



# Whitechapel Vision Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document

## Consultation and Engagement Report

December 2013

**CONTENTS PAGE**

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>
Background and Context	
Role of this Consultation and Engagement Report	
<b>2</b>	<b>CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT APPROACH</b>
Statement of Community Involvement	
Engaging the Local Community and Key Stakeholders	
How we involved the Local Community and Key Stakeholders	
<b>3</b>	<b>CONSULTATION PROGRAMME</b>
Consultation Events and Activities	
<b>4</b>	<b>STAGES 1 &amp; 2 OF CONSULTATION &amp; ENGAGEMENT PROCESS</b>
Overview and Summary	
<b>Representations &amp; Responses Table (Table 3)</b>	
A table of the representations received during statutory consultation period (Monday 23 October – Monday 4 November 2013) and LBTH's responses.	

*Please note that copies of the Council's consultation publicity materials (for example, press advertising and webpages) are available upon request.*

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### Background and Context

- 1.1 The London Borough of Tower Hamlets is currently in the process of finalising the Whitechapel Vision Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), with the intention of this strategic planning document being formally adopted in December 2013.
- 1.2 The overall aim of the Masterplan SPD is to maximise the opportunities arising in Whitechapel from the new Crossrail station (due to open in 2018) and the world-class health and education facilities offered by the Royal London Hospital and Queen Mary, University of London in order to drive regeneration and improve the area for future and existing residents and visitors.
- 1.3 The Whitechapel Vision Masterplan SPD will ensure a co-ordinated approach is taken to the physical and socio-economic regeneration of Whitechapel to 2025. It will set out a clear and unique vision for the area, identify key development priorities on private sites and public land and provide guiding development principles.
- 1.4 The Masterplan SPD will be a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications, within the defined boundary.

### Role of the Consultation and Engagement Report

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

## 2.0 CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

### Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

2.1 The approach to consultation has been developed to be in conformity with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2012). The overarching aim for consultation is to provide an opportunity for involvement from a wide range of local community groups and individuals.

### Engaging the local community and key stakeholders

2.2 In undertaking community involvement, the core principles which have governed the approach to consultation are provided below:

**Appropriate** to the level of planning issue and the type of document being consulted on;

**From the beginning**, giving people the opportunity to shape the documents and make it their own;

**A continuous process** and not just a one off event;

**Clear and straightforward** by using methods suitable to the communities being consulted; and

**Planned** as a central part of the planning and plan making process.

### How we involved the local community and key stakeholders

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

**Table 1 – Whitechapel Vision Masterplan SPD Consultation Process**

Stage		Method of Consultation / Engagement	How the community have their say
<b>Stage 1 – Preliminary Consultation</b> Engagement and participation before developing a SPD.	<i>February 2013 - August 2013</i>	This stage comprises information gathering and generating options before developing the Masterplan through a series of engagement activities.	By writing to us and/or attending a meeting or workshop.
<b>Stage 2 - Statutory Consultation</b> Community involvement and participation before adopting a SPD.	<i>23 September – 4 November 2013 (6 weeks)</i>	Undertaken for six weeks, before the finalisation and adoption of the Masterplan SPD. A series of events and activities, as well as the opportunity to submit formal written representations.	By writing to us and/or attending a meeting or workshop.
<b>Stage 3 – Publication of adopted SPD</b>	<i>December 2013</i>	Publish the Consultation and Engagement Report and Adoption Statement. This is the final stage and those who have requested to be notified, will be sent the adoption statement.	N/A

2.4 Throughout the Masterplan SPD preparation process, a diverse range of consultation techniques and activities were carried out to ensure an effective and efficient engagement. Some of these include (and are detailed further in table 2):

**a) Internal drop-in sessions**

Engagement with LBTH Council service departments throughout process

**b) Stakeholder ‘surgery’ sessions**

Engagement with a wide range of key stakeholders in the area including local businesses, community organisations, various resident groups, voluntary and faith sectors during development stages of the draft Masterplan.

**c) Landowner and Developer Meetings and Forums**

Regular meetings/forums with local landowners and developers to engage them on the development of the Masterplan SPD.

**d) New London Architecture (NLA) ‘Whitechapel Think Tank’**

A session organised by the NLA inviting a wide range of built environment professionals to discuss issues and ideas that affect Whitechapel's future.

**e) One to one meetings on request**

Throughout the preliminary and statutory consultation the Masterplan project team has offered bespoke one to one meetings with interested individuals, groups and organisations.

**f) Market traders drop-in sessions**

Drop-in sessions to engage with Market Traders about the plans in order to understand better their issues with and aspirations for the market

**g) Meeting with Elected Members**

Regular engagement with Mayor and Lead Member for Housing to ascertain community priorities and aspirations, to ensure community issues are fed into the Masterplan SPD.

**h) Public and local resident drop-in sessions**

Public consultation and residents drop-in sessions during statutory consultation

**i) Meetings with statutory consultees**

Meetings with Greater London Authority (GLA), Transport for London (TfL) and Crossrail to inform and update them on the progress of the Masterplan SPD.

**j) Online updates**

Regular updates to the Council's purpose built website [www.whitechapelmasterplan.com](http://www.whitechapelmasterplan.com) to inform people of the progress of the document during the preliminary consultation and invite comment and input. The Council's own website published the draft Masterplan in full inviting comments on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2013.

**k) Media Coverage/Press Adverts**

The Masterplan has been subject to wide publicity to increase awareness for residents of Tower Hamlets and on London and national context

At preliminary consultation stage local media East End Life informed residents of the borough about the Whitechapel Vision in the 18 March 2013 edition (front page) and East London Advertiser 13 March 2013 (front page) and how to get involved.

Professional journal magazines have covered the Whitechapel Masterplan:

During the statutory consultation (23 September – 4 November 2013) the Whitechapel Masterplan was covered in the following media detailing the high level content of the Vision and in instances publicising the consultation process:

- 24 September 2013 - Building Design Journal
- 29 September 2013 - BBC (Web)
- 30 September 2013, 2 October 2013 and 14 October 2013- East End Life (including public notice)
- 2 October 2013, 27 October 2013 East London Advertiser
- 18 October 2013 – Bangla Mirror
- 24 October 2013 – Bangla Post
- 24 October 2013 – Bangla Post
- 25 October 2013 – Weekly Bangla Bangladesh
- 25 October 2013 – Janomot
- 28 October 2013 – Weekly Euro Bangla
- 1 November 2013 – NRB news

**l) Posters in area**

Posters displayed in the area to inform residents, workers and visitors of public consultation and events

**m) Postcards in area**

Feedback postcards left in Whitechapel Idea Store and some local shops to raise awareness amongst the community of Masterplan Vision

**n) Email and Letters**

Contacted those on the Whitechapel Consultation database to inform them of public consultation and dates

**o) Media Coverage**

The draft Masterplan has been advertised as set out above.

**3.0 CONSULTATION EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES**

3.1 The table below outlines the programme of events and activities undertaken for stage 1 (preliminary consultation) and stage 2 of the consultation (statutory consultation).

**Table 2 – Whitechapel Vision Masterplan SPD key consultation activities**

Method/Type of Consultation	Aim/details	Target Groups	Location and Date
<b>Stage 1 - Preliminary Consultation</b>			
Masterplan SPD media campaign. Publication on LBTH website, postcards in Whitechapel Idea Store and various local shops, posters	Raising awareness amongst the community of the Masterplan project	Local community	Various <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>February – September 2013</li> </ul>
Stakeholder 'surgery'	To engage with some of the key stakeholders in the area, to ascertain key issues and aspirations and gain initial ideas for the Masterplan	Key stakeholders, including: Local landowners including NHS, QMUL, Safestore, Lidl Various local Residents Associations Registered Providers	Whitechapel Idea Store <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20 and 21 February 2013</li> </ul>



		Other organisations including TfL and Citizens UK	
Landowner and developer Forums	To engage with and update key landowners and developers. Separate focused meetings with key landowners to discuss specific issues relating to the Masterplan SPD and their aspirations for their site.	Key landowners and developers in the area.	Whitechapel Idea Store and BDP offices (Clerkenwell) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24 April 2013</li> <li>• 17 May 2013</li> <li>• 4 July 2013</li> </ul>
Professional forum (NLA)	To engage expert opinion from a wide range of built environment professionals on Whitechapel's future development	Professional advisors and bodies	Building Centre (Tottenham Court Road) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 April 2013</li> </ul>
Community group meetings	To engage with groups to understand their key issues with and aspirations for the area	Local business associations, media and cultural groups	LBTH Town Hall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 13 June 2013</li> </ul>
Drop-in session for Market Traders	To engage with the market traders to understand their key issues and aspirations for Whitechapel Market	Local market traders	Whitechapel Idea Store <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 July 2013</li> </ul>
Meetings with statutory stakeholders	To update and engage them on the Masterplan	GLA  TfL  Crossrail  English Heritage	GLA City Hall (Southwark) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23 May 2013</li> </ul> TfL Palestra (Southwark) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 April 2013</li> </ul> Crossrail depot offices (Whitechapel) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 29 May 2013</li> <li>• 23 July 2013</li> </ul>

<b>Stage 2 - Statutory Consultation</b>			
<b>Method/Type of Consultation</b>	<b>Aim/details</b>	<b>Target Groups</b>	<b>Date and Location</b>
Public Drop-in Sessions	To introduce and discuss the aims and objectives of the Masterplan SPD, and the spatial proposals contained in the draft document.	The general public.	Whitechapel Idea Store <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 October 2013</li> <li>• 16 October 2013</li> </ul>
Bespoke Residents Drop-in session	To discuss spatial proposals for specific sub areas within the Masterplan boundary	Local residents and businesses on Durward Street, Unze Court, Wodeham Gardens, Trinity Hall, Vallance Road (south east side) and Albion Yard	Whitechapel Idea Store <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24 October 2013</li> </ul>
Stakeholder Presentation session	Presentation of draft Masterplan to key stakeholder group with Question and Answers session	Key stakeholders group, including: Local landowners, Registered Providers Community organisations, regulatory bodies.	Whitechapel Idea Store <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 October 2013</li> </ul>
Drop-in session for Market Traders	To engage with the market traders and to introduce the proposals for Whitechapel Market in the draft Masterplan	Local market traders	Whitechapel Idea Store <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 31 October 2013</li> </ul>

SEA Screening Determination notification email	To confirm that the Masterplan SPD does not require an SEA, in accordance with the requirements of regulation 9(1) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.	Statutory environmental bodies (Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England) via email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>30 September 2013</li> </ul>
<b>Stage 3 - Adopting the Masterplan</b>			
<p>Formal consideration of final Masterplan for adoption.</p> <p>For detail on the representations received and the Council's responses to these comments see table below</p>	Approval of proposed responses to representations received during the statutory consultation period and adoption of the masterplan by the Executive Mayor in Cabinet.	<p>Council's Mayor and Cabinet.</p> <p>Cabinet is a public meeting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 December 2013</li> </ul>

#### 4.0 STAGES 1 & 2 OF CONSULTATION & ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

##### Stage 1 – Preliminary consultation

4.1 A number of key messages emerged out of this stage 1 preliminary engagement process, including:

- Lack of sense of arrival into Whitechapel
- Whitechapel has a unique character which should be retained and enhanced
- Some interesting old buildings including the old Royal London Hospital and the Blind Beggar pub
- Parts of Whitechapel feel unwelcoming, unattractive and unsafe
- Lack of public and open spaces for people to enjoy

- Appearance of streets need tidying up
- Pedestrian access through market can be difficult
- Hard to navigate around area, lack of connectivity and signage for wayfinding
- Desire for media hub and cultural space for the community
- Royal London Hospital and QMUL keen to work together to develop health and education campus with an emphasis on 'life sciences'
- Shoppers would like a more diverse retail offer
- Lack of cafes, bars and restaurants in the area
- Overcrowding in some social housing estates and need for larger, affordable family housing

4.2 The key issues and opportunities identified in this stage 1 preliminary engagement, in addition to the evidence base work, then shaped the Draft Whitechapel Vision Masterplan SPD and the resultant spatial options for the area and key development sites.

## **Stage 2 – Formal statutory consultation**

- 4.3 The statutory public consultation has engaged broad support from the local community and key major landowners and developers in the area.
- 4.4 Key landowners and developers that have offered their broad support through submitted representations include QMUL, Barts Health NHS Trust, Sainsbury's, Safestore, and Cavell Street owners.
- 4.5 Statutory consultees namely Transport for London and the Greater London Authority offer strong support for the Masterplan in their submitted representations. The Environment Agency and Natural England have also expressed broad support of the document with detailed technical requests set out within their representations.
- 4.6 English Heritage has made representations on the Masterplan referencing concern regarding the indicative design proposals in Key Place Transformation sub areas and the deemed adverse impact upon existing heritage assets within Whitechapel. The Council notes these concerns and is proposing a number of minor amendments to emphasise the safeguards in the masterplan which, together with adopted Local Plan policies and national planning and heritage legislation, provide a comprehensive basis to preserve and enhance heritage assets within the Masterplan area.

- 4.7 Some local residents of north Durward Street have expressed concerns regarding the potential demolition of their properties as shown under 'Key Place Transformation 3: Durward Street Gardens'. The Council has considered these representations and has proposed amendments to the Masterplan that achieve the regeneration ambition for this sub area without the redevelopment of existing residential properties. The proposed change is set out in the table below.
- 4.8 Some residents of Kempton Court have also expressed concern regarding future environmental and amenity impacts of the development guidance proposed within the Masterplan on land adjacent to their properties located to the south at Whitechapel station under 'Key Place Transformation 3: Durward Street Gardens'. The Council considers that existing local planning policies will apply to mitigate any impacts through the planning applications process and do not consider an amendment to the Masterplan is required in this respect.
- 4.9 Some residents of Albion Yard object to the Masterplan proposals for a new open space at the rear of Albion Yard under 'Key Place Transformation 6: Cambridge Heath Gateway' with regard to perceived adverse impacts on their amenity and privacy. In addition, some residents have drawn the Council's attention to the associated car park site currently occupied by Crossrail under a temporary lease arrangement during the construction period at Whitechapel until 2018 when works are due to be complete. The Council has considered these representations and propose minor amendments to the Masterplan regarding associated car parking provision that serves the site and recognises the existing land ownership arrangements directly linked with Albion Yard development. The proposed minor plan changes are set out in the table below.
- 4.10 Tower Hamlets Homes (THH) has expressed concern regarding social tenant and leaseholder properties which are managed by THH on the north side of Vallance Gardens. The Council recognises that the indicative development guidance for these properties does not reflect THH's plans to refurbish these properties and therefore propose minor amendments to these affected properties, together with other properties on Old Montague Street and Hanbury Street, as set out in the table below.

## **5.0 TABLE OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING STATUTORY CONSULTATION**

### **Key abbreviations:**

MDD = LBTH's Managing Development Document, adopted 2013

CS = LBTH's Core Strategy, adopted 2010

SPD = Supplementary Planning Document

KPT = Key Place Transformation

HS2012 = High Street 2012 (Olympic funded public realm improvement project on Whitechapel Road)

**Table 3 - Summary of Representations received during statutory consultation and LBTH responses**

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Consultee type</b>	<b>Organisation Details or Location</b>	<b>Representation summary (Section 1: Introduction)</b>	<b>LBTH Response</b>
226	Resident	Sidney St, E1	Concern about planning jargon in document	Noted. The document has been written in the clearest language for all readers and where technical terms are used these are explained where possible.
216	Statutory consultee	Greater London Authority (GLA)	<p>Masterplan should support high trip generating development that reduces need to travel</p> <p>Improve interchange between different modes of transport</p> <p>SPD should be read alongside London Plan and City Fringe Opportunity Area Framework (OAPF)</p> <p>Suggested amendment to text on Page 2 (See full GLA response)</p>	<p>Noted. The Masterplan promotes sustainable forms of travel to support new development that includes improving access to public transport (bus, rail, underground) and recommendations for improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure as listed in the 'Wider Interventions' table (Page 39 and 40).</p> <p>Noted. Under KPT1, it is anticipated a number of significant public realm improvements will occur to make interchange easier on Whitechapel Road for those travelling by bus, rail, underground, walking and cycling (Page 17 and 19).</p> <p>Agree. Reference's to London Plan and City Fringe OAPF are set out within Section 1 Figure 1 (Page 2). Amendment to Figure 6 Section 3 (Page 4) to demarcate draft City Fringe OAPF boundary.</p> <p>Agree. Amendment to text on Page 2, under 'Planning Status of SPD', paragraph 2:</p>

				<i>"The London Plan and draft City Fringe OAPF, which is an SPG to the London Plan".</i>
255	Statutory consultee	English Heritage (EH)	<p>EH's Partnership Schemes in Conservation Areas (PSCIA) scheme should be recognised in Masterplan as part of HS2012 programme</p> <p>Key purpose of Masterplan is to conserve historic environment - this should be made clear in wording.</p> <p>Additional objective suggested re historic environment - suggested wording</p>	<p>Agree. Add text reference PSCIA on Page 2 under 'Background', paragraph 3, 3rd bullet point.</p> <p>Noted. Section 3 under 'Whitechapel Local Context' (Page 5) includes a new paragraph to emphasise the CS Whitechapel Vision with regard to historic environment and Section 4 'Urban Design Analysis' Figure 8 (Page 8) and Section 5 under 'Delivering High Quality Place' sub section 'Protecting and Enhancing Heritage' (Page 11) and Townscape Strategy Figure 11 (Page 14) already recognise the importance of the existing historic environment.</p>

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details or Location	Representation summary (Section 2: Masterplan Boundary)	LBTH Response
31	Resident	Durward St, E1	Suggests Masterplan boundary should include deprived housing estates, and regeneration should	Noted. The Masterplan boundary does encompass a number of social housing estates to both the north and south of Whitechapel station/Road. As set out in the

			not just be around station but wider area	'Wider Interventions' table (Page 40), it is the intention that a Whitechapel Estate Capacity and Improvement Study be undertaken to explore housing regeneration opportunities for these estates.
137	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Agree with the boundary as set.	Support noted.
14	Landowner	KTS Group Ltd.	Seeking views about potential development site on Commercial Road within the Masterplan boundary.	The Council is open to meeting with prospective developers through its pre-application planning service.
59	Organisation	Project Architects	Suggests perhaps Commercial Road should have been included in Masterplan boundary	Disagree, the Council considers the Masterplan boundary as an appropriate reflection of the 'Place of Whitechapel' as set out in the Core Strategy (2010).
50	Resident	E1	Supports Masterplan boundary	Support noted.
122	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Supports Masterplan boundary	Support noted.
85	Resident	Walden St, E1	Masterplan boundary should include Commercial Rd and other deprived areas in vicinity	Disagree. The Council considers the Masterplan boundary as an appropriate reflection of the 'Place of Whitechapel' as set out in the Core Strategy (2010)
209	Resident	Cleveland Way, E1	Suggests original White Chapel site be included in boundary	Disagree. The Council considers the Masterplan boundary as an appropriate reflection of the 'Place of Whitechapel' as set out in the Core Strategy (2010).



			<p>Suggests old Wickhams store should be included</p> <p>Suggests Bethnal Green National Rail Station and the development site on Dunbridge Street to be included.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details or Location	Representation summary (Section 3: Context of Whitechapel)	LBTH Response
123	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Supports context section.	Support noted.
233	Resident	Sidney St, E1	Does not want Whitechapel to be encroached on by City.	Noted. The Masterplan seeks to distinguish Whitechapel as distinct place within London as mapped by the Masterplan Area Boundary (Figure 3 Page 3)
223	Statutory consultee	GLA	<p>Suggested amendments to diagram/text on Page 2 and 4 (see full GLA response).</p> <p>Further scope to harmonise Whitechapel Vision boundary and draft City Fringe OAPF boundary.</p>	<p><b>Agree.</b> Amendment to text on Page 2 and diagram (Figure 3) on Page 4 regarding Overland and City Fringe wording.</p> <p>Noted. Reference to London Plan and City Fringe OAPF is set out within Sections 1 Figure 1 (Page 2). Amendment to Figure 6 Section 3 (Page 4) to demarcate draft City Fringe OAPF boundary.</p>
256	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	Context Section 3 lacks wording on historic environment. Suggests text	<b>Agree.</b> Amendment within Section 3 under 'Whitechapel Local Context' (Page 5) with new text reference to the

			should be added (see detailed comments).	Core Strategy exert 'Vision for Whitechapel' (Ref: Figure 5, Page 106) with regard to historic environment.
--	--	--	--	---

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation details or location	Representation summary (Section 4: Baseline Findings)	LBTH Response
234	Resident	Sidney St, E1	Notes that Baseline section shows there is a need more social housing in area and requests Masterplan emphasises this more.	Noted. One of the key objectives of the Masterplan is to deliver 3,500 new homes by 2025, including substantial amounts of new family and affordable homes (Page 11). The Council will seek to secure minimum of 35% affordable provision within new residential development as per Policy SP02 in the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Policy DM3 in the adopted MDD (2013). Furthermore Policies SP02 and DM3 seek to provide a balance of housing types, including family homes.
124	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Supports baseline findings as reflective of area.	Support noted.

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation details or location	Representation summary (Section 4: Urban design analysis)	LBTH Response
257	Statutory	English Heritage	Suggest that in urban design	<b>Agree.</b> Amend text on p 8, Challenges and Opportunity

	consultee		analysis table/plan the challenge to deliver growth AND enhance Whitechapel's historic character should be recognised - suggest this be amended.	table, final row, as requested by EH.
225	Statutory consultee	GLA	<p>Hanbury Street currently poorly connected to Whitechapel and should be described as an 'aspiration' rather than a route.</p> <p>Whitechapel Road could be identified as part of Transport for London Road Network (TLRN).</p>	<p>Disagree. The current existing route requires physical public realm improvement beyond aspiration. Hanbury Street is identified as priority under Section 7 'Wider Highway and Public Realm Improvements' (Page 40).</p> <p>Noted. The SPD is not required to recognise existing non planning policy designations, however the TLRN will be a key consideration under project 'Whitechapel Road Public realm Improvements' (Page 19) whereby Transport for London (TfL) are identified as key delivery partner.</p>

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation details or location	Representation summary (Section 4: Consultation)	LBTH Response
121	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	<p>Introduction language not accessible to wider public</p> <p>Objects to residents not being invited to preliminary consultation</p>	<p>Noted. The document has been written in the clearest language for all readers and where technical terms are used these are explained where possible.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See</p>

				Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
135/ 136	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Objects to lack of consultation of local residents.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
33	Resident	Durward St, E1	Concerns around lack of consultation.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
65	Resident	Durward St, E1	Objects to lack of consultation.  Questions legitimacy of plans due to lack of consultation with residents.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.

67	Resident	Durward St, E1	Objects to lack of consultation of Durward St residents (during stakeholder surgeries/forums in Feb, April, July 2013).	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
46	Resident	Chester St, E2	Object to lack and method of consultation.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
126	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Complaint about lack of consultation for residents of Durward St and method of informing residents.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
80		Durward Street North Residents	Complaint about lack of consultation of Durward St North residents.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance

				with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
92	Resident	Walden St, E1	Complaint about lack and method of consultation.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
202	Resident		<p>Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) Report does not consider the needs of the local Bangladeshi and Somali and other 'hard to reach' communities.</p> <p>Notes the lack of adequate consultation with street market traders.</p>	<p>Disagree. The local Black and Multi Ethnic (BME) populations and other demographic groups have been considered in the supporting EqIA and the Masterplan's overall objectives, which seek to improve housing, educational attainment, employment and business opportunities, for all local residents including BME and other demographic groups.</p> <p>Disagree. As part of the consultation process, engagement has been undertaken with street markets traders, through focussed meetings inviting licenced traders to attend. Together with the wider public events, two drop-in consultation sessions have been held specifically for Whitechapel street market traders were</p>

				undertaken. See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken. The Masterplan recommends further engagement with market traders via further studies including 'Updated Street Market Plan' and 'New Market Pilot Projects' (Page 37 and 40)
71/74	Resident	Durward St, E1	Concerns about lack of consultation.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
139	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Issue with lack of consultation.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation details or location	Representation summary (Section 5: Vision and Guiding Principles)	LBTH Response
32	Resident	Durward St, E1	Improving Housing Offer: Concerns about need for range of housing tenures and more affordable housing	Noted. One of the key objectives of the Masterplan is to improve housing offer by delivering 3,500 new homes by 2025, including substantial amounts of new family and affordable homes (p 11). A minimum of 35% affordable provision with new residential development will be sought, as per Policy SP02 in the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Policy DM3 in the adopted MDD (2013). Furthermore Policies SP02 and DM3 seek to provide a balance of housing types, including family homes.
91	Resident	Walden St, E1	<p>SPD must ensure diversity of Whitechapel is preserved.</p> <p>Housing should provide a range of types and choice.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan is to promote sustainable communities, which will address social deprivation, improve the housing offer and educational attainment for local residents, and support a diverse range of cultural, leisure and community uses (Page 11). Another key ambition of the Masterplan is to deliver high quality places, which includes protecting and enhancing heritage (Page 11). These combined will ensure that the unique character and diversity of Whitechapel is preserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives of the Masterplan is to improve housing offer by delivering 3,500 new homes by 2025, including substantial amounts of new</p>



				family and affordable homes (Page 11). A minimum of 35% affordable housing provision within new residential development will be sought, as per Policy SP02 in the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Policy DM3 in the adopted MDD (2013). Furthermore Policies SP02 and DM3 seek to provide a balance of housing types, including family homes.
146	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Agrees with/supports guiding principles.	Support noted.
75	Resident	Durward St, E1	<p>Supports provision of more housing in area.</p> <p>Emphasises need for environmental sustainability of new housing.</p> <p>Concerns about lack of support for local businesses.</p> <p>Emphasises the importance of community and promoting cultural facilities/activities.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. Policy DM21 and DM29 of the MDD with regard to sustainable design, construction and transport will ensure the sustainability of new development.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan is 'Supporting local business' (Page 10).</p> <p>One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan is to strengthen Whitechapel's District Centre, which will include expanding and diversifying town centre activity with increased cultural and community activity (Page 10). Another key ambition is promoting sustainable communities, which will include supporting culture,</p>

				leisure and community uses (Page 11).
146	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Agrees with/supports guiding principles.	Support noted.
162	Landowner	Safestore (agent: GVA)	Broadly support vision for Whitechapel.	Support noted.
99	Statutory Consultee	Thames Water Property	Request that specific policy be included in Whitechapel SPD to deal with water supply and sewerage infrastructure.	Noted. Policies within the Core Strategy and DM12 and DM13 of the MDD consider water supply and sewerage infrastructure.
163	Landowner	Safestore (agent: GVA)	Requests SPD states that provision of affordable homes is 'subject to viability'.  Agree with statement in SPD that Whitechapel can support higher residential densities.	Disagree. The Council has undertaken its own supporting viability assessment appropriate to this level of strategic planning and considers development is financially viable over the lifetime of the plan, applying adopted planning policies, including minimum levels of affordable housing. As a result, it is not considered necessary to amend this part of the statement. Detailed planning proposals will be subject to viability testing in accordance with CS Policy SP02 and Policy DM3 of the MDD at the planning application stage.  Support noted.
127	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Note housing and education important for area.	Noted. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan is to improve the housing offer and support community uses and infrastructure (Page 11). Detailed proposals will be

			New housing should not disadvantage existing households and community, including Durward Street residents.	<p>subject to infrastructure assessment at planning application stage.</p> <p>Noted. The Masterplan seeks to provide a new planning framework to enhance the future built environment in Whitechapel, including existing residential communities in the area. The revised design framework for 'KPT3 Durward Street Gardens' (Page 24) seeks to minimise the impact on existing residential properties on Durward Street (property nos. 73-95 and 57-71) by removing from the sub area plan (See Figure 22).</p>
235	Resident	Sidney St, E1	Important to provide truly affordable housing.	One of the key objectives of the Masterplan is to improve the housing offer, delivering 3,500 new homes by 2025, including substantial amounts of new family and affordable homes (p 11). A minimum of 35% affordable provision with new residential development will be sought, as per policy SP02 in the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and policy DM3 in the adopted MDD (2013). Furthermore Policies SP02 and DM3 seek to provide a balance of housing types, including family homes.
87	Resident	Walden St, E1	<p>Concern about loss of Whitechapel's unique character.</p> <p>Note area would benefit from greater diversity of shops, restaurants and cafes, not chains.</p>	Noted. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan is to promote sustainable communities, which will address social deprivation, improve the housing offer and educational attainment for local residents, and support a diverse range of cultural, leisure and community uses (Page 11). Another key ambition of the

			<p>Plans for street market not clear in SPD</p> <p>Support plans for local decentralised energy network in area.</p>	<p>Masterplan is to deliver high quality places, which includes protecting and enhancing heritage (Page 11). These combined will ensure that the unique character and diversity of Whitechapel is preserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
101	Resident	Homer Drive, E1	<p>Concern about population increase in Whitechapel, impact on number of school places - no mention in the Masterplan of new or expanded schools. No reference in Masterplan to new or expanded GP surgeries. Welcomes proposed new homes but LBTH not planning for required social infrastructure to meet the needs of the increase in population.</p> <p>No reference in Masterplan to additional car parking capacity</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan is to support community uses and infrastructure (Page 11). Detailed planning proposals will be subject to an infrastructure assessment and requirements, including schools and health facilities. All new development in the borough is assessed against the Planning Obligations SPD (2012).</p> <p><b>Agree.</b> Amendment to text, on Page 27, under 'Creation of Med-City campus', point 3:</p> <p><i>'Range of complementary uses to support the campus will be required, including...ancillary parking to support</i></p>

				<i>RLH'</i>
102	Resident		<p>Concerns about regeneration of Whitechapel making it too expensive for local residents to live there.</p> <p>Concerns about the unique character of Whitechapel being lost through its regeneration.</p> <p>Concerns about the loss of local independent shops.</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD is unable to control values of property but the Council will continue to secure affordable housing for LBTH residents as the areas s redeveloped and regenerated.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan is to promote sustainable communities, which will address social deprivation, improve the housing offer and educational attainment for local residents, and support a diverse range of cultural, leisure and community uses (Page 11). Another key ambition of the Masterplan is to deliver high quality places, which includes protecting and enhancing heritage (Page 11). This combined will ensure that the unique character and diversity of Whitechapel is preserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan is to strengthen Whitechapel's District Centre, which will specifically include supporting local businesses (Page 10).</p>
106	Registered Provider	London Quadrant (agent: DP9)	<p>Agree with supporting local businesses, but protection of existing local businesses should depend on specific circumstances.</p> <p>Suggests viability should be taken into</p>	<p>Support noted. It is not considered necessary to alter the statement under 'Supporting local business' (page 10)'</p> <p>Disagree. The Council has undertaken its own</p>

			account in provision of Affordable Housing.	supporting viability assessment appropriate to this level of strategic planning and considers development is financially viable over the lifetime of the plan, applying adopted planning policies, including minimum levels of affordable housing. Detailed planning proposals will be subject to viability testing in accordance with CS Policy SP02 and Policy DM3 of the MDD at the planning application stage.
114	Registered Provider	London Quadrant (agent: DP9)	Suggests objective for high-density residential development is made explicit within SPD.	Disagree. One of the key ambitions 'improving the housing offer' sets out a target of 3,500 new homes, which is considered high density for the locality.
153	Landowner	Cavell Properties/ SARL (agent: DP9)	Suggest wording be added with respect of affordable housing standard 'subject to viability'	Disagree. The Council has undertaken its own supporting viability assessment appropriate to this level of strategic planning and considers development is financially viable over the lifetime of the plan, applying adopted planning policies, including minimum levels of affordable housing. Detailed planning proposals will be subject to viability testing in accordance with CS Policy SP02 and Policy DM3 of the MDD at the planning application stage.
157	Landowner	KTS Group (agent: NLP)	Strongly support positive vision and ambitions for Whitechapel.  SPD must provide sufficient flexibility and responsive approach to facilitate	Support noted.  Noted. It is considered the SPD strikes the appropriate balance between clear planning guidance and flexibility

			development and deliver objectives for the area.	and is subject to further updates in the future by the Council if considered necessary in order to respond to change.
159	Landowner	KTS Group (agent: NLP)	<p>Welcomes aspiration to deliver 3,500 new homes in Whitechapel over plan period.</p> <p>LBTH must adopt realistic and flexible approach to delivery of affordable/family housing - minimum 35% affordable housing target must be flexibly applied dependent on specific circumstances - flexible approach also needs to be taken to provision of family housing.</p> <p>Certain areas, such as the Cavell Street site, are less appropriate for family units and this should be recognised in the Masterplan.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council has undertaken its own supporting viability assessment appropriate to this level of strategic planning and considers development is financially viable over the lifetime of the plan, applying adopted planning policies, including minimum levels of affordable housing. Detailed planning proposals will be subject to viability testing in accordance with CS Policy SP02 and Policy DM3 of the MDD at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Disagree. Development sites should have the ability to accommodate a sustainable mix of new homes, including family sized units on site through sensitive design as required by planning policy.</p>
205	Organisation	The East London Mosque Trust Ltd	Suggest Masterplan includes more ambitious targets for new affordable housing, need to refer to improvements to existing social housing and plans for the improvement of streets and areas where people currently live.	Noted. Section 7' Delivering the Vision: Wider Interventions Across Whitechapel' (Page 40) seeks to improve social housing under 'Whitechapel Estate Capacity Study and Medium Scale sites'. 'Wider highway and Public Realm Improvements' addresses the issues of improving streets and neighbourhoods in the areas outside the core area.

187	Resident	Whitechapel	Suggests new jobs created must benefit local people.	Noted. The Masterplan aims to assist with the delivery of 5000 new local jobs to the Whitechapel area, Page 1. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan is to strengthen Whitechapel's District Centre, through creating employment growth, supporting local businesses and enhancing the street market (Page 10). Furthermore, KPT1, KPT2 and KPT4 seek to promote Whitechapel's emerging employment sectors creating significant employment opportunities for local people in retail, leisure, public services, education and health.
166	Developer	Berkeley Homes	Broadly supports vision for Whitechapel.  SPD needs to be flexible to ensure delivery.	Support noted.  Disagree. It is considered the SPD strikes the appropriate balance between clear planning guidance and flexibility and is subject to further updates in the future by the Council if considered necessary in order to respond to change.
168	Developer	Berkley Homes	Suggest flexible approach taken in SPD regarding the delivery of affordable and family sized housing to allow for 1 and 2 bed units.  Suggest rewording in SPD to state that delivery of affordable housing is 'subject to viability'.	Disagree. Development sites should have the ability to accommodate a sustainable mix of new homes, including family sized units on site through sensitive design as required by planning policy  Disagree. The Council has undertaken its own supporting viability assessment appropriate to this level of strategic planning and considers development is financially viable over the lifetime of the plan, applying adopted planning policies, including minimum levels of affordable housing. Detailed planning



				proposals will be subject to viability testing in accordance with CS Policy SP02 and Policy DM3 of the MDD at the planning application stage.
172	Developer	Zen Developments (agent: NLP)	<p>Strongly supports the Council's positive vision for Whitechapel.</p> <p>Requests the Masterplan must provide a suitably flexible and responsive basis to achieve the Council's vision and aspirations for the area.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. It is considered the SPD strikes the appropriate balance between clear planning guidance and flexibility and is subject to further update in the future by the Council if considered necessary in order to respond to change.</p>
178	Developer	Zen Developments (agent: NLP)	<p>Requests Masterplan must be clear that target of 35% affordable housing will be applied flexibly having regard to specific circumstances, including viability.</p> <p>Requests Masterplan should take flexible approach to provision of family sized housing too.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council has undertaken its own supporting viability assessment appropriate to this level of strategic planning and considers development is financially viable over the lifetime of the plan, applying adopted planning policies, including minimum levels of affordable housing. Detailed planning proposals will be subject to viability testing in accordance with CS Policy SP02 and Policy DM3 of the MDD at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council considers family sized units, especially affordable homes as a priority in order to meet acute housing needs of the borough residents.</p>
204	Resident		Suggest social housing quota should be increased.	Support noted.
214	Statutory consultee	GLA	Mayor of London supports Council's vision	Support noted.

			<p>Strong support for Med City, and inclusion of supporting leisure/retail uses.</p> <p>Supports optimising opportunities from Crossrail station.</p> <p>Notes the SPD needs to align with emerging City Fringe OAPF and signpost strategic policy and documents where appropriate.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Masterplan does align with the GLAs draft City Fringe OAPF and other documents on Page 4 and 5.</p>
227	Statutory consultee	GLA	<p>Support ambition to expand health, bio-tech and life-sciences industries at QMUL and RLH.</p> <p>Strongly support highlighting creative production and technology.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
258	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	<p>Intentions stated under 'Protecting and enhancing heritage' seem incompatible with illustrations on front cover of Masterplan.</p> <p>Welcome intention to improve public realm</p>	<p>Noted. The cover image of the Masterplan is an illustrative image only and new proposals will be subject to MDD Policies DM24, DM26 and DM27.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
93	Resident	Walden St, E1	<p>Suggests SPD should not be a corporate-driven policy.</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD has been produced in collaboration with a wide variety of stakeholders facilitated by the Council in response to increasing development pressure further to the scheduled opening of the new Crossrail line at Whitechapel station in 2018.</p>

			Requests SPD should contain more detail about additional community infrastructure.	Noted. KPT1-6 each require various types of social infrastructure to be provided on site and these will be subject to a infrastructure assessment at planning application stage. Additional community infrastructure to support regeneration is identified within 'Wider Interventions Across Whitechapel' (Page 39 and 40).
--	--	--	--	--

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation details or location	Representation summary (Section 5: Spatial Concept)	LBTH Response
8	Organisation	Barclays Bank, Whitechapel branch	Need for LBTH to take corporate approach to Masterplan in order to attract private investment needed to deliver Vision.  Masterplan should encourage and support A2 uses in town centres.	Noted. The Council to date has involved the private in production of the Masterplan and will continue to work with stakeholders to ensure the maximum regeneration benefits can be realised  Noted. The town centre policies within the MDD seek to protect retail (A2) land uses to ensure the vitality and viability of the Whitechapel district town centre.
107	Registered Provider	London Quadrant (agent: DP9)	Supports residential land uses in Eastern area of Masterplan area	Support noted.
147	Landowner	Sainsbury's (agent: Turley Associates)	Requests Cambridge Heath Gateway site is recognised in Spatial Concept plan as 'Core retail'.	Disagree. Figure 9 (Page 12) shows part of the site is within the 'Core Retail' area. The remainder of the site, while not explicitly showing as 'Core Retail' due to future residential land uses, remains within the District town centre boundary that prioritises retail and other

				commercial land uses.
154	Landowner	Cavell Properties/SARL (agent: DP9)	<p>Request land uses at ground floor level on sites in KPT4 should be expanded to include residential and supporting land uses.</p> <p>Request SPD should not presume that health and education uses at ground floor levels would be compatible with residential uses above.</p> <p>Request RLH and QMUL land should be differentiated from client's site.</p>	<p><b>Agree.</b> Amendment to text on Page 27 under 'Creation of a Med City campus' to include residential.</p> <p>Disagree. In planning and design terms these land uses can be compatible.</p> <p><b>Agree.</b> Amendment to text to acknowledge difference between different land ownerships.</p>
167	Developer	Berkeley Homes	<p>Consider that land use framework is too prescriptive, may prevent development opportunities coming forward.</p> <p>Suggest text is reworded on Page 12 to reflect more flexibility.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council considers it necessary to provide local specific planning guidance to manage future development in Whitechapel balanced with sufficient flexibility to allow variety development opportunities to come forward across the area. The supporting policies of the MDD (2013) and Core Strategy also guide development.</p> <p>Disagree. It is necessary to provide a high-level land use framework.</p>
173	Developer	Zen Developments (agent: NLP)	Masterplan should recognise that more peripheral areas of Whitechapel also have an important role to play in delivering new homes and jobs,	Noted. The Council has inserted text on Page 37 to acknowledge the medium scale sites outside the Key Place Transformation sub areas.

			particularly at sites located on primary routes and in key gateway/entrance locations.	
228	Statutory consultee	GLA	Setting out Cultural, Community and Creative Quarter AND Med City campus as key elements of the spatial strategy is strongly supported.	Support noted.
248	Landowner	QMUL (agent: CRBE)	<p>Support recognition by LBTH of need to zone land for higher education/research expansion at Whitechapel.</p> <p>QMUL key concern is that masterplan appropriately recognises opportunities for expansion for the university and guides future development.</p> <p>Aspirations and expansion plans for university buildings also in accordance with Mayor's 2020 vision document.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is satisfied the SPD recognises and promotes future development opportunities for QMUL through Med City.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
140	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Does not support new commercial loop through Durward St	Noted. The secondary loop seeks to better connect Whitechapel through improving existing routes and provide for 7 new linked open spaces.

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation details or location	Representation summary (Section 5: Open Space and Movement strategy)	LBTH Response
11	Resident	Mount Terrace, E1	Lack of green/open space in Masterplan.	Noted. The Masterplan proposes a variety of new public open spaces across Whitechapel including a new 'Green Spine', creating a net increase in green space in the Whitechapel area (Figure 10, Page 13). Furthermore, the Masterplan seeks to improve existing streetscapes and green spaces through a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, which would include new green landscaping, as referenced on Page 18 and in Delivery Schedule on Page 19.
42	Anonymous	Anonymous	Suggests need for more cycle facilities, and reduce traffic and parking on all side roads and make pedestrian/cycle access only.	Noted. The Public Realm Improvement Scheme for Whitechapel Rd under KPT1 will seek to address these cycling/highways issues, as referenced on Page 18 and in the Delivery Schedule on Page 19. Cycling and pedestrian enhancements are also referenced in Section 7 'Wider Interventions Across Whitechapel' (Page 39 and 40).
54	Resident	E1	Supports new open spaces.	Support noted.
128	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Welcome improvements to pedestrian and cycling routes.	Support noted.
88	Resident	Walden St, E1	Not clear in SPD how movement of traffic is being resolved, LBTH need radical policy for traffic control and	Noted. The Public Realm Improvement Scheme for Whitechapel Road under KPT1 will seek to address these cycling/highways issues, as referenced on

			<p>parking in area. Support cycling but not two-way cycle lanes</p>	<p>Page 18 and in the Delivery Schedule on Page 19. Cycling and pedestrian enhancements are also referenced in Section 7 'Wider Interventions Across Whitechapel' (Page 39 and 40).</p> <p><b>Agree</b> regarding parking. Text amendment Page 27, under 'Creation of Med-City campus', point 3:</p> <p><i>'Range of complementary uses to support the campus will be required, including... ancillary parking to support RLH'.</i></p>
108	Registered Provider	London Quadrant (agent: DP9)	<p>Open space shown on plan must be indicative only.</p> <p>Flexibility needed for location and scale of open space for sites coming forward.</p>	<p>Disagree. The 'Open Space and Movement Strategy' (Figure 10) is necessary to form the framework and guiding principles for planning new public open space and routes across Whitechapel to support anticipated future development and sets the approximate likely location and scale of new public open space required.</p>
155	Landowner	Cavell Properties/SARL (agent: DP9)	<p>Support new route between Commercial Road and Whitechapel Rd in principle.</p> <p>Concerned that there needs to be flexibility for new public spaces in context of new proposals coming forward in this area.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The 'Open Space and Movement Strategy' (Figure 10) is necessary to form the framework and guiding principles for planning new public open space and routes across Whitechapel to support anticipated future development and sets the approximate likely location and scale of new public open space required.</p>

207	Organisation	The East London Mosque Trust Ltd	ELM recommends SPD include specific provision of a neighbourhood connection route between Fieldgate St and Whitechapel Rd, well designed for safe use both day and night.	Noted. The 'Open and Movement Strategy' (Figure 10) sets out the planning framework for future connections and includes a proposed new north-south route between Fieldgate Street and Whitechapel Road.
174	Developer	Zen Developments (agent: NLP)	<p>Inconsistency between figures 9 and 10 regarding Vallance Rd as primary or secondary route.</p> <p>Requests Vallance Road should be classified as a Primary route throughout Masterplan.</p> <p>Masterplan should promote larger scale development along such routes, particularly at nodes and gateway/entrance locations.</p> <p>Suggest unique opportunity at northern end of Vallance Road to create a northern 'gateway' from Tech City in Shoreditch to Whitechapel district centre.</p> <p>Requests gateways and entrance nodes should be marked on Townscape strategy Plan as well as Open Space/Movement plan</p>	<p><b>Agree.</b> Amendment to text on Page 12, Figure 9, from 'Primary route' to 'Key route'.</p> <p>Disagree. Existing and proposed primary routes are considered to on Whitechapel Road and KPTs.</p> <p>Disagree. Large-scale development is promoted within and on the periphery of Whitechapel District Centre and areas of high public transport accessibility levels (PTAL).</p> <p>Disagree. The key 'gateways' to the area are centred around the Whitechapel District Centre on Whitechapel Road. It inaccurate to identify northern section of Vallance Road as a gateway to Tech City.</p> <p>Disagree. Figure 10 is the appropriate plan to demarcate 'entrance spaces'.</p>



196	Resident	Newark St, E1	Support more green space, trees, and plants.	Support noted.
100	Resident	Sidney Square, E1	<p>Suggest changes to north-south route: from the north moving south:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sidney Street to Stepney Way junction</li> <li>2. Stepney Way to Jubilee Street</li> <li>3. Jubilee Street traffic lights with commercial road</li> </ol> <p>This route has the advantage of wide streets with cars being able to pass each other on either side. Additionally it avoids the conservation areas and connects to Commercial Road cross roads that have traffic lights.</p>	Noted. Section 7 'Wider Interventions Across Whitechapel' (Page 39 and 40) will assess future traffic alignments under 'Wider Highways and Public Realm Improvements'
229	Statutory consultee	GLA	<p>Strategy should include creation of improved streets and surface linkages towards the City (Legible London, Cycle Superhighway and attractive/consistent public realm).</p> <p>Suggest segregated facilities for cycling along Whitechapel Road where space permits.</p>	<p>Noted. The 'Open Space and Movement Strategy' (Figure 10) sets out the planning framework for future connections and includes cycling, walking infrastructure, and public realm improvements. These are also set out in Section 7 'Wider Interventions Across Whitechapel' table (Page 39 and 40).</p> <p>Noted. 'Whitechapel Road Public Realm Improvements' project will consider the need for segregated cycle lanes.</p>
259	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	Gateway buildings should not necessarily be tall buildings. They	Noted. The three major gateway spaces will mark arrival points into Whitechapel around key junctions

			<p>should be designed to enhance area's historic character</p>	<p>and in front of the Crossrail entrance and Civic Hub. The gateways will be defined in a number of ways, including landmark buildings, public realm and public art. This does not necessarily mean that tall building will be located in these locations.</p> <p>The principles of landmark buildings have been subject to a detailed urban design analysis with regard to key routes, corners, entrances, frontages and local context. This baseline evidence informs the 'Open Space and Movement Strategy' (Figure 10) and 'Townscape Strategy' (Figure 11) sets out the location for gateways with landmark buildings, public realm and public art.</p>
238	Resident	Sidney St, E1	<p>No mention of existing housing in this area.</p> <p>More open space needed.</p>	<p>Disagree. Existing housing is recognised within Section 5: the Vision: Spatial Concept' Figure 12 and under the heading 'A Place to live'. It is also referenced within Section 7 under Whitechapel Estate Capacity Study' (Page 40</p> <p>Noted. The Masterplan proposes a variety of new public open spaces, including a new 'Green Spine', creating a net increase in green space in the Whitechapel area (Figure 10, Page 13). Furthermore, the Masterplan seeks to improve existing streetscapes and green spaces through a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, which would include new green landscaping, as</p>

				referenced on Page 18 and in Delivery Schedule on Page 19.
206	Organisation	The East London Mosque Trust Ltd	<p>Request that the SPD improve way finding in key places outside of central Whitechapel including signposting to ELM.</p> <p>Request controlled parking hours to ensure evenings and weekend parking is not restricted away from red routes.</p>	<p>Noted. Under KPT1 'Revitalising Whitechapel Road' (Page 17) and Section 7 'Upgrade Walking Infrastructure' (Page 39), the Masterplan will seek to address local way finding to important local destinations.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD cannot set out local parking controls for the area.</p>
86	Resident	Walden St, E1	Not clear in SPD how issue of parking will be resolved - parking serious issue in area	<p><b>Agree</b> regarding parking. Amend to text, Page 27, under 'Creation of Med-City campus', point 3:</p> <p><i>'Range of complementary uses to support the campus will be required, including... ancillary parking to support RLH'.</i></p>
235	Resident	Sidney St, E1	<p>Suggest enhance street market.</p> <p>Suggest improving accessibility a good proposal, especially for disabled people.</p> <p>Good public open space and seating supported.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>

213	Resident	Cleveland Way, E1	Suggest need for a segregate CS2 route.	The Public Realm Improvement Scheme for Whitechapel Road under KPT1 will seek to address these cycling/highways issues in partnership with TfL as referenced on Page 18 and in the Delivery Schedule on Page 19. Cycling enhancements are also referenced in Section 7 'Wider Interventions Across Whitechapel' (Page 39 and 40).
-----	----------	-------------------	---	---

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation details or location	Representation Summary (Section 5: Townscape Strategy)	LBTH Response
35	Resident	Durward St, E1	Concerns about tall buildings affecting skyline and historical character of Whitechapel.	Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/ Computer Generated Images (CGIs) contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.
141	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Does not support tall buildings OSD.	Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in policy DM26 in the

				adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.
240	Resident	Sidney St, E1	Objects to tall buildings	Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.
52	Resident	E1	Supports new taller buildings on Whitechapel Road.	Support noted.
164	Landowner	Safestore (agent: GVA)	Agree with SPD that Whitechapel can support higher density development, and that taller buildings may be appropriate.	Support noted

			Support identification of Safestore site for proposed landmark buildings (in accordance with pre-app advice received from LBTH).	Support noted.
129	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Does not support tall buildings in Whitechapel, support retention of unique character and heritage of Whitechapel	Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.
94	Resident	Walden St, E1	Concerns about tall building impacts.	Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.
84	Resident	Walden St, E1	Concerns about tall buildings impact on area (non-human scale, create desolate	Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the

			spaces, wind tunnel affect).	adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.
109	Registered Provider	London Quadrant (agent: DP9)	Suggests proposed locations for landmark buildings on sites 18a, 18b and 18c are not necessarily the best locations for such buildings and impacts need to be fully tested	Disagree. The principles of landmark buildings have been subject to a detailed urban design analysis with regard to key routes, corners, entrances, frontages and local context. Detailed design will however be subject to further testing through the pre-application and planning application processes.
156	Landowner	Cavell Properties/SARL (agent: DP9)	Reference to high density residential development is strongly supported.  Clarity needed about definition of landmark building and location of these in Masterplan area.	Support noted.  <b>Agree.</b> It is recognised the definition within the 'Townscape Strategy' is unclear with regard to landmark buildings. Amendment to text on Page 14, paragraphs 3:  <i>Landmark buildings are an important visual representation of regeneration and provide an opportunity to provide high quality architecture within the existing built environment. In some areas, where redevelopment can provide significant regeneration benefits for Whitechapel, a new landmark building</i>

				<i>may be expressed as a high quality taller building.</i>
158	Landowner	KTS Group (agent: NLP)	<p>Requests indication of landmark building in northern area of the Masterplan area.</p> <p>Notes higher density should not just be focused in District centre but depend on specific sites and higher densities should be considered appropriate in principle throughout the Masterplan area. Suggest Masterplan should explicitly refer to the need to maximise residential densities across the whole Masterplan area.</p> <p>Notes that SPD too restrictive with regard to heights of buildings needing to be district centre scale - opportunities for landmark buildings in Whitechapel of heights similar to those in Central Activity Zone, Activity Area and Major Centre locations.</p>	<p>Disagree. This area is outside the District centre boundary and is subject to policy DM26 of the MDD.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD promotes higher density development within the boundary of the Whitechapel District Centre and major development sites identified within Key Place Transformations sub areas. It is not considered appropriate to apply similar density levels across the wider Masterplan area.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD provides a local framework for landmark buildings based scale parameters set out within Policy DM26 of the MDD for District Centres.</p>
194	Resident	Durward St, E1	Concerns over nature of 'iconic' tall residential buildings.	Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the policies



				DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.
170	Developer	Berkley Homes	<p>Suggest western part of Whitechapel is identified in SPD as being in an Activity Area (THAA) where even taller buildings may be appropriate.</p> <p>Suggest flexible approach is taken to tall buildings across Masterplan area, should not be restricted to District centre scale - suggest supporting text on p 14 is amended.</p> <p>Suggest flexible approach is taken to high density development across Masterplan area, not just specific sites - suggest supporting text on p 14 is amended.</p>	<p>Noted. Amendment to Figure 6 demarcates the TH AA boundary. The western part of the Masterplan is within the TH AA and considers the scale transition between the Central Activity Zone (CAZ) and Preferred Office Locations (POLs) and surrounding residential streets. The low scale and historic nature of the area, Policy DM24, DM25, DM26 and DM27 will be applied.</p> <p>Disagree, A blanket heights policy for the whole Masterplan area is not considered appropriate in the context of the existing built environment and planning policy focusses scale towards the district town centre as per Policy DM26.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD promotes higher density development within the boundary of the Whitechapel District Centre and KPT sub areas. It is not considered appropriate to apply similar density levels across the wider Masterplan area.</p>
175	Developer	Zen Developments (agent: NLP)	Requests SPD should state that higher densities are considered in principle appropriate across the whole	Disagree. The SPD promotes higher density development within the boundary of the Whitechapel District Centre and major development sites identified

			<p>Masterplan area, not only in District Centre, and that densities should be maximised across the area.</p> <p>Requests northern section of Masterplan area offers significant opportunities for intensive development - in particular, a cluster of key sites on Pedley Street, Selby Street, Surma Close, Hemming Street and Vallance Road demarcate the northern 'gateway' into Whitechapel.</p> <p>Requests Masterplan should acknowledge opportunity for taller buildings, particularly at sites on primary routes and in gateway locations.</p> <p>Requests Vallance Road, alongside the gateway at Cambridge Heath Road, provides principal northern entrance to Whitechapel - this role should be</p>	<p>within Key Place Transformations sub areas. It is not considered appropriate to apply similar density levels across the wider Masterplan area.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD recognises there are wider opportunities for new development within the peripheral areas of the Masterplan on medium scale sites outside the District centre and KPTs areas. These are recognised in the Masterplan with reference to new text amendments to text within 'Section 7: Delivery Strategy' under 'Design &amp; Development Briefs' (Page 37) and 'Wider Interventions Across Whitechapel' in the schedule under 'Medium Scale Sites'(Page 40).</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD focusses scale towards the district town centre as per Policy DM26. In other locations proposed taller buildings subject to Policy DM24 and DM26 of the MDD.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD does not consider taller buildings are appropriately located in principle at this location and are subject to Policy DM24 and DM26 of the MDD.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			reflected in the height and scale of its buildings.	
198	Resident	Newark St, E1	<p>Request new buildings are of modern, high quality design that compliments historic architecture in area.</p> <p>Concerns about effect of tall buildings in terms of micro-climate (wind tunnel effect).</p>	<p>Noted. The 'Townscape Strategy' on Page 14 proposes that any new landmark buildings should be of high quality architecture and sensitive to existing heritage assets. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan (Page 11) is delivering high quality places, which will include new development being of an appropriate scale, mass and appearance, which promotes high quality design and responds to Whitechapel's context. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013) with regard to sensitive design and high quality architecture.</p> <p>Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.</p>
201	Resident		Shadows of tall buildings not indicated on graphics in document.	Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall

				buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.
	Resident	Durward St, E1	Concerns regarding tall buildings design and types of housing.	<p>Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives of the Masterplan is to deliver 3,500 new homes by 2025, including substantial amounts of new family and affordable homes (Page 11). A minimum of 35% affordable provision with new residential development will be sought, as per policy SP02 in the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Policy DM3 in the adopted MDD (2013). Furthermore, Policies SP02 and DM3 will guide housing provision, which seek to provide a</p>

				balance of housing types, including family homes.
211	Resident	Cleveland Way, E1	<p>Issues with new RLH building design and suggests stepping down of building heights as they approach living zones as set out in Spatial Concept.</p> <p>Concern about potential extension of City Fringe Area and impact this would have on heights.</p>	<p>Noted. The 'Townscape Strategy' on Page 14 proposes that any new landmark buildings should be of high quality architecture and sensitive to existing heritage assets. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan (Page 11) is delivering high quality places which will include new development being of an appropriate scale, mass and appearance which promotes high quality design and responds to Whitechapel's context. All proposals will be subject to the policies DM24, DM25 and DM26 in the MDD (2013).</p> <p>The City Fringe OAPF boundary is decided by the Mayor of London and representations can be submitted to the GLA on this matter during the statutory consultation period envisaged to take place with the early New Year (2014)</p>
230	Statutory consultee	GLA	Suggested amendments to text on p 14 (see full GLA response).	<p><b>Agree.</b> Amendment to text on Page 14, 4<sup>th</sup> Paragraph:</p> <p><i>London wide impact, 'as per the GLA's London View Management Framework'</i></p>
251	Landowner	QMUL (agent: CBRE)	QMUL support approach to high quality design and opportunity for landmark buildings.	Support noted.

			<p>New buildings should be carefully designed to respond to setting of heritage assets.</p> <p>Draft Masterplan should specify where new tall buildings would be acceptable and criteria that would need to be met to justify height.</p> <p>Clarify that heights of buildings should be in accordance with MDD policies, setting and policy designations, except where otherwise indicated.</p>	<p>Noted regarding building design to respond to historic context.</p> <p>Disagree. The Whitechapel district centre boundary (Figure 6, Page 5) sets out the location for where taller buildings can be located assessed against Policy DM26. In addition the Townscape Strategy (Page14) sets out the framework for where landmark buildings could be located and this is defined within the supporting text.</p> <p>Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings will be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.</p>
260	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	Tall buildings are to be managed and the historic environment is to be protected under policy DM26 in MDD.	Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings will be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24, DM25

			<p>SPD should identify upper limits for building heights for the sites set out in this SPD, based a detailed urban design and historic significance context analysis.</p> <p>The form and height of new RLH should not be the starting context for future proposals.</p>	<p>and MD27 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.</p> <p>Disagree. The Whitechapel district centre boundary (Figure 6, Page 5) sets out the location for where taller buildings can be located assessed against Policy DM26. In addition the Townscape Strategy (Figure 11) is informed by the urban design baseline analysis and sets out the framework for where 'landmark' buildings could be located across Whitechapel. A landmark building is defined within the supporting text on Page14.</p> <p>Noted. Taller building will be subject to tests set out within Policy DM26 of the MDD.</p>
34	Resident	Durward St, E1	<p>Concerns about loss of history and unique characts of Whitechapel</p> <p>Concerns about tall buildings affecting character of area.</p>	<p>Noted. Much of Whitechapel lies within Conservation Areas and as such heritage assets will be considered against Policy DM27 of the MDD with regard to the protection and enhancement of the historic environment, which will seek to ensure the unique history and character of Whitechapel is preserved.</p> <p>Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including</p>

				existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24, DM25 and DM27 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.
139	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Don't support tall buildings OSD.	Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.



Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details	Representation Summary (6 Key Place Transformations)	LBTH Officer Response
148	Landowner	Sainsbury's (agent: Turley Associates)	<p>Welcomes identification of Sainsbury's' site in KPT6</p> <p>Requests greater flexibility of uses on Sainsbury's' site and re-wording of text to reflect this.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council has set out priority land uses for the site further to its baseline analysis, consultation with stakeholders and community in the context of Local Plan policies and considers there is sufficient flexibility within the Masterplan to respond to additional land uses proposals at the detailed planning application stage.</p>
176	Developer	Zen Developments (agent: NLP)	<p>SPD should be clear that development is not only confined to 6 key places.</p> <p>SPD should state that high quality development is needed across Masterplan area to meet housing and employment targets, and is especially favourable along key routes and gateways.</p> <p>The area north of Durward Street is currently overlooked in the Masterplan and this should be addressed.</p>	<p><b>Agree.</b> Text amendment on Page 16, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph in dark blue box insert text:</p> <p><i>Together with wider area interventions the Masterplan focuses on 6 Key Transformational places based on ...</i></p> <p>Page 37, Section 7, amendment to text under 'Design and Development Brief' to list mediums scale sites.</p> <p>Noted. Text amendments as per above.</p>

261	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	Conservation Areas/heritage assets should be shown on all plans to indicate potential impacts	Disagree. Figure 8 and Figure 11 set out the conservation areas and heritage assets across the Masterplan area. It is not appropriate that these are further demarcated on the key urban design and planning principles diagrams and illustrative masterplan interventions maps for each Key Place Transformation. Policy DM24 of the MDD ensures that heritage assets are protected and enhanced.
-----	---------------------	------------------	---	--

Comment ID	Consultee Type	Organisation/ Details or Location	Representations Summary (KPT1: Revitalising Whitechapel Road)	LBTH Response
36	Resident	Durward St, E1	<p>Suggest market is relocated or rebuilt, and pedestrian areas widened.</p> <p>Concerns regarding proposal of Western 'Gateway'.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is transforming and improving the quality of the public realm (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH in partnership with TfL will undertake a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, in which different improvement schemes will be considered for Whitechapel Road and surrounding</p>

			Supports development along South side of Whitechapel Road.	highways in the Masterplan area. Support noted.
98	Resident	Albion Yard, E1	Notes issues with street market.	Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.
242	Resident	Sidney St, E1	Suggests segregated cycle routes and cycle parking required.  Accessible public toilets required.	Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is transforming and improving the quality of the public realm (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH in partnership with TfL will undertake a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, in which different improvement schemes will be considered for Whitechapel Road and surrounding highways in the Masterplan area.  Noted. As above these can be addressed as part of the Public Realm Improvement Scheme for Whitechapel Road under KPT1.
19	Resident	Devons Rd, E3	Suggests there is no need for historic listing/retention of most of the buildings along Whitechapel Road, suggest they be redeveloped.	Disagree. Whitechapel Road lies within Conservation Areas, and as such these buildings are protected by the policies in the MDD (DM27) and heritage legalisation with regard to the protection and enhancement of the historic

			<p>Plans for 'Eastern 'Gateway could be improved.</p> <p>Notes issues with market (storage, servicing, flooding, security, parking, accessibility) and suggests market is relocated and is covered, and issues addressed.</p>	<p>environment.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is transforming and improving the quality of the public realm on Whitechapel Road (Page 17). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19 and 20, LBTH in partnership with TfL will undertake a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme for Whitechapel Road which will incorporate proposals for the 'Eastern Gateway' and be subject to consultation with local residents and stakeholders.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p>
13	Resident	E14	<p>Concerns about Whitechapel Market (waste, pedestrian accessibility) and suggest LBTH look to Borough Market as example of successful market.</p> <p>Concerns about type of retail outlets along Whitechapel Road (e.g. fast food, gaming, pawn brokers).</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key ambitions is to the strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). One of the key interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity, and this will include higher quality retail</p>

				offer.
18	Resident	Albion Yard, E1	Concerns about Whitechapel market (parking, accessibility, quality of stalls, waste) and suggests market be relocated away from Whitechapel Road.	Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.
16	Resident	Whitechapel Rd, E1	Broadly supports Masterplan - will benefit community.  Suggest relocation of the street market and creation of a self-contained market, in grid-like pattern, with supporting infrastructure.	Support noted.  Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.
24	Resident	Albion Yard, E1	Broadly support the improvements to Whitechapel Market.  Issues with market (noise, parking and congestion) and suggest relocation of market to an enclosed area or less congested street.	Support noted.  Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.

30	Resident	Durward St, E1	<p>Concerns about quality of retail outlets on Whitechapel Road (e.g. betting/gaming shops).</p> <p>Concerns about waste along Whitechapel Road and alleyways, fly tipping and vans parking.</p> <p>Suggests clock on RLH frontage is fixed.</p> <p>Questions where is land for new public spaces going to come from.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key ambitions is to the strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). One of the key interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity, and this will include higher quality retail offer.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is transforming and improving the quality of the public realm (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH proposes to undertake a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, in which different improvement schemes will be considered for Whitechapel Road and surrounding highways in the Masterplan area.</p> <p>Noted. Council will seek to notify landowner on this matter and additionally has powers to protect listed buildings against damage and disrepair.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD provides a local framework for new public open space in Whitechapel and these are predominantly located on the major development sites located within the KPT sub areas.</p>
43	Resident	Chester St, E2	Notes issues with quality of design of frontages.	Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is transforming and improving the quality of the public realm (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a

			<p>Concerns about quality of retail outlets.</p> <p>Concerns about availability of leases to small businesses (not only chains).</p> <p>Suggests permanent or semi-permanent covered structure for market.</p> <p>Supports Market as a crucial part of history and future prosperity and vitality of area.</p>	<p>comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, in which different improvement schemes will be considered for Whitechapel Road and surrounding highways in the Masterplan area. This will include the continuation of the HS2012 scheme, which seeks to continue the shop front upgrades (Page 19).</p> <p>Noted. One of the key ambitions is to strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). This will also include supporting local businesses. One of the key interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity, and this will include higher quality retail offer and should not preclude small businesses occupying the space available.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (p 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
53	Resident	E1	Issues with market (waste, accessibility) and suggest market is reduced in size.	Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan

				bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.
69	Resident	Albion Yard, E1	<p>Supports proposed improvements to market (issues with accessibility, waste).</p> <p>Do not want bland high street with chain stores.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key ambitions is to strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). This will also include supporting local businesses. One of the key interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity, and this will include higher quality retail offer.</p>
130	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	<p>Issues with HS2012 improvement works including seating, lighting and statue and suggest radical transformation needed of Whitechapel Road.</p> <p>Support retention of market but questions need for number of stalls and similar offer - suggest creation</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is transforming and improving the quality of the public realm (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH in partnership with TfL will undertake a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, in which different improvement schemes will be considered for Whitechapel Road and surrounding highways in the Masterplan area.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on p 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke</p>



			<p>of a themed food market. Notes issue with parking of vans servicing Whitechapel market.</p> <p>Questions need for so many new retail units, but suggests is a need for more cafes and restaurants with diverse food offer.</p>	<p>to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key ambitions is to strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). One of the key interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity, and this includes seeking to promote a mix of cafes, restaurants and bars (Page 18).</p>
89	Resident	Walden St, E1	<p>Support improvements to High St and question how street lighting will be improved.</p> <p>Objects to tall building north of station OSD.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is transforming and improving the quality of the public realm (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH in partnership with TfL will undertake a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, in which different improvement schemes will be considered for Whitechapel Road and surrounding highways in the Masterplan area.</p> <p>Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are</p>

				illustrative only.
186		Anonymous	Aspiration of SPD to strengthen retail offer must not result in clone High St with same anchor stores.	Noted. One of the key ambitions is to strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). This will also include supporting local businesses. One of the key interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity.
189	Resident	Whitechapel, E1	<p>Suggests easy to clean new paving and trees to create boulevard feel to Whitechapel Road.</p> <p>Strengthening retail offer should not result in Whitechapel Road becoming a clone town with same national retailers.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is transforming and improving the quality of the public realm (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH in partnership with TfL will undertake a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, in which different improvement schemes will be considered for Whitechapel Road and surrounding highways in the Masterplan area.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key ambitions is to strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). This will also include supporting local businesses. One of the key interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity.</p>
199	Resident	Turner St, E1	Request that quality is byword of Masterplan - request no introduction of fast food businesses like McDonalds (issues with litter,	Noted. One of the key ambitions is to strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). This will also include supporting local businesses. One of the key

			<p>antisocial behaviour etc.)</p> <p>Suggests promotion of high quality architecture, protection of heritage assets and Conservation Areas</p> <p>Complaint about difficulty using online system to make comments.</p>	<p>interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity, and this will include higher quality retail offer.</p> <p>Noted. The 'Townscape Strategy' on Page 14 proposes that any new landmark buildings should be of high quality architecture and sensitive to existing heritage assets. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan (Page 11) is delivering high quality places, which will include new development being of an appropriate scale, mass and appearance, which promotes high quality design and responds to Whitechapel's context. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013) with regard to sensitive design and high quality architecture.</p> <p>Noted regarding online feedback form. The Council continuously reviews its methods of online engagement to deliver an easy to use and customer focussed systems.</p>
183	Resident		<p>Concerns about condition of current market (look of stalls, accessibility issues) - gives bad impression of Whitechapel. Suggest changes to market, including relocation to Southern side of road, reduction in size, standards about appearance of stalls and waste to be enforced.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p>

195	Resident	Newark St, E1	<p>Requests independent shops on Whitechapel Road not chains.</p> <p>Issues with parking - need to explore opportunity for parking on RLH land.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key ambitions is to strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). This will also include supporting local businesses. One of the key interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity.</p> <p><b>Agree</b> regarding parking. Amendment to text on Page 27, under 'Creation of Med-City campus', point 3:</p> <p><i>'Range of complementary uses to support the campus will be required, including...ancillary parking to support the RLH'.</i></p>
203	Resident		<p>Notes negative affect on new development proposed on small, local, family-sized businesses, including rent rises.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key ambitions is to the strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). This will also include supporting local businesses. One of the key interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity.</p>
213	Resident	Cleveland Way, E1	<p>Concern regarding trees along the centre of Whitechapel Road. More trees on the north of Whitechapel Road. Concern at the Gateways and existing and former public houses.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is transforming and improving the quality of the public realm (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH in partnership with TfL will undertake a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, in which different improvement schemes will be considered for Whitechapel Road and surrounding highways in the Masterplan area.</p>

			<p>Suggests looking at improving the market.</p> <p>Suggests betting shops and pawnbrokers should be resisted.</p> <p>Restore original Barclay's Bank frontage.</p> <p>Would like return of car park on Whitechapel Road / New Road.</p>	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key ambitions is to the strengthen Whitechapel District centre and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). One of the key interventions proposed by KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity, which will include higher quality retail provision.</p> <p>Disagree. The urban design baseline analysis identifies this building block as being of poor architectural quality and redevelopment of this key corner site at high density is supported by the Masterplan under Ref 1b (page 20).</p> <p><b>Agree.</b> Amendment to text, Page 27, under 'Creation of Med-City campus', point 3: <i>'Range of complementary uses to support the campus will be required, including...ancillary parking to support the RLH'.</i></p>
232	Statutory consultee	GLA	TfL supports overall aim of improving area.	Support noted.

			<p>Note concerns of market traders expressed during HS2012 programme regarding changes to market stalls.</p> <p>Suggest consideration to permanent storage area for stalls/provision of freestanding structure.</p> <p>Concerned about potential relocation of stalls to south side of Whitechapel Road due to highway obstruction/enforcement issues.</p> <p>Request clarify regarding form and type of structure proposed for 'Western Gateway' (proposals for equipment/structure on TLRN will require TfL approval) and potential iconic structure on New Road will need to take account of highway improvement plans for junction.</p> <p>Refer to TfL Roads Task Force report for specific highway interventions.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.</p> <p>Noted. The detailed design proposals 'Western Gateway' (Page 19) on the south side of Whitechapel Road and the junction of Whitechapel Road/Vallance Road/New Road are currently unknown. Under Ref1 the SPD sets out the priority land uses of retail, other commercial at lower levels with potential for residential above within an iconic landmark building and/or structure. TfL will be consulted on these proposals as landowner and transport authority including any upgrades to the Whitechapel/ Vallance Road/New Road.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is engaging with TfL Toad Task Force reading future highway improvements on Whitechapel Road. Noted. Text refers to TfL within Delivery Schedule, column 'Funding Streams' (Page 19).</p>
--	--	--	---	--

263	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	<p>Gateway and OSD do not need to be necessarily tall buildings.</p> <p>Notes site 1a (Vallance Road) is within Whitechapel Market Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Agree. It is recognised the definition within the 'Townscape Strategy' is unclear with regard to landmark buildings. Amendment to text Page 14, paragraphs 3 and 4:</p> <p><i>Landmark buildings are an important visual representation of regeneration and provide an opportunity to provide high quality architecture within the existing built environment. In some areas, where redevelopment can provide significant regeneration benefits for Whitechapel, a new landmark building may be expressed as a high quality taller building.</i></p> <p>Noted. Proposals will be subject to tests of Policy DM24, which seek to protect and enhance heritage assets.</p>
138	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Notes issues with Market, suggests it should be removed.	Noted concern regarding market. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.
135/ 136	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Support work on Whitechapel Road HS2012.	Support noted.

			Concerns about issues with Market.	Noted concern regarding market. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.
34	Resident	Durward St, E1	Concerns about street market – should be relocated.	Noted concern regarding market. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.
139	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Supports Gateways.  Market needs improvements.	Support noted.  Noted concern regarding market. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is enhancing the Whitechapel Street Market (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a more detailed Market Plan bespoke to Whitechapel Market to plan for a range of improvements, and resolve existing issues.



125	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Suggests commemorative sculpture/information boards on the site in front of Mount Terrace to form 'Eastern Gateway'.	Noted. The proposed gateways will be created through new public spaces, public art and new landmark buildings on corner sites. The Public Realm Improvement Scheme referenced on Page 19, will consider the details of these interventions in more detail.
-----	----------	-------------------	--	--

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details or location	Representations Summary (KPT2: New Civic Hub)	LBTH Response
37	Resident	Durward St, E1	Suggests old Royal London Hospital (RLH) is used for residential, provide affordable housing.	Disagree. Creating a 'Civic Hub' is considered a key component of the Council's vision for civic services located in this sub area.
142	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Supports new civic hub.  Refers to need to sensitively restore old RLH.	Support noted.  Noted. As set out in KPT2, the Masterplan proposes the sensitive re-use of the historic Grade 11 listed former RLH buildings, with retention of the historic frontage (Page 21 and Delivery Schedule Page 23). Proposals for the Grade II listed RLH buildings will be subject to the requirements of policy DM27 in the adopted MDD (2013) and heritage legislation, which seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets.
20	Resident		Concerns about need to sensitively restore the old Royal London Hospital.	Noted. As set out in KPT2, the Masterplan proposes the sensitive re-use of the historic Grade II listed former RLH buildings, with retention of the historic frontage (Page 21

				and Delivery Schedule Page 23). Proposals for the Grade II listed RLH buildings will be subject to the requirements of policy DM27 in the adopted MDD (2013) and heritage legislation, which seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets.
21	Resident		Concerns about need for sensitive restoration of old Royal London Hospital, and urges retention of the old building not just frontage.	Noted. As set out in KPT2, the Masterplan proposes the sensitive re-use of the historic Grade II listed former RLH buildings, with retention of the historic frontage (Page 21 and Delivery Schedule Page 23). Proposals for the Grade II listed RLH buildings will be subject to the requirements of policy DM27 in the adopted MDD (2013) and heritage legislation, which seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets..
22	Resident		Concerns about the need to sensitively restore the old Royal London Hospital.	Noted. As set out in KPT2, the Masterplan proposes the sensitive re-use of the historic Grade II listed former RLH buildings, with retention of the historic frontage (Page 21 and Delivery Schedule Page 23). Proposals for the Grade II listed RLH buildings will be subject to the requirements of policy DM27 in the adopted MDD (2013) and heritage legislation, which seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets.
45	Landowner	Barts Health NHS Trust	Suggests KPT2 be rebranded to 'Commercial Hub' and make it office-led.	Disagree. Creating a 'Civic Hub' is considered a key component of the Council's vision for civic services located in this sub area.

56	Resident	E1	Supports creation of Civic hub.	Support noted.
104	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Objects to LBTH considering relocation to RLH site at time of Government cuts and families struggling.	Noted. Creating a 'Civic Hub' is considered a key component of the Council's vision for civic services located in this sub area.
131	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Supports relocation of Town Hall to Civic Hub in Whitechapel - much easier access for residents than where Town Hall is currently located.	Support noted.
95	Resident	Walden St, E1	Request careful preservation of old RLH facade and old buildings behind façade and new civic square is an appealing concept but needs to fit with local character including old RLH.	Noted. As set out in KPT2, the Masterplan proposes the sensitive re-use of the historic Grade II listed former RLH buildings, with retention of the historic frontage (Page 21 and Delivery Schedule Page 23). Proposals for the Grade II listed RLH buildings will be subject to the requirements of policy DM27 in the adopted MDD (2013) and heritage legislation, which seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets.
185	Resident	Whitechapel	Support proposal to bring RLH back into active use.  Suggest using old RLH as an art gallery to draw people into area.	Support noted.  Noted. As set out in KPT2, the Masterplan seeks to promote other uses within the Civic Hub including community and cultural facilities (see text, Page 21).

193	Resident	Durward St, E1	Support plan to develop old RLH as civic centre.	Support noted.
	Resident.	Durward St, E1	Support old RLH as new Town Hall for LBTH	Support noted.
236	Statutory consultee	GLA	Welcome inclusion of SME space in vacant old RLH buildings.	Support noted.
263	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	<p>Welcome proposals to restore old RLH.</p> <p>EH would like to work with LBTH.</p> <p>Back of building must be appropriate in terms of details/materials.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Council welcome partnership working with EH regarding restoration of the old RLH buildings sensitively.</p> <p>Noted. The Council welcome partnership working with EH regarding restoration of the old RLH buildings sensitively.</p>
23	Resident		Concerns about preservation of old RLH entrance	Noted. As set out in KPT2, the Masterplan proposes the sensitive re-use of the historic former RLH buildings, with retention of the historic frontage (Text Page 21, Delivery Schedule Page 23). Proposals for the Grade II listed RLH buildings will be subject to the requirements of Policy DM27 in the adopted MDD (2013), which seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets.

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details or location	Representations Summary (KPT3: Durward Street Gardens)	LBTH Officer Response
38	Resident	Durward St, E1	<p>Objects to proposals for KPT3.</p> <p>Concerns about increased traffic and noise on Durward St, concerns over safety for students' access.</p> <p>Objects to the creation of public open space in Durward St.</p> <p>Objects to tall building over station (impact on light).</p>	<p>Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.</p> <p>Noted. KPT3 'Durward Street Gardens' (Page 26) seeks to improve public realm on Durward Street which is will aim to achieve safer and cleaner streets which may include traffic reduction measures.</p> <p>Noted. KPT3 'Durward Street Gardens' (Page 26) seeks to improve public realm on Durward Street which is will aim to achieve safer and cleaner streets which may include traffic reduction measures.</p> <p>Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.</p>
	Resident	Durward St, E1	Objects to KPT3.	Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from

				Masterplan and public space re-designed.
243	Resident	Sidney St, E1	Affordable housing needed by local people.	Noted. One of the key objectives of the Masterplan is to improve housing offer by delivering 3,500 new homes by 2025, including substantial amounts of new family and affordable homes (Page 11). A minimum of 35% affordable provision with new residential development will be sought, as per policy SP02 in the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Policy DM3 in the adopted MDD (2013). Furthermore, housing provision will be guided by Policies SP02 and DM3, which seek to provide a balance of housing types, including family homes.
2	Resident	Durward St, E1	Objects to proposals for KPT3. Concerns about potential demolition of North Durward St properties.  Complaint about lack of consultation.	Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.  Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation Report and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
5	Resident	Durward St, E1	Objects to proposals for KPT3. Concerns about potential demolition of properties on North Durward St.	Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed

			<p>Complaint about lack of consultation.</p> <p>Concerns about need for larger family homes in Tower Hamlets, not flats as proposed in Masterplan.</p>	<p>from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation Report and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives of the Masterplan is to improve housing offer by delivering 3,500 new homes by 2025, including substantial amounts of new family and affordable homes (Page 11). A minimum of 35% affordable provision with new residential development will be sought, as per policy SP02 in the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and policy DM3 in the adopted MDD (2013). Furthermore, housing provision will be guided by policies SP02 and DM3, which seek to provide a balance of housing types, including family homes.</p>
25	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Complaint about method of consultation.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation Report and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
26	Resident	Trinity Hall, E1	Broadly supports the creation of new public spaces in and around	Support noted.

			<p>Whitechapel Rd and Durward St.</p> <p>Suggestions about how Durward St and links could be developed.</p> <p>Request need for residents parking permits on Durward St to be reinstated once Crossrail works complete.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council welcomes local resident engagement and participation in the future design of Durward Street within any new detailed public realm proposals.</p> <p>Noted. Resident and business permit bays and Controlled Parking Zones will be a consideration as part of any public realm proposals for Durward Street in the future once Crossrail works are complete.</p>
29	Resident	Durward St, E1	<p>Objects to proposals for KPT3. Concerns about potential demolition of properties on North Durward St. Objects to lack of sustainability of proposals (North Durward St terrace only 10 years old). Objects to existing community potentially being pushed out by proposals.</p> <p>Objects to lack of consultation.</p> <p>Objects to certain wording used in Masterplan.</p>	<p>Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.</p> <p>Noted. The document has been written in the clearest language for all readers and where technical terms are</p>



			Objects to lack of clarity around timescales for Masterplan process.	used these are explained where possible.  Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations that have detailed the timescales of the Masterplan process and these have been communicated through various media and public communication since March 2013. See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of documented public communications.
103	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Concerns about potential disruption and blight caused by proposed redevelopment of KPT3 to Durward St residents. Concerns about unsustainability of plans - redevelopment of relatively new buildings.  Object to proposals for OSD. Concerns about scale and overshadowing caused by proposed OSD.	Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.  Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are

			Questions whether there is a need for new retail units and whether these will be successful	illustrative only.  Noted. One of the key ambitions of the Masterplan is to the strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10). The opening of the Crossrail station in 2018 and other anticipated new developments in Whitechapel is expected to significantly increase footfall in the town centre and subsequent demand for new retail space in this sub area.
132	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	<p>Object to proposals for KPT3. Object to proposals to demolish houses on north-west of Durward St.</p> <p>Durