of development achievable in this area should reflect its strategic importance, existing and future accessibility/infrastructure and emerging development context. The height and scale proposed under the brief underperforms in urban design terms and in relation to the creation of a sustainable and balanced community. The draft Brief should incorporate greater flexibility in terms of density. It should be revised to include a higher estimated capacity for this area. | The proposed building heights are considered to create design that will respond suitably to the development constraints and opportunities of the site. The Brief states that building height "should be" a proposed height and the diagram identifies heights as "indicative".  | No change         |
| 00035 /0007      | Not Stated                | The land use and design brief is not supported by a financial framework upon which to assess the viability of the land use mix, development quantum and infrastructure works. It is critical for the area's long term economic sustainability that the brief is underpinned by a robust and responsive financial framework. A publicly available appraisal should be produced as an integral part of the consultation process.   | The objective of the brief is to provide guidance on what is considered to be an appropriate type and form of development on the site. The extent to which redevelopment of the site in accordance with the Brief is commercially viable will be taken into account at planning application stage when it is expected that the appropriate information is made available. | No change         |
| 00035 / 0008     | Not Stated                | The layout of development indicated should be dictated by the opportunity to deliver well designed buildings and a high quality public realm, rather than the configuration of deep level sewer runs. The proposed commercial/employment generating floorspace should be designed with greater flexibility.  | The proposed development is not based on the alignment of existing sewers. The primary route through the new town centre is on a natural movement and visual desire line between Bromley-by-Bow Station and the Lea River Navigation bridge crossing to the Three Mills and beyond.   | No change         |
| 00035 / 0001     | Support                   | General principles of the draft Brief are closely aligned with Cleveland Regeneration Ltd objectives for the Bromley by Bow area.  | Noted   | No change         |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| 00035 /0002      | Support                   | Support the draft Brief's identification of the opportunity to deliver a new neighbourhood centre. The principle of introducing higher density residential accommodation alongside enhanced employment generating floorspace is supported, though the draft Brief should provide greater flexibility in terms of residential density and mix. The draft Brief should incorporate greater flexibility in its interpretation of industrial capacity. Retained employment capacity should be defined in terms of intensity of use, employment projections, financial viability and local market demand. The draft Brief should provide a clearer definition of the specific types of employment uses that will be promoted in the area. | The housing density and mix guidelines are in general conformity with London Plan and London Borough of Tower Hamlets Interim Planning Guidance.   | No change   |
| 00035 / 0006     | Not Stated                | The draft Brief does not indicate how the regeneration of Bromley-by-Bow will be coordinated with development in the Sugar House Lane area and Stratford beyond. The relationship between the Bromley-by-Bow framework and the emerging framework for Sugar House Lane remains unclear and should be clarified in the draft Brief. The Bromley-by-Bow area is confined by barriers and the draft Brief does not adequately set out how these barriers will be overcome. As such, it does not comprise a comprehensive and integrated approach in a strategic sense.  | There are clear opportunities to integrate development at Bromley-by-Bow and Sugar House Lane. However, the Brief is not intended to provide guidance on how redevelopment of the site will be coordinated or phased with other developments in the area. Bridge links are proposed to ensure that the development potential of Sugar House Lane is maximised.                   | No change   |
| 00035 / 0005     | Not Stated                | The Brief fails to provide deliverable solutions to overcoming the area's transport and movement constraints. The brief notes that 'major interventions' are required in the area, though fails, on several levels, to identify both the scale of these interventions and the need for multi-agency working and support to agree and then deliver them. Indeed, one of the principal concerns in highways and transport terms, is that the brief does not recognise the role of other agencies/stakeholders in the agreement, management, funding and delivery of the necessary transport works in this area.  | Major interventions to the A12 could address its barrier effect and improve pedestrian, cyclist and public transport accessibility between existing communities and new development.<br><br>This could involve the creation of a grade separated A12 junction. The Council is committed to working with landowners, developers and the LTGDC and Transport for London to explore | It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.<br><br>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the |

| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
|                     |                           |   | <p>the feasibility of achieving this objective.</p>  | <p>wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following"</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point;</p> <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport</p> |
| <b>00035 / 0004</b> | Not Stated                | The phasing of development in the area should not be constrained by the need to redevelop its southern section first. | The Brief identifies an opportunity to develop the site in two phases: a first phase south of Three Mills Lane, and a second phase north of Three Mills Lane. While this would be preferred, redevelopment of the site is not predicated on this phasing plan. | It is recommended that Section 2.1 of the Brief is amended to state a preference [as opposed to requirement] that redevelopment is phased from south to north.  |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| 00037 / 0001     | Not Stated                | The draft Brief should make it clear that the LBTH/LTGDC will entertain separate planning applications for two parts of the area in order to allow the proposed phasing to come forward.                            | The Brief promotes the comprehensive redevelopment of the site. The extent to which this is achieved by the submission of applications for different parts of the site is influenced by landowners and developers.  | It is recommended that section 2.1 of the Brief is amended to state a preference [as opposed to requirement] that redevelopment is phased from south to north within consideration given to its contribution to an overall phasing plan.   |
| 00037 /0002      | Not Stated                | Depending on the design and orientation of the building, it is possible, with good architectural design, to locate good quality residential close to this road. This principle should not be excluded in the Brief. | The Brief is in accordance with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Interim Planning Guidance: Leaside Area Action Plan which states that employment uses should be orientated towards the A12 to act as a buffer between new residential communities and the A12.  | No change  |
| 00037 /0003      | Not Stated                | There is still no evidence available which supports the stipulation that 6,700sqm of retail space is actually necessary or indeed viable. As, such, there should be flexibility regarding the amount                | <p>The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation has commissioned the Bromley-by-Bow Retail Planning Assessment. This work concludes that consideration should be given to designating Bromley-by-Bow as a district centre given the size of the existing Tesco store and the increase in expenditure projected within an appropriate walk and drive to catchment area.</p> <p>LBTH have also commissioned a Borough wide Town Centre Spatial Strategy, which will fed into the boroughs emerging LDF – Core Strategy in 2009. This Strategy will</p> | <p>It is recommended that the first two paragraphs of section 4.1 be amended to read:</p> <p>“The site will be redeveloped to provide a new centre, accessed from the west by improved subways and/or a potential new pedestrian, cycle and vehicular junction across the A12, and comprising a relocated supermarket, independent retail units, a new primary school and open space that are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. The new town centre will provide a mix of</p> |



| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
|                  |                           |   | <p>assess and designate existing and proposed centres in the Borough.</p>  | <p>uses within a high quality pedestrian environment that will provide a destination for existing and future communities on foot, bicycle or public transport. The new town centre will be located at the southern end of the site to benefit from close proximity to Bromley-by-Bow Station and an upgraded existing A12 subway.</p> <p>The new town centre will be expected to accommodate an appropriate amount and type of retail floorspace to meet the need, demand and capacity of its existing and future catchment area in accordance with the relevant tests set out in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. The new town centre will be expected to complement the existing retail hierarchy and be capable of operating as a district centre without having a detrimental impact on other existing or future town centres.”</p> |
| 00037/ 0004      | Not Stated                | <p>It is unclear whether the subsequent references to individual site costs, availability of public subsidy etc are intended to allow flexibility to the overall 50% provision or just to the tenure split.</p> | <p>New affordable housing will need to take into account the LBTH IPG requirement for 80% social rented and 20% intermediate housing and the London Plan requirement of 70% social rented and 30% intermediate housing. The second paragraph of section 4.2 states</p> | No change   |

| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|
|                     |                           |   | that the amount and type of affordable housing will be subject to individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and the need to encourage rather than restrain development.                                       |   |
| <b>00037/0005</b>   | Not Stated                | The proposed housing mix in the draft Brief based on the London Plan in the Brief is far too onerous. There is therefore no justification for seeking to apply the stated mix in developments.  | It is accepted that the Brief should include local level housing mix policy.  | The London Plan housing mix has been deleted and replaced with London Borough of Tower Hamlets Interim Planning Guidance housing mix. |
| <b>00037 /0009</b>  | Not Stated                | An additional hectare of open space is likely to be an unnecessary over provision. This area of open space should be  | The requirement for 1.2 hectares of open space is outlined in the LBTH Interim Planning Guidance, Leaside Area Action Plan and draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan in response to meeting the needs of planned population growth. | No change   |
| <b>00037 / 0008</b> | Support                   | Welcome the possibility of including a hotel in the area close to the A12 and proposed neighbourhood centre. Proposals for a tall building in this location are also welcomed as this will help sign post regeneration and reinforce the character of the area. | Support welcomed  | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 00037 /0006      | Not Stated                | The Brief should make it clear that whilst affordable housing should be provided with individual developments, pepper potting will not be sought.                                      | The Brief does not prescribe or preclude pepper potting affordable housing.   | It is recommended that the Section 4.2 3rd sentence of the final paragraph be amended to read:<br><br>"Affordable housing will be expected to be distributed across the site and within tenure blind designed development blocks" |
| 00037 / 0007     | Not Stated                | Brief needs to be re-worded to accept the need for flexibility single aspect and sunlight/daylight.  | Section 5.5 resists the creation of single aspect north facing units in new housing development. As north facing single aspect units represent poor urban design it is recommended that the proposed wording remain.<br><br>Any impact in amenity will be assessed at planning application stage. | No change   |
| 00037/ 0011      | Not Stated                | Brief needs to allow some flexibility on development form as there may be circumstances where it is architecturally beneficial to exceed these height restrictions to the same extent. | The height of new buildings will be expected to establish a positive relationship with the character and quality of the built and natural environment. The storey heights in the Brief are indicative and should be used as guidance.   | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| 00037 /0010      | Not Stated                | There is therefore no definitive position as to whether and where a connection point will be sought from the Sugarhouse Lane. The Brief should not therefore seek to anticipate this.                      | <p>There is a clear planning justification for proposing new bridge links to improve the accessibility of Sugar House Lane to Bromley- by-Bow centre and station.</p> <p>The precise location and detailed bridge design will be considered at planning application stage</p> | No change  |
| 00037 / 0012     | Not Stated                | The Brief should therefore make it clear that a reduced contribution will be accepted where this can be justified on viability grounds. This is particularly relevant given the current market conditions. | Noted   | <p>It is recommended that paragraphs 1-3 of Section 7 be amended to read:</p> <p>Development will be required to make appropriate financial and in kind contributions towards the provision of physical infrastructure and community facilities required to mitigate the impact of the type and density of development proposed in the Brief. These contributions will be secured by S106 Agreement in accordance with the LTGDC's Planning Obligations Community Benefit Strategy (POCBS).</p> <p>The POCBS requires payment of a standard charge of £22,600 per residential unit towards the infrastructure needs in the Lower Lea Valley. Developers will be required to enter into S106 Agreements that will require new</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
|                  |                           |  |   | development to contribute a discounted standard charge of £10,000 per unit and include mechanisms to secure deferred charge payments up to £22,600 per residential unit in the event that realised sales values increase above a previously agreed baseline.   |
| 00040 /0005      | Support                   | The provision of new education and healthcare facilities is welcomed.  | Support welcomed  | No change  |
| 00040 /0001      | Not Stated                | Connectivity should be examined on a spatial scale having regard to surrounding sites and future opportunities for positive change. It is not appropriate to suggest that pedestrian connectivity should cease at the Bow Locks site and not enhance wider connections to the south. | <p>The Brief emphasises the need for new development to integrate with and improve accessibility to and between existing communities and future development sites. Section 5.1 sets out the infrastructure improvements that new development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate. While the Brief focuses on providing land use and design guidance for the site, it does not suggest that pedestrian connectivity should cease at the Bow Locks site or not consider enhanced connections to the south.</p> <p>London Borough of Tower Hamlets, Development Implementation officers are closely working with officers working on the Bow Lock site to ensure all proposals are integrated.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
|                  |                           |   |  | [and the following replace the eighth bullet point] A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment." |
| 00040 / 0002     | Not Stated                | The intensification of employment and other opportunities is welcomed, as is the strategy to promote uses such as commercial and residential that are able to co-exist in a more cohesive manner than traditional patterns of land-use within the area. | Noted  | No change   |
| 00040 / 0006     | Support                   | The promotion of new open spaces and enhanced connectivity  | Support welcomed   | No change   |
| 00040 / 0004     | Support                   | The introduction of housing into the area is welcomed. The brief needs to ensure that the aspirations of density and dwelling mix are compatible.   | The proposed density and dwelling mix is informed by the Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework and London Borough of Tower Hamlets Interim Planning Guidance. The relevant policies provide guidance on appropriate housing density and tenure mix. | No change   |
| 00040 / 0003     | Not Stated                | The location of the neighbourhood centre on the southern area of the site is welcomed. It is important that the supermarket does not act as a barrier to N-S connectivity.  | Pre-application discussions will ensure that the north/south and east/west movements are facilitated. The Brief is clear that connectivity and integration is a key objective.   | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 00040 / 0007     | Support                   | The strategy of promoting building height on the A12 frontage is   | Support welcomed   | No change  |
| 00040 /0008      | Not Stated                | The LTGDC framework of contributions of between circa £22,000 and £28,000 is considered to be excessive and needs acute review following changing long-term economic conditions. | The brief should provide greater clarity on London Thames Gateway Development Corporation's Planning Obligations Community Benefit Strategy. | <p data-bbox="1682 300 2011 389">It is recommended that paragraphs 1-3 of Section 7 be amended to read:</p> <p data-bbox="1682 421 2047 884">“Development will be required to make appropriate financial and in kind contributions towards the provision of physical infrastructure and community facilities required to mitigate the impact of the type and density of development proposed in the Brief. These contributions will be secured by S106 Agreement in accordance with the LTGDC's Planning Obligations Community Benefit Strategy (POCBS).</p> <p data-bbox="1682 916 2047 1437">The POCBS requires payment of a standard charge of £22,600 per residential unit towards the infrastructure needs in the Lower Lea Valley. Developers will be required to enter into S106 Agreements that will require new development to contribute a discounted standard charge of £10,000 per unit and include mechanisms to secure deferred charge payments up to £22,600 per residential unit in the event that realised sales values increase above a previously agreed baseline.”</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| 00041/0011       | Not Stated                | The Brief should be less prescriptive and should instead set out how the proposed routes and streets will realise the broader connectivity and integration goals for the site | Major interventions to the A12, to enable improved east west movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, would address the existing severance of the A12 and improve integration between existing and new communities. This could involve the implementation of a grade separated A12 junction. | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following"</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point;</p> <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> <p>The Brief does not prescribe a network of routes and streets but promotes a development layout and circulation strategy.</p> |



| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 00041 / 0010     | Not Stated                | The planned provision for employment industrial floorspace is too excessive, but can only once a full understanding of the employment context has been gained should any parameters be included in the Brief. The Brief should adopt a flexible approach to employment | It is accepted that the Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework (LLVOAPF) policy requirement for redevelopment to incur no net loss of industrial capacity is not based on any assessment of market demand.  | It is recommended that the first paragraph (second sentence) of section 4.3 be amended to read: "The LLVOAPF requires the redevelopment of land north of Three Mills Lane to incur no net loss of industrial capacity. Industrial capacity is defined as the overall space comprising internal floor areas and all functional external areas. The existing industrial capacity of these sites is 22,500sqm. New development will be expected to target a replacement industrial capacity unless an assessment of market demand and development viability justifies a reduction in industrial capacity." |
| 00041 / 0001     | Support                   | Support the Brief's aims and objectives  | Support welcomed  | No change   |
| 00041 / 0004     | Support                   | Support the considerations given to flood risk in the draft Brief; however the Brief should also adopt the terminology employed by the Environmental Agency.   | <p>The Environmental Agency has been consulted and LBTH will consider the representation they have submitted.</p> <p>London Borough of Tower Hamlets is required to prepare a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to support their Local Development Framework. Developers will require the submission of a FRA.</p> | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| 00041 / 0003     | Support                   | Support the objectives for improving connectivity and accessibility. However, the inclusion of an all movement junction with east-west links will be the key driver to regenerate the site. | Major interventions to the A12, to enable improved east west movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, would address the existing severance of the A12 and improve integration between existing and new communities. This could involve the implementation of a grade street level, all movement separated A12 junction. It is recommended that the Urban Design Guidelines diagram be amended to promote improvements to the A12 along the site's western boundary. | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:"</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point"</p> <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| 00041 / 0002     | Support                   | Support the intension of the draft Brief to establish principles for redevelopment independent of the constraints imposed for the existing ownership. The first phase of the development can be achieved without resource to the use of extensive CPO powers. | The public sector authorities promote landowner-led site acquisition and assembly and will consider the use of compulsory purchase as a last resort.   | No change   |
| 00041 /0005      | Object                    | The Brief refers to Bromley-by-Bow as a Neighbourhood Centre whilst the LLVOAPF designates Bromley-By-Bow as an Enhanced Local Centre. The Brief should ensure consistency of terminology and should be named 'Enhanced Local Centre'.                        | <p>The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation has commissioned the Bromley-by-Bow Retail Planning Assessment. This work concludes that consideration should be given to designating Bromley-by-Bow as a district centre given the size of the existing Tesco store and the increase in expenditure projected within an appropriate walk and drive to catchment area.</p> <p>LBTH have also commissioned a Borough wide Town Centre Spatial Strategy, which will fed into the boroughs emerging LDF Core Strategy in 2009. This Strategy will assess and designate existing and proposed centres in the Borough.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the first two paragraphs of section 4.1 be amended to read:</p> <p>"The site will be redeveloped to provide a new centre, accessed from the west by improved subways and/or a potential new pedestrian, cycle and vehicular junction across the A12, and comprising a relocated supermarket, independent retail units, a new primary school and open space that are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. The new centre will provide a mix of uses within a high quality pedestrian environment that will provide a destination for existing and future communities on foot, bicycle or public transport. The new centre will be located at the southern end of the site to benefit from close proximity to Bromley-by-Bow Station and an upgraded existing A12 subway.</p> <p>The new town centre will be expected to accommodate an</p> |

| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>00041 / 0007</b> | Not Stated                | The position in the hierarchy afforded to Bromley-by-Bow in the LLVOAPF is not based on a solid evidence base. | <p>The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation has commissioned the Bromley-by-Bow Retail Planning Assessment. This work concludes that consideration should be given to designating Bromley-by-Bow as a district centre given the size of the existing Tesco store and the increase in expenditure projected within an appropriate walk and drive to catchment area.</p> <p>LBTH have also commissioned a Borough wide Town Centre Spatial Strategy, which will fed into the boroughs emerging LDF Core Strategy in 2009. This Strategy will assess and designate existing and proposed centres in the Borough.</p> | <p>appropriate amount and type of retail floorspace to meet the need, demand and capacity of its existing and future catchment area in accordance with the relevant tests set out in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. The new town centre will be expected to complement the existing retail hierarchy and be capable of operating as a district centre without having a detrimental impact on other existing or future town centres."</p> <p>It is recommended that the first two paragraphs of section 4.1 be amended to read:</p> <p>"The site will be redeveloped to provide a new centre, accessed from the west by improved subways and/or a potential new pedestrian, cycle and vehicular junction across the A12, and comprising a relocated supermarket, independent retail units, a new primary school and open space that are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. The new centre will provide a mix of uses within a high quality pedestrian environment that will provide a destination for existing and future communities on foot, bicycle or</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| 00041 / 0006     | Object                    | Object to the centre's position in the hierarchy and suggest it already functions as a District Centre. As such, do not support the expectation of the draft Brief that the new centre will be expected to compliment the existing hierarchy. The Brief should be flexible on this issue. | <p>The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation has commissioned the Bromley-by-Bow Retail Planning Assessment. This work concludes that consideration should be given to designating Bromley-by-Bow as a district centre given the size of the existing Tesco store and the increase in expenditure projected within an appropriate walk and drive to catchment area.</p> <p>LBTH have also commissioned a</p> | <p>public transport. The new centre will be located at the southern end of the site to benefit from close proximity to Bromley-by-Bow Station and an upgraded existing A12.</p> <p>The new town centre will be expected to accommodate an appropriate amount and type of retail floorspace to meet the need, demand and capacity of its existing and future catchment area in accordance with the relevant tests set out in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. The new town centre will be expected to complement the existing retail hierarchy and be capable of operating as a district centre without having a detrimental impact on other existing or future town centres."</p> <p>It is recommended that the first two paragraphs of section 4.1 be amended to read:</p> <p>"The site will be redeveloped to provide a new centre, accessed from the west by improved subways and/or a potential new pedestrian, cycle and vehicular junction across the A12, and comprising a relocated supermarket, independent retail units, a new primary school and open</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary: | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|
|                  |                           |                         | <p>Borough wide Town Centre Spatial Strategy, which will fed into the boroughs emerging LDF Core Strategy in 2009. This Strategy will assess and designate existing and proposed centres in the Borough.</p> | <p>space that are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. The new centre will provide a mix of uses within a high quality pedestrian environment that will provide a destination for existing and future communities on foot, bicycle or public transport. The new centre will be located at the southern end of the site to benefit from close proximity to Bromley-by-Bow Station and an upgraded existing A12 subway.</p> <p>The new town centre will be expected to accommodate an appropriate amount and type of retail floorspace to meet the need, demand and capacity of its existing and future catchment area in accordance with the relevant tests set out in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. The new town centre will be expected to complement the existing retail hierarchy and be capable of operating as a district centre without having a detrimental impact on other existing or future town centres."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 00041 / 0008     | Object                    | Object to the reference to a specific floorspcae for the centre. This approach should be flexible. | <p>The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation has commissioned the Bromley-by-Bow Retail Planning Assessment. This work concludes that consideration should be given to designating Bromley-by-Bow as a district centre given the size of the existing Tesco store and the increase in expenditure projected within an appropriate walk and drive to catchment area.</p> <p>LBTH have also commissioned a Borough wide Town Centre Spatial Strategy, which will fed into the boroughs emerging LDF Core Strategy in 2009. This Strategy will assess and designate existing and proposed centres in the Borough.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the first two paragraphs of section 4.1 be amended to read:</p> <p>"The site will be redeveloped to provide a new centre, accessed from the west by improved subways and/or a potential new pedestrian, cycle and vehicular junction across the A12, and comprising a relocated supermarket, independent retail units, a new primary school and open space that are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. The new centre will provide a mix of uses within a high quality pedestrian environment that will provide a destination for existing and future communities on foot, bicycle or public transport. The new centre will be located at the southern end of the site to benefit from close proximity to Bromley-by-Bow Station and an upgraded existing A12 subway.</p> <p>The new town centre will be expected to accommodate an appropriate amount and type of retail floorspace to meet the need, demand and capacity of its existing and future catchment area in accordance with the relevant tests set out</p> |

| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| <b>00041 / 0007</b> | Not Stated                | The position in the hierarchy afforded to Bromley-by-Bow in the LLVOAPF is not based on a solid evidence base. | <p>The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation has commissioned the Bromley-by-Bow Retail Planning Assessment. This work concludes that consideration should be given to designating Bromley-by-Bow as a district centre given the size of the existing Tesco store and the increase in expenditure projected within an appropriate walk and drive to catchment area.</p> <p>LBTH have also commissioned a Borough wide Town Centre Spatial Strategy, which will feed into the boroughs emerging LDF Core Strategy in 2009. This Strategy will assess and designate existing and proposed centres in the Borough.</p> | <p>in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. The new town centre will be expected to complement the existing retail hierarchy and be capable of operating as a district centre without having a detrimental impact on other existing or future town centres."</p> <p>It is recommended that the first two paragraphs of section 4.1 be amended to read:</p> <p>"The site will be redeveloped to provide a new centre, accessed from the west by improved subways and/or a potential new pedestrian, cycle and vehicular junction across the A12, and comprising a relocated supermarket, independent retail units, a new primary school and open space that are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. The new centre will provide a mix of uses within a high quality pedestrian environment that will provide a destination for existing and future communities on foot, bicycle or public transport. The new centre will be located at the southern end of the site to benefit from close proximity to Bromley-by-Bow Station and an upgraded existing A12</p> |



| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| 00041 /0006      | Object                    | Object to the centre's position in the hierarchy and suggest it already functions as a District Centre. As such, do not support the expectation of the draft Brief that the new centre will be expected to compliment the existing hierarchy. The Brief should be flexible on this issue. | <p>The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation has commissioned the Bromley-by-Bow Retail Planning Assessment. This work concludes that consideration should be given to designating Bromley-by-Bow as a district centre given the size of the existing Tesco store and the increase in expenditure projected within an appropriate walk and drive to catchment area.</p> <p>LBTH have also commissioned a Borough wide Town Centre Spatial Strategy, which will fed into the boroughs emerging LDF Core Strategy in 2009. This Strategy will assess and designate existing</p> | <p>subway.</p> <p>The new town centre will be expected to accommodate an appropriate amount and type of retail floorspace to meet the need, demand and capacity of its existing and future catchment area in accordance with the relevant tests set out in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. The new town centre will be expected to complement the existing retail hierarchy and be capable of operating as a district centre without having a detrimental impact on other existing or future town centres."</p> <p>It is recommended that the first two paragraphs of section 4.1 be amended to read:</p> <p>"The site will be redeveloped to provide a new centre, accessed from the west by improved subways and/or a potential new pedestrian, cycle and vehicular junction across the A12, and comprising a relocated supermarket, independent retail units, a new primary school and open space that are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. The new centre will provide a mix of uses within a high quality</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary: | Response:                            | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
|                  |                           |                         | and proposed centres in the Borough. | <p>pedestrian environment that will provide a destination for existing and future communities on foot, bicycle or public transport. The new centre will be located at the southern end of the site to benefit from close proximity to Bromley-by-Bow Station and an upgraded existing A12 subway.</p> <p>The new town centre will be expected to accommodate an appropriate amount and type of retail floorspace to meet the need, demand and capacity of its existing and future catchment area in accordance with the relevant tests set out in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. The new town centre will be expected to complement the existing retail hierarchy and be capable of operating as a district centre without having a detrimental impact on other existing or future town centres."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 00041 /0009      | Object                    | Object to the application of density and family housing targets, these figures should be instead be used as guidelines, with the final density and mix established through detailed design as applications come forward on the site. | The housing density and mix standards conform to those adopted in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Interim Planning Guidance and London Plan. The proposed housing density and mix will to contribute to the creation of a mixed and balanced community living within a design led environment.                                     | No change  |
| 00041 / 0012     | Not Stated                | The adoption of a flexible approach to unit design and the associated amenity spaces as essential to ensure the delivery of the quantum of larger units appropriate to this site.  | The housing typologies are expressed indicatively and are considered to contribute to the design opportunities and constraints and the aspiration to create a mixed and balanced community.  | No change  |
| 00041 / 0013     | Object                    | Object to the assumption that the existing circulation issues of severance cannot be overcome as part of the development of Bromley-by-Bow. Any development should seek to reconnect Bromley-by-Bow with the land west of the A12.   | Major interventions to the A12, to enable improved east west movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, would address the existing severance of the A12 and improve integration between existing and new communities. This could involve the implementation of a grade street level, all movement separated A12 junction. | <p data-bbox="1682 863 2040 1166">It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p data-bbox="1682 1198 1984 1291">It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p data-bbox="1682 1323 2040 1444">"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
|                  |                           |   |  | <p>communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following”</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point</p> <p>“A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment.”</p> |
| 00041 / 0014     | Not Stated                | In absence of the supporting viability work to support the LTGDC and LBTH’s proposals, it’s advocated that a flexible approach is adopted towards the quantum of the uses and the levels of contributions, to allow an appropriate mix and density of uses to be provided on the site and support the delivery of the necessary infrastructure works. | The London Borough of Tower Hamlets Interim Planning Guidance (Leaside Area Action Plan and Draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan) identify the site for mixed-use regeneration to include a new centre comprising new retail, a primary school and open space. Emphasis is placed on the need to provide the physical and social infrastructure to support an increased population and address the severance of the A12 to help the existing communities to the west access the benefits of new development. The Brief adopts flexibility in terms of the density and design of development and recognises that for comprehensive regeneration to be delivered development must be commercially viable. | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary: | Response:  | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--|-------------------|
|                  |                           |                         | <p>The objective of the Brief is to provide guidance on what is considered to be an appropriate type and form of development on the site. The extent to which redevelopment of the site in accordance with the Brief is commercially viable will be taken into account at planning application stage when it is expected that the appropriate information is made available.</p> |                   |

| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| Statutory Consultee |                           |  |   |   |
| 00042 / 0027        | Not Stated                | Section 3.4.5 - The second strand of sustainable development should be re-worded to read: 'effective protection and enhancement of the environment'.   | Noted   | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to reference 'effective protection and enhancement of the environment' as a sustainability strand in section 3.4.5. |
| 00042 / 0009        | Not Stated                | It is good that maximising use of roof space for biodiversity is mentioned.  | Noted   | No change   |
| 00042 / 0039        | Not Stated                | The design brief should recommend the adoption of the higher standard rather than propose separate standards. These sustainability objectives will require the Local Authority forming partnerships with other stakeholders. This should be recognised within the final Brief report that is prepared and reflected in the SA.   | New development will be required to achieve a MINIMUM Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and BREEM Excellent standards. This is in accordance with LBTH Interim Planning Guidance and emerging LDF - Core Strategy. | No change   |
| 00042 / 0016        | Support                   | It is good that the opportunity to connect the new areas of open space to other new and exciting open spaces is mentioned in the second paragraph.   | Noted   | No change   |
| 00042 / 0036        | Not Stated                | The recommendations for Objective 16 should be amended to state that attenuation measures and reductions in surface water discharge rates will be required to ensure that the site does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere (PPS25) and should be in line with the Mayor's London Plan Policy 4A.14 which states that developers should seek to reduce run off rates down to greenfield rates. | Noted. The Brief has been amended to say more on flood risk. The Sustainability Appraisal assumes that applications will work towards the required standards, or be refused for not doing so.                       | No change   |
| 00042 / 0033        | Support                   | Strongly support the sustainability objectives listed.   | Support welcomed  | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| 00042 /0032      | Not Stated                | <p>The water quality of the River Lee and the risk of flooding to vulnerable land uses should be a key design considerations. Through the development of the site opportunities to significantly improve the quality of the water in the river should be sought in line with the WFD.</p> | <p>The site is located within a Flood Risk Area as identified in the LBTH Interim Planning Guidance. New development will require the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates conformity with the Sequential and Exceptions Tests in accordance with PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk. New development will also be required to scope out appropriate mitigation measures in response to floodrisk, such as design solutions, Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs) etc.</p> <p>Development will be required to retain and extend the existing towpath and make active use of the waterfront. New development should enhance the setting and amenity and biodiversity value of the waterfront.</p> | No change  |
| 00042 /0031      | Support                   | <p>Overall we support the key sustainability issues listed that relate to the brief in this section. However, we request that an additional point be added which states: The need to enhance biodiversity of private and public spaces in particularly along the River Lee corridor.</p>  | Noted  | <p>It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal reference the need to enhance biodiversity of private and public spaces in particularly along the River Lee corridor.</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 00042 / 0030     | Not Stated                | The poor water quality of the river should be listed as a baseline condition in the section titled 'environmental characteristics'.  | Noted   | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to reference that the poor water quality of the river and list as a baseline condition in the section titled 'environmental characteristics'. |
| 00042/0028       | Not Stated                | This section fails to recognise the value that the river corridor has for animals and birds that use it for migration.   | Noted   | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to reference recognise the value that the river corridor has for animals and birds that use it for migration.                                 |
| 00042 / 0040     | Not Stated                | The list of national policies listed under the heading 'Effective protection of the environment' needs to be updated i.e. it incorrectly refers to PPG25 and 'draft' PPS9.   | Noted   | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal amend list of national policies listed under the heading 'Effective protection of the environment'.   |
| 00042 / 0026     | Not Stated                | Where possible opportunities to use developer contributions to for environmental enhancements should be sought. Contributions could be sought to cover the re-profiling of flood defences or habitat creation.   | Noted. The LTGDC's Planning Obligations Community Benefit Strategy will determine the level of developer contributions. The Environment Agency is represented on the Lower Lea Valley Management Board which will allocate monies secured by the Strategy for infrastructure works. | No change   |
| 00042 / 0025     | Not Stated                | The draft Brief should address the concept of water neutrality and how it can explore and/or adopted as a method of achieving the desired reduction and management of water demand in accordance with the Governments 'living within environmental limits' principle. The design brief should include asking | Noted.  | It is recommended that the 8th bullet point refer to the need for development to maximise opportunities for rainwater harvesting.   |



| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
|                     |                           | <p>developers to provide an Environmental Sustainability Water Report. This could bring together all the sustainability options and environmental technical assessments considered appropriate for that site.</p>                                |  |   |
| <b>00042 / 0024</b> | Support                   | Support the inclusion of Green Roofs.  | Support welcomed   | No change.  |
| <b>00042 /0010</b>  | Not Stated                | <p>The opportunity to increase biodiversity along the River Lee corridor should be mentioned in this section, this should be built into flood mitigation measures.</p>   | <p>The 10th bullet point of section 6.0 refers to the need for new development to protect and enhance ecology and biodiversity through the creation of new open space, the enhancement of existing waterways and the use of roof top gardens, green roofs and walls.</p>   | <p>It is recommended that a new bullet point include the need for new development to incorporate necessary flood mitigation measures.</p>                               |
| <b>00042/0020</b>   | Not Stated                | <p>A link needs to be made in this section to the opportunity to use the public realm for dual purposes. SUDS (green roofs) or river terracing cannot not only enhance the public realm but also provide ecological and flood risk benefits.</p> | <p>The London Borough of Tower Hamlets is required to prepare a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to support their Local Development Framework (LDF). This has been done in response to the guidance in Planning Policy Statement 25 – Development and Flood Risk that states that a sequential risk based approach should be applied to decision making at all levels of the planning process.</p> | <p>It is recommended that Section 5.6 amended to include the provision of SUDS as a means of enhancing and improving public realm in the redevelopment of the site.</p> |

| <b>Representer Ref:</b> | <b>Nature of Representation:</b> | <b>Representation Summary:</b>  | <b>Response:</b>   | <b>Changes to Brief:</b> |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| <b>00042 / 0014</b>     | Support                          | Support the list of requirements that development scheme proposals will be required to demonstrate they achieve. To further support this point a BREEAM rating target included stating that 'Non-residential development should meet the BREEAM excellent rating' should be included.   | The 13th bullet point of section 6.0 refers to the need for new development to achieve a MINIMUM Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and BREEAM Excellent standards. This is in accordance with LBTH Interim Planning Guidance. | No change                |
| <b>00042 / 0018</b>     | Support                          | Support the approach to step down the building height in a tiered arrangement towards the river. This will reduce associated shading impacts on the river course.   | Support welcomed   | No change                |
| <b>00042 /0017</b>      | Not Stated                       | All proposed connections will need to address flood risk, conservation, maintenance, encroachment into the watercourse and other concerns that we may have. They should also be fully justified as the proposed crossings over the river for example will further fragment the river course. Design principles should be agreed to inform the number, location and design of the crossings to minimise the negative effects on the ecological value of the river. In meeting these design principles it is important that the bridges are designed to Environment Agency standards. | It is considered that these design issues would be dealt with at planning application stage  | No change                |
| <b>00042 /0029</b>      | Not Stated                       | The comments concerning flood risk in section 3.5.17 are very brief. This section could be expanded.  | Noted. In the interests of keeping the report brief we think this topic is adequately covered. The Brief says more on this.  | No change                |
| <b>00042 /0041</b>      | Not Stated                       | The brief and the SA should be designed in line with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets 'Core Strategy and Development Control Development Plan Document, 'DEV5. Sustainable Design'.  | The Brief and the SA is in accordance to the LBTH Interim Planning Guidance and emerging LDF - Core Strategy.  | No change                |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| 00031/ 0006      | Support                   | Welcomes that a specific sustainability objective on the historic environment in the SA.  | Support welcomed  | No change  |
| 00031 /0012      | Not Stated                | The listed paved roadway (Grade II) should be considered in the new routes between the historic mills and the A12. The design of the cross route, should enhance the view of the Mills, perhaps in a way that allows the view to 'unfold' instead of a formal straight link as currently suggested. Any new development must pay particular attention to protecting the setting of the historic mills; the design of the proposed open space will be of particular importance in this regard. | Reference should be made to the listed roadway.   | It is recommended that the Constraints and Opportunities Map and Section 3.5 are amended to identify all listed buildings and structures adjacent to the site. |
| 00031 / 0011     | Support                   | Welcomes a sensitive scale and lower density development is expected within the boundary and setting of Three Mills Conservation Area. It would help if this was stated more strongly on page 19. Need to consider the setting of Fairfield Road Conservation Area.   | Section 4.2 states that new housing development will be required to demonstrate that it achieves an "an appropriate scale, form and massing to suit the site context and housing type". The reference to site context is considered to adequately cater for the need to respect the setting of the Three Mills Conservation Area. Given the type and form of development proposed in the Brief and the location of the Fairfield Road Conservation Area beyond the Bow flyover it is not considered necessary to refer to the Conservation Area in the Brief. | No change  |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 00042 / 0044     | Not Stated                | Appendix E refers to 'Water', which states that the Mayors Preferred Standard is to; achieve 100% attenuation of the undeveloped site's surface water run off at peak times. However, this has been superseded as the London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, Consolidated with Alterations since 2004 (GLA February 2008), Policy 4A.14 Sustainable Drainage on page 213, states that; developers should aim to achieve greenfield run off from their site through incorporating rainwater harvesting and sustainable drainage. | Noted  | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to be amend text relating to 'water' on pages 61 and 62 will be amended accordingly.                                     |
| 00042 / 0043     | Not Stated                | Any submitted FRA must show how SUDS such as permeable pavements, filter drains and strips, swales, temporary basins, ponds, wetlands and green / brown roofs will be maximised on the site with any obstacles to their use clearly justified. To suggest that a 'mix of hard and soft SUDS' could be used at this stage is not acceptable.<br><br>The adopted site drainage design can be made up of a range of SUDS techniques and the brief should specify this.  | Noted.   | Brief has been amended to include mitigation measures such as SUDS. Developers will be required to provide further mitigation details at planning application stage. |
| 00042 / 0042     | Not Stated                | Appendix C, objective 15 - does not mention that the Mayor promotes the use of SUDS to improve water quality. Objective 15 refers to the brown roofs that are 'designed to have enhanced ecological value (over and above that associated with a green roof)'. This statement needs to be clarified to avoid confusion.  | Noted  | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to be amended accordingly.   |
| 00024 / 0003     | Not Stated                | The Council should ensure the mitigation measures are delivered through planning conditions/obligations. The Council should also be aware that there are records of breeding sand martins in close proximity to the site. Mitigation measures may need to be put in place to ensure that these are not adversely affected by development.  | The ecological impact of development will be considered at planning application stage with appropriate mitigation secured through Section 106 Agreement and other methods. | No change  |

| <b>Representer Ref:</b> | <b>Nature of Representation:</b> | <b>Representation Summary:</b>   | <b>Response:</b>   | <b>Changes to Brief:</b>  |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 00039 /0003             | Not Stated                       | The canal running alongside the east of the site is referred to in the document as the Lea Navigation Canal. It is more correctly known as the River Lee Navigation.   | Noted  | The Brief will be replace references to Lea Navigation Canal with River Lee Navigation. |
| 00039 / 0002            | Not Stated                       | This document should make reference to other surrounding sites in order to put it into its wider context and to holistically realise the full potential of the waterways and the wider area.   | The Brief references the development context and the potential for new development to straddle the River Lea Navigation. | No change   |
| 00024 /0001             | Support                          | Welcome the inclusion of new open space within the design of the area, and its proposed location adjacent to the River Lea. However, it is unclear how this open space will be designed, and whether it will be green in nature. NE believes the LPA should consider the provision of natural area as part of a balanced policy to ensure that local communities have access to an appropriate mix of green spaces providing for a range of recreational needs of at least 2 hectares of accessible natural greenspace per 1,000 population. We would expect the public open space adjacent to the River Lea to contribute top the aim set out in the Vision for the Lower Lea Valley to create new linked green spaces. | Noted. The design of the new open space will be considered at planning application stage.                                | No change   |
| 00039 / 0001            | Not Stated                       | The strategic context for the waterways in the Lower Lea Valley is established by the Blue Ribbon Network policies in the Mayor's Consolidated London Plan (Feb 2008) and the LLV OAPF (Jan 2007). The Land Use and Design Brief should therefore be in general conformity with both sets of adopted planning guidance.  | The Brief is in general conformity with the Blue Ribbon Network policies in the London Plan.                             | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 00030 /0001      | Support                   | The planned and comprehensive approach in line with the London Plan and LLV OAPF to redevelopment the site is supported.   | Support welcomed  | No change   |
| 00030 / 0007     | Not Stated                | The LLV OAPF is not supplementary to the London Plan as stated on page 15 of the draft document, it is an application or amplification of the London Plan policies and is the Mayoral strategic planning guidance.   | Noted   | It is recommended that the second sentence be amended to read:<br><br>"The LLVOAPF is the Mayor of London's Strategic Planning Guidance for the Lower Lea Valley".  |
| 00029 / 0004     | Not Stated                | The delivery of the Lee Tunnel and Beckton STW extension will result in significant improvements in the water and environmental quality of the River Lea and thereby contribute to the efforts to make Bromley-by-Bow an attractive place to live, work and visit. | The Council welcomes improvements which will contribute to the efforts to make Bromley-by-Bow a better place. | No change   |
| 00043 / 0005     | Support                   | TfL strongly support the public transport objectives. TfL considers there to be a number of significant barriers that should be overcome in this area in terms of accessibility to the bus network   | Noted   | It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.<br><br>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:<br><br>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed |

| Representer Ref:               | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
|                                |                           |   |   | new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:"   |
|                                |                           |   |   | The following will replace the eighth bullet point   |
|                                |                           |   |   | "A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment." |
| <b>00042 / 0001</b> Not Stated |                           | An additional objective should be added; A development that embraces its proximity to the River Lee and enhances the natural environment maximising the benefit both for people and the environment.  | The objectives are intended to be high level. The seventh bullet point refers to the need for development to adopt an innovative and exemplary approach to urban design and architecture that responds to the area's development constraints and opportunities. This requires development to embrace the site's proximity to the River Lea and enhance its natural environment. | No change  |
| <b>00031 / 0009</b> Not Stated |                           | An objective should be included that relates more broadly to sustaining the character and heritage of the area. The guiding principles for new development should also aim to (where appropriate) better understand, protect, enhance and increase public access to the historic environment and cultural heritage of the area. | Section 1.0 identifies the high level objectives. Reference is made to the need for new development to adopt an innovative and exemplary approach to urban design and architecture that responds to the area's constraints and opportunities. One of the constraints and opportunities is   | No change.   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
|                  |                           |  | the character and heritage of the area. Section 2.0 provides high level guiding principles. The need to understand, protect, enhance and increase access to the historic environment and cultural heritage of the area is integral to the Brief. |  |
| 00038 / 0001     | Not Stated                | The Brief should reinforce the links with Sugarhouse Lane and Three Mills fringe Masterplans   | Explicit reference could be made to the preparation of a Masterplan document for Sugar House Lane and Three Mills and for new development to demonstrate compatibility and integration with the emerging proposals.                              | It recommended that a form of words is inserted at section 1.2 to reinforce the links with Sugarhouse Lane and Three Mills Masterplan. |
| 00039/ 0005      | Not Stated                | Waterfront uses should be maximised. The Brief should consider uses on the water itself, such as commercial, residential or leisure moorings.  | Section 5.7 of the Brief refers to the opportunities to create moorings.   | It is recommended that section 5.7 is expanded to include reference to the potential opportunities to use of the water.                |
| 00039 / 0004     | Not Stated                | The briefs should include the consideration of an intermodal transport hub for water transport, such as a wharf and/or a waterbus stop providing connectivity to the Olympic Park or the Thames via the Limehouse Cut. | Noted  | It is recommended that Section 5.7 is expanded to include reference to water transport.  |
| 00042/0002       | Support                   | Support the proposed comprehensive approach to redevelopment at this site. The Developer Contributions as detailed in section 7 could be used to provide funding for this.   | Noted  | No change  |
| 00043/ 0006      | Not Stated                | The current barriers to a simple bus network must be overcome to allow the bus network to develop to support intensification. In other words, TfL does not see how one can be done without the                         | Noted  | It is recommended that section 5.8 is amended to require new development to provide  |



| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
|                  |                           | other, therefore no half-measures are acceptable in this particular location.  |   | the infrastructure for bus interchange and standing within the new centre and facilitates east and west extensions to the bus network.  |
| 00042 / 0003     | Support                   | Support the adoption of green roofs on all buildings.  | Noted   | No change   |
| 00042 / 0004     | Not Stated                | The design brief should consider the potential positive impacts of development and the potential opportunities to enhance Biodiversity at the site. The Brief should included a target that 'development should explore the possibility of re-profiling the banks of the river'.   | Section 5.7 of the Brief promotes active use of the site's waterfront.  | It is recommended that section 5.7 be expanded to promote the opportunity to reprofile the canal bank.  |
| 00029 / 0002     | Not Stated                | Boroughs should work with Thames Water to ensure infrastructure is put in place in tandem with new development.  | The Borough will continue to work with Thames Water at detailed application stage.  | No change.  |
| 00042 / 0005     | Not Stated                | The wording in this section 3.6 needs to be amended. The correct process to follow in line with PPS25 and the PPS25 Practice Guide is to start by applying the Sequential Approach to the location of development on the site prior to requesting the submission of a flood risk assessment for the site. PPS25 sets out that a sequential risk-based approach to determining the suitability of land for development in flood risk areas is central to the policy statement and should be applied at all levels of the planning process. This should be addressed from the Masterplan level and feed into the planning application stage. This has not been addressed in the 'proposed land use', i.e., the school and housing is located in the area at the highest risk of flooding; There is no mention of flood storage compensation; The document suggest that car park areas would be flooding to over a metre deep during a major flood event which is unacceptable; The design concept indicated stepped back development with lowered riverside pathways, which should ensure that there is no increase in fluvial flood risk. | The London Borough of Tower Hamlets is required to prepare a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to support their Local Development Framework (LDF). This has been done in response to the guidance in Planning Policy Statement 25 Development and Flood Risk that states that a sequential risk based approach should be applied to decision making at all levels of the planning process. | It is recommended that section 3.6 be amended to require development to be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates conformity with the Sequential and Exceptions Tests in PPS25. |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| 00042 / 0006     | Not Stated                | Surface water flood risk should also be addressed in this section. In line with the London Plan Policy the Developer should seek to reduce the surface water run off rates down to Greenfield rate. This should be achieved through the adoption of Sustainable Drainage Principles or SUDS. SUDS seek to control surface water run off as close as possible to the source | Noted  | Section 6.0 refers to the need for development to incorporate SUDS. It is recommended that this bullet point refers to the need for new development to minimise surface water run off rates |
| 00038 / 0002     | Not Stated                | Parts of Sugarhouse Lane now have conservation Status, this should be reflected in the Brief   | Given the type and form of development proposed in the Brief and the location of the Fairfield Road Conservation Area beyond the Bow flyover it is not considered necessary to refer to the Conservation Area in the Brief.                                    | No change   |
| 00029 / 0001     | Support                   | Support the reference to the four strategic sewers that cross the site and the requirement that the sewers should have a protection zone.  | Noted  | No change required  |
| 00043 / 0001     | Support                   | Support the aspiration to reduce the severance caused by the A12 Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and provide better links between existing communities and the redevelopment site. However, any proposed highway solution would need to adequately accommodate existing and future strategic traffic movements as well as enhancing local connectivity.           | Noted. The extent to which the type and quantum of development proposed by the Brief will impact on the capacity and operation of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and public transport networks will be considered at planning application stage. | No change   |
| 00043 / 0002     | Not Stated                | Whilst the Land Use and Design Brief seeks to address severance issues immediately adjacent to the development site, TfL would not want any proposed highway solution to preclude further improvements along the A12 corridor. It is felt that a wider realignment of the A12 could be the only way to facilitate improvements at this location.                           | Noted. TfL has not produced a scheme for the wider realignment of the A12 against which the Brief can be tested.<br><br>LTGDC has commissioned A12   | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
|                  |                           |  | <p>Transport Capacity and Access Study to consider the cumulative trip generation impact on operation of the A12 and develop a corridor-based strategy, mitigation and measures for addressing this impact that focuses on improving pedestrian/cycle/public transport accessibility and public realm/environmental improvements.</p>   |                   |
| 00043 / 0003     | Not Stated                | <p>The Brief should include the following; recognition of how the Borough's responsibilities under the Traffic Management Act 2004 have informed the evolution of the land use and design brief; reference to the traffic conditions that exist on the road network adjacent to the site; existing or future capacity constraints on the (TLRN) and local transport networks should inform the type, size and intensification of proposals for development; enhancement and mitigation will be required to ensure that all the sites access arrangements including Hancock Road are designed/improved to current high standards and provision for car parks should be informed by principles of sustainable development that reduces the reliance on private car as a mode of transport.</p> | <p>The extent to which the type and quantum of development proposed by the Brief will impact on the capacity and operation of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and public transport networks will be considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>LTGDC has commissioned (1) the Bromley-by-Bow Station Improvement and Integration Study to consider options for improving station capacity and accessibility and (2) the A12 Transport Capacity and Access Study to consider the cumulative trip generation impact on operation of the A12 and develop a corridor-based strategy, mitigation and measures for addressing this impact that focuses on improving pedestrian/cycle/public transport accessibility and public realm/environmental</p> | No change         |

| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
|                     |                           |  | improvements.  |   |
| <b>00043 / 0007</b> | Not Stated                | There are some awkward connections in the area due to the significant barrier-effect of the A12 and the underpasses. Some of the potential bus network improvements being put forward in the area are specifically designed to overcome these issues, alongside pedestrian improvements. | Noted  | No change   |
| <b>00031 / 0010</b> | Not Stated                | Not many opportunities have been outlined, for example the accessibility improvements for heritage assets listed in the objectives and enhanced visitor facilities recommended in the SA are absent.   | The opportunities for improving access to and the setting of existing heritage assets is integral to the Brief. As the Brief does not include land use proposals for Three Mills itself, it would be inappropriate to suggest the use of those buildings for visitor facilities. This is more appropriate for the Sugar House Lane/Three Mills Masterplan work commissioned by London Thames Gateway Development Corporation and London Borough of Newham. | No change   |
| <b>00042 /0007</b>  | Not Stated                | Contaminated land should be included in this section as a potential constraint. An assessment of the site for contamination will need to be undertaken early to inform the land use and determine where to locate development.   | Noted  | It is recommended that Section 3.0 be expanded to include reference to the need undertake a site investigation and undertake appropriate remediation of contaminated land |
| <b>00039 / 0006</b> | Not Stated                | The Brief should consider the use of Compulsory Purchase Orders to assemble the site and achieve its objectives.   | The Brief provides clear guidance for new development and where necessary, will support the case   | It is recommended that Section 8.0 of the Brief is amended to state that while it is the public   |

for public sector site assembly and development implementation.

authorities' preference for land owners to assemble the site and deliver comprehensive development in accordance with the Brief; it is not intended to prescribe a strategy for implementation. The LTGDC has planning and regeneration CPO powers to facilitate development.

---

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| 00039 / 0008     | Not Stated                | An energy policy should be incorporated into the Land Use and Design Brief. Towpaths and sewers are being considered as utility routes. A district heating strategy should be considered which promotes combined cooling, heating and power (CCHP) and the use of biomass. | Section 6.0 identifies the energy and sustainability requirements for development proposed within the site and refer to decentralised CCHP networks and renewable energy. CCHP and biomass is a strategic consideration as part of the LDF-Core Strategy work. | No change   |
| 00039 / 0007     | Not Stated                | British Waterways and the Environmental Agency have undertaken extensive flood modelling and should be consulted on any flood risk strategies for the site.  | British Waterways and the Environment Agency would be consulted on any planning application submitted on land within the site.   | No change   |
| 00029 / 0003     | Not Stated                | The design brief should make reference to the requirement for development to be located in proximity to compatible land uses.  | The proposed land uses as outlined in the Brief are in accordance with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Leaside Area Action Plan and draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan.   | No change   |
| 00030 / 0004     | Not Stated                | The document should better set out the range, quantity and quality of existing employment on the site, and the measures that will be used to maintain viable employment opportunities.   | The Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework policy for redevelopment on the site requires no net loss of industrial capacity. Section 4 of the Brief outlines existing industrial uses on the site.   | It is recommended that the first paragraph (second sentence) of section 4.3 be amended to read: "The LLVOAPF requires the redevelopment of land north of Three Mills Lane to incur no net loss of industrial capacity. Industrial capacity is defined as the overall space comprising internal floor areas and all functional external areas. The existing industrial capacity of these sites is 22,500sqm. New development |

| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response: | Changes to Brief:  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|-----------|--|
| <b>00043 / 0008</b> | Not Stated                | The focus of Bromley-by-Bow, with the neighbourhood centre and supermarket, appears to be shifting to the east of the A12. This emphasises the need to improve pedestrian/bus linkages to existing development west of the A12. The penultimate paragraph on Page 16 refers to pedestrian access. It should also refer to bus access. | Noted     | <p>will be expected to target a replacement industrial capacity unless an assessment of market demand and development viability justifies a reduction in industrial capacity."</p> <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:<br/> "Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following:<br/> [and the following replace the eighth bullet point] A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| 00010 / 0001     | Not Stated                | The proposals are very well thought out. Supporting retail could be cafes, restaurants etc. Community facilities should also include youth facilities and fitness centre.  | Noted. The Brief requires development to include a new primary school that provides flexible space for out-of-hours healthcare and community use.  | No change.        |
| 00030 / 0005     | Not Stated                | As set out in the LLV OAPF and the London Plan, the document should clearly set out the social and community infrastructure requirements of the land use scenario being promoted.  | The proposed social and community infrastructure in the Brief are established by the in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, Interim Planning Guidance (Leaside Area Action Plan and Draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan). These objectives are highlighted in the Brief by promoting mixed-use regeneration to include a new neighbourhood centre comprising new retail, a primary school and open space. | No change.        |
| 00038 / 0007     | Not Stated                | Support the principle of maximising the use of industrial sites and introducing new residential and commercial activity, including creative industries and affordable workspace in appropriate locations.  | Support welcomed   | No change         |
| 00042 / 0015     | Not Stated                | An alternative options for the school design is for the open grounds of the school be utilised or sequentially designed as a flood storage area instead of the potentially more dangerous and unsustainable underground or below ground parking referred to in section 3.6. The primary schools are also excellent sites for the innovative use of SUDS. | The London Borough of Tower Hamlets is required to prepare a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to support their Local Development Framework (LDF). This has been done in response to the guidance in Planning Policy Statement 25 Development and Flood Risk that states that a sequential risk based approach should be applied to decision  | No change         |



| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief: |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
|                     |                           |   | <p>making at all levels of the planning process</p> <p>It is considered that these detailed design issues would be dealt with at planning application stage.</p>  |                   |
| <b>00042 / 0013</b> | Not Stated                | <p>The Brief (page 19) does not mention sequentially designing the site, providing SUDS or flood risk which will be important constraints and opportunities for this site.</p>  | <p>The London Borough of Tower Hamlets is required to prepare a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to support their Local Development Framework (LDF). This has been done in response to the guidance in Planning Policy Statement 25 Development and Flood Risk that states that a sequential risk based approach should be applied to decision making at all levels of the planning process.</p> <p>It is recommended that this can be dealt with a planning application stage.</p> | No change         |
| <b>00042 / 0008</b> | Support                   | <p>Support the list of requirements that the proposals will be required to demonstrate to deliver housing.</p>  | Noted   | No change         |
| <b>00039 / 0010</b> | Not Stated                | <p>Pleased to see that the Brief acknowledge the Dutch family housing example which was designed around flood risk issues. Residential moorings can enhance the mix of uses and provide surveillance of public areas.</p> | Noted   | No change         |

| <b>Representer Ref:</b> | <b>Nature of Representation:</b> | <b>Representation Summary:</b>  | <b>Response:</b>   | <b>Changes to Brief:</b> |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| <b>00039 / 0011</b>     | Not Stated                       | The inclusion of other uses on the navigation, such as commercial business barges, freight uses, and water buses and taxis should be encouraged   | Developers will be required to work with British Waterways to ensure navigation uses improve and enhance the waterfront.   | No change                |
| <b>00039 / 0012</b>     | Not Stated                       | The primary school presents the perfect opportunity for a mooring point for a floating classroom. The principle of a floating classroom can also be used for the provision of a community facility. | Developers will be required to work with British Waterways to ensure navigation uses improves and enhances the waterfront  | No change                |
| <b>00039 / 0013</b>     | Support                          | British Waterways supports the reference to the management and maintenance of the 'open space', although the principles will need to be agreed with British Waterways.                              | Noted  | No change required       |
| <b>00039 / 0009</b>     | Support                          | Generally support the proposed layout of uses on the site, although some retail uses along the waterfront is encouraged, in order to add vibrancy and interest along this elevation.                | The Brief promotes a land use arrangement that is in accordance with LLV OAPF and LBTH Interim Planning Guidance and draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan and delivers a new mixed use centre for existing and future communities. The Brief does not propose retail along the waterfront but requires development to enhance and improve waterfront activity and vibrancy. | No change                |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 00042/0011       | Not Stated                | Development should not only require to 'Achieve a minimum Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4' (page 19), but also aspire to meet level 5 or 6. All government funded housing sites are expected to exceed this level by 2010 and reach Code level 6 by 2013.   | The 13th bullet point of section 6.0 refers to the need for new development to achieve a MINIMUM Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and BREEAM Excellent standards. This is in accordance with LBTH Interim Planning Guidance.   | No change  |
| 00030 / 0002     | Not Stated                | The proposals to run a bus under the existing road (A12) or over a new parallel bridge are unlikely to be implemented. The proposals would need to widen the existing underpass without rebuilding the entire section of the road above and the parallel bridge would also require a bridge which would take up a lot of land and result in some odd juxtaposition of buildings and open spaces. A 'at grade' solution should be explored and promoted further in the Brief. | It is accepted that the feasibility of running buses under the A12 or over a new parallel bridge will be strongly influenced by engineering, urban design and cost constraints. It is accepted that major interventions to the A12, to enable improved east west movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, would address the existing severance of the A12 and improve integration between existing and new communities. This could involve the implementation of a grade separated A12 junction. The Brief does not prescribe a network of routes and streets but suggests a successful arrangement for a permeable and integrated development. | <p data-bbox="1682 555 2040 735">It is recommended that proposed bus route options are refreshed to identify, as a base case, the requirement for buses to terminate and interchange within the centre.</p> <p data-bbox="1682 802 2040 1106">It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p data-bbox="1682 1137 1984 1230">It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p data-bbox="1682 1265 2040 1445">"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New</p> |

| Representer Ref:    | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief:   |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|
|                     | Not Stated                | The brief should consider the recent work of Bromley-by-Bow Station Study, which considers whether the link between the station and the green space on the water edge should be a high street with a well designed edge on either side. | The Brief should make explicit reference to the Bromley-by-Bow Station Improvement and Integration Study.                                 | <p>development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following”</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point;</p> <p>“A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment.”</p> <p>It is recommended that section 5.8 be amended to identify a base case bus route with options.</p> |
| <b>00038 / 0003</b> | Not Stated                | The brief should consider the recent work of Bromley-by-Bow Station Study, which considers whether the link between the station and the green space on the water edge should be a high street with a well designed edge on either side. | The Brief should make explicit reference to the Bromley-by-Bow Station Improvement and Integration Study.                                 | It is recommended that a form of words is inserted at section 1.2 to reflect the work being undertaken by London Borough of Tower Hamlets and London Thames Gateway Development Corporation.  |
| <b>00038 /0004</b>  | Not Stated                | The bridge connecting Sugarhouse Lane site is not in the correct location, and it’s located too far north. This should be aligned to create a more direct connection between Sugarhouse Lane and Bromley-by-Bow station                 | The Brief is only intended to establish the principle, function and indicative location of bridge crossings to the Sugar House Lane area. | No change   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief: |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| 00038/ 0006      | Not Stated                | The significance and size of the other roads linking to the west is unclear. This does not appear to lead anywhere, and a link is not possible at that location.       | <p>This connection is indicative and requires further feasibility to determine the correct location. It is recognised that further work is necessary in assessing the feasibility and detailed design of the proposed infrastructure - in particular the proposed interventions across the A12. The Council is committed to working with public sector agencies and landowners to ensure interventions support the comprehensive development of the site.</p> <p>LTGDC has commissioned A12 Transport Capacity and Access Study to consider the cumulative trip generation impact on operation of the A12 and develop a corridor-based strategy, mitigation and measures for addressing this impact that focuses on improving pedestrian/cycle/public transport accessibility and public realm/environmental improvements.</p> | No change         |
| 00039/0015       | Support                   | Welcome the building height proposals, particularly those adjacent to the canal, in order to respect its setting. These should be 'guidance' rather than prescriptive. | The Brief states the proposed height of new buildings as indicative and to be used as guidance.  | No change         |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| 00039 /0016      | Not Stated                | The exploration of a new waterspace as a feature for Three Mills should be mentioned as forming part of the setting of the site.   | The Brief requires development to preserve and enhance the setting of Three Mills and promotes canal activity.                        | No change  |
| 00039 / 0017     | Not Stated                | A Waterspace Strategy for the site, as a sister document to the brief, should be developed in order to include the suggestions above and maximise the potential of the site's location adjacent to the River Lee Navigation.   | Developers will be required to work with British Waterways to ensure development maximises the potential of the River Lea Navigation. | No change  |
| 00043 / 0009     | Not Stated                | The bus routeing should be safeguarded, including the proposed bus underpass. The link is described as 'long-term'. TfL are concerned that this could be interpreted as not important for this scheme. TfL considers it to be very important to the long-term success of Bromley-by-Bow. | Noted   | It is recommended that this bus routing is identified as an option for improving east-west links within the Brief.   |
| 00038 / 0005     | Not Stated                | The position of the road linking to the west across the A12 does not appear to be in the right position. Should a link connecting this site to the west be possible, it would be more sensible to connect directly into Bruce Road, as this is the more significant local street.        | Noted   | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
|                  |                           |  |  | new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following: [and the following replace the eighth bullet point] A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment." |
| 00030 / 0003     | Not Stated                | The site would not benefit from buses running through the site as there are existing bus routes in short walking distance.   | The opportunity to serve new communities in Bromley-by-Bow and Sugar House Lane will promote sustainable travel patterns and help maximise site potential. The proposed bus route options have in principle support of London Buses. | It is recommended that section 5.8 be amended to identify a base case bus route with options.   |
| 00042 / 0012     | Not Stated                | A recycled content target is included in the Brief. Development should be designed to: enable reuse and recycling at least 90% of demolition and construction waste and; a recycled content of at least 30%. Minimum levels of recycled content to be adopted for new build should be encouraged.  | Noted  | It is recommended that a new bullet point is added to Section 6.0 that adopts targets for recycling demolition waste and using recycled construction materials.   |
| 00042 / 0019     | Not Stated                | Section 5.5 details what the development will be expected to provide to achieve the objectives of the draft Brief. There seems to be very little, if any mention of the buffer zones along the watercourse required by us for flood defence reasons, maintenance access and conservation. The drawing on page 29 illustrating the 'Indicative Development Form and Housing Types' does not indicate the provision of a buffer zone but has the area adjacent to the watercourse as 'Semi-Private Open Space'. This | Noted.   | It is recommended that section 5.7 be amended to require new development to provide a buffer zone along the watercourse that addresses flood defence, maintenance and access and conservation issues.   |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
|                  |                           | contradicts section 5.7 - Canal Activity on page 30 states that development will be required to retain the existing towpath but that ecology zones should be incorporated.  |  |  |
| 00042 /0021      | Support                   | Support the intention of Canal Activity. However, the wording needs to be expanded and strengthened to capture the opportunity to enhance the currently poor ecological state of the river inline with the Water Framework Directive, PPS9 and the Blue Ribbon Network. watercourse.  | Noted  | It is recommended that section 5.7 be amended to require new development to improve the ecological value of the  |
| 00043 / 0010     | Not Stated                | In order for the proposed new bus routeing to be effective, a number of factors outside of the area covered by this document need to resolved. This includes the need for an all-movement junction (for buses at least) between the Sugar House Lane site and Stratford High Street, and a suitable routeing serving Bromley-by-Bow west of the A12 to Devons Road. If a bus routeing cannot be provided linking both sides of the A12, the aspiration to link this development with the surrounding areas cannot be fulfilled. If a link across (or under) the A12 is not provided, buses will need to be able to terminate and stand at the southern end of the site close to the railway line, linking the pedestrian access to the station, at least in the short term. A bus standing and turning facility is therefore required and must be taken forward as a key part of the project. The stand may be required even if the link is provided to ensure the bus network can be developed to best serve the area. | Noted  | It is recommended that section 5.8 is amended to require new development to provide the infrastructure for bus interchange and standing within the new centre and facilitates east and west extensions to the bus network. |
| 00043 / 0011     | Support                   | Support the proposal for a pedestrian, cycle and bus only link which connects the site to the central part of the Sugarhouse lane development in LB Newham. The policy document should specify that agreement with LB Newham is required.   | Noted. It is acknowledged that the use of bus, pedestrian and cycle bridge connecting Sugar House Lane will only become active following redevelopment of both sites. The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation has commissioned a | No change  |



| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:  | Changes to Brief:   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| 00043 / 0016     | Not Stated                | <p>TfL considers that the wider realignment of the A12 would be the most appropriate way to improve connectivity in the area. There is very little information provided in the document on cycle parking for residents, more information should be provided. However, TfL commend the comments highlighting that the level of success of the neighbourhood is directly linked to the level of pedestrian and cycling accessibility.</p> | <p>Masterplan document for Sugar House Lane and Three Mills and is the Local Planning Authority for major development proposals.</p> <p>TfL has not produced a scheme for the wider realignment of the A12 against which the Brief can be tested.</p> <p>LTGDC has commissioned A12 Transport Capacity and Access Study to consider the cumulative trip generation impact on operation of the A12 and develop a corridor-based strategy, mitigation and measures for addressing this impact that focuses on improving pedestrian/cycle/public transport accessibility and public realm/environmental improvements.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following"</p> <p>The following will replace the eighth bullet point;</p> <p>"A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
|                  |                           |  |  | It is recommended that the Land Use section includes reference to the need for new development to make adequate provision for cycle parking.   |
| 00043 / 0015     | Not Stated                | Support a new two-way bus route through the site, it is perhaps presumptuous to specify that it 'will' run through the site given the considerable technical, inter-borough, and land ownership issues that need to be overcome. It is also noted that while there are substantial technical issues associated with bus route option 1, option 2 is probably less feasible due to the likely gradient of a road across the rail line, which would be required to link into Twelve Trees Crescent. The maximum acceptable gradient for such a link is 6%. | Noted  | It is recommended that section 5.8 is amended to require new development to include infrastructure for a bus interchange and standing within the new centre with opportunities for extending the bus network east and west, facilitated by a proposed bridge link to Sugar House Lane and promoted grade separated A12 junction. |
| 00043 / 0014     | Not Stated                | It is unclear how the vehicle entrance to the retail area and pedestrian link between Three Mills Bridge and the northern subway would function. Further details are necessary.  | Section 5.8 of the Brief includes a proposed circulation strategy. The road allocation and highway design issues will be considered at detailed design and planning application stage. | No change  |
| 00043 / 0013     | Not Stated                | It is unclear as to how the removal of the "crescent" would work if access to the northern subway is to be improved.   | It is considered that this detailed design issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.  | No change  |
| 00039 / 0014     | Support                   | Welcome the promotion of both physical and visual connections from the site to the surrounding area and. However, maintaining navigation along the waterway, and maintaining access along the towpath should be considered. Any new bridge and associated easement will require a commercial agreement with BW.  | Developers will be required to work with British Waterways to ensure navigation uses improves and enhances the waterfront.   | No change  |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 00043 / 0012     | Support                   | Support the proposal to consider widening the southern pedestrian subway to accommodate a bus route. However, draft Brief should state that a new connection to the local street network to the west of the A12 is also necessary.             | Noted  | <p>It is recommended that the Brief identify this potential infrastructure and access improvement by amending the Urban Design Guidelines diagram to promote a new at-grade pedestrian, cycle and vehicular crossing of the A12 along the site's western boundary.</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 include the wording:</p> <p>"Infrastructure improvements will be required and/or promoted to improve the site's accessibility between existing communities and proposed new development. New development will be required to deliver, contribute to and/or accommodate the following: [and the following replace the eighth bullet point] A new grade separated A12 junction that connects the site to and from the west and prioritises pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements within a high quality urban environment."</p> |
| 00042 / 0023     | Not Stated                | Energy and Sustainability section should include reference to Policy 4A.14 Sustainable Drainage (Page 213) of The London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, Consolidated with Alterations since 2004 (GLA February 2008)). | The 8th bullet point refers to the need for development to include SUDS. | No change  |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| 00042 / 0022     | Not Stated                | There should be an additional principle included in this section to ensure that development can adapt to climate change. The climate change adaptation plan should be considered and used to plan development at both the strategic and detailed stages, informing the layout and design to ensure it is adaptable to climate change | London Borough of Tower Hamlets is required to prepare a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to support their Local Development Framework (LDF). This has been done in response to the guidance in Planning Policy Statement 25 Development and Flood Risk that states that a sequential risk based approach should be applied to decision making at all levels of the planning process. | It is recommended that the 2nd bullet point be expanded to include reference to the need for development to contribute to the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change.                                    |
| 00039 / 0018     | Not Stated                | Three Mills site potentially presents opportunities for harnessing hydroelectric power, which could be highlighted as part of this document. The brief should also ensure that developers are required to consider the feasibility of these sustainable options for development within reasonable proximity to the waterways.        | The Brief does not include proposals for Three Mills.   | No change  |
| 00030 / 0006     | Not Stated                | The Brief should set out how waste will be dealt with and managed, and how recycling will be encouraged within the new developments.   | Waste management will be incorporated into discussions on planning applications on a site by site basis.  | It is recommended that the final bullet point of section 6 is amended to read:<br><br>"Provide facilities for waste management and recycling within all housing, industrial, commercial and retail development". |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:   | Response:   | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| 00039 /0019      | Not Stated                | The brief does not mention potential contributions from development (either s106 agreements or service charges), but it provides excellent opportunities for better connections to and improvements of the waterways. BW would expect a financial contribution from development towards improving the waterway environment and their long term management and maintenance to a higher standard. | The Brief includes a section on Developer Contributions which sets out that development will be required to make financial and in kind contributions towards the provision of infrastructure and community facilities required to support the type and density of development proposed in this Brief. These contributions will be secured through Section 106 agreements. | <p>It is recommended that paragraphs 1-3 of Section 7 be amended to read:</p> <p>"Development will be required to make appropriate financial and in kind contributions towards the provision of physical infrastructure and community facilities required to mitigate the impact of the type and density of development proposed in the Brief. These contributions will be secured by S106 Agreement in accordance with the LTGDC's Planning Obligations Community Benefit Strategy (POCBS).</p> <p>The POCBS requires payment of a standard charge of £22,600 per residential unit towards the infrastructure needs in the Lower Lea Valley. Developers will be required to enter into S106 Agreements that will require new development to contribute a discounted standard charge of £10,000 per unit and include mechanisms to secure deferred charge payments up to £22,600 per residential unit in the event that realised sales values increase above a previously agreed baseline"</p> |

| <b>Reprenter Ref:</b> | <b>Nature of Representation:</b> | <b>Representation Summary:</b>   | <b>Response:</b>  | <b>Changes to Brief:</b>   |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>00043 /0004</b>    | Not Stated                       | It is recommended that where possible the London Borough of Tower Hamlets should seek to secure S106 contributions to improve walking routes to and from DLR stations. TfL would also welcome a statement recognising the positive role of public art in improving the public realm and urges the Borough to ensure that where contributions towards art are secured in S106 agreements for development near the railway, the Borough should support the use of the DLR Public Art Strategy as the vehicle for delivery of art projects. | Noted. The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation Planning Obligations Community Benefit Strategy will be used to secure developer contributions. TfL is represented on the Lower Lea Valley Management Board which will allocate monies secured by the Strategy for infrastructure works. | No change  |
| <b>00042 / 0037</b>   | Not Stated                       | The SA should refer to the current Planning Policy Statement 25 not the superseded Planning Policy Guidance 25. It should also refer to the PPS25 Practice Guide. An additional note should be put in this section that: Under the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981, our prior written consent is required for any works in, over, under or within 8.0m of a main river or flood defence structure or 16.0m of a tidal river or tidal flood defence structure.  | Noted   | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to be amended accordingly. |
| <b>00042 /0038</b>    | Not Stated                       | The following plans/ programs should be added for Ecology/Biodiversity; Blue ribbon network; HAP for Tower Hamlets (in production)and ; London River Restoration Strategy and its predecessor the North London River Restoration Strategy (these should be applied to the area that the brief covers and should be added to Appendix A Plans and Programmes).  | Noted   | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to be amended accordingly. |
| <b>00042 / 0035</b>   | Not Stated                       | Objective 15 - Recommendations should be taken a step further to capture the significant opportunity the development of this site offers to enhance the river corridor both in terms of flood risk and ecology. The statement in regards to brown roofs needs to be amended. Both green and brown roofs offer different benefits. When designing the roof the developer needs to question what they are seeking to achieve i.e. habitat for black redstarts, or surface water attenuation or both.                                       | Noted   | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to be amended accordingly. |

| Representer Ref: | Nature of Representation: | Representation Summary:  | Response:  | Changes to Brief:  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 00042 /0034      | Not Stated                | Objective 14 - reference should be made to the Water Framework Directive and the need to improve the water quality of the River Lee. Under the theme of water use and water waste deposal needs to be carefully managed and policies proposed to achieve the UK Governments 5 principles of sustainable development.   | The Brief has been amended to make reference to water quality and use, the revised Sustainable Appraisal takes account of the change.                  | No change  |
| 00024 / 0002     | Support                   | We also support the recommendation in the SA that 'a detailed breakdown of the types of open space required on site should be provided to ensure that all requirements are provided if, as anticipated, the area is developed in a phased manner. We welcome and endorse the recommendations on page 26 of the SA Report relating to biodiversity, that the overall aim should be to achieve a net gain in the ecological value of the area. | Support welcomed   |  |
| 00031 / 0008     | Not Stated                | It should also be noted in the SA that this site falls within an Archaeology Priority Area and any archaeological impacts will need to be mitigated.   | Noted. Developers will be required to submit an archaeology assessment and mitigate any significant effects from the proposed development of the site. | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to be amended to reference archaeology and mitigation. |
| 00031 / 0001     | Support                   | The European Landscape Convention should be included in the review of plans and programmes. Include the LB of Newham Three Mills Conservation Area Appraisal and Management plan as key documents to be taken into account in the preparation of the DPD. Fairfield Road Conservation Area to the north of the site should also be considered if such plans exist.   | The Brief acknowledges the need to respect adjacent Conservation Areas.  | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal include relevant plans.                                |
| 00031 / 0002     | Not Stated                | Baseline information - the heritage attractions and facilities at Three Mills should be included (in para 3.5.22), as part of the cultural infrastructure in the area.   | Noted  | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to be amended to refer to the attractions.             |

| <b>Representer Ref:</b> | <b>Nature of Representation:</b> | <b>Representation Summary:</b>   | <b>Response:</b>  | <b>Changes to Brief:</b>   |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>00031 /0003</b>      | Support                          | Welcomes the strategic approach to development of Bromley-by-Bow that respects the historic context of Three Mills.  | Support welcomed  | No change  |
| <b>00031 / 0004</b>     | Support                          | Welcomes the historic environment has been identified as a key sustainability issue to be taken into account in drafting the Brief.  | Support welcomed  | No change  |
| <b>00031/0005</b>       | Not Stated                       | It should also be noted that archaeology will potentially be affected (in addition to the conservation area and listed buildings) and this will also need to be mitigated.   | Noted. Developers will be required to submit an archaeology assessment and mitigate any significant effects from the proposed development of the site.  | It is recommended the Sustainable Appraisal to be amended to reference archaeology and mitigation. |
| <b>00031 / 0007</b>     | Support                          | English Heritage agrees that providing enhanced visitor facilities associated with the Lea River Park and Three Mills area could significantly improve people's enjoyment of the local heritage in the area, as well as provide a greater understanding of its history and source of amenity/ recreation. We are therefore supportive of this recommendation | Support welcomed. However, the it would be inappropriate to suggest the use of those buildings for visitor facilities as they are outside of the Brief's area. This is more appropriate for the Sugar House Lane/Three Mills Masterplan work. | Noted  |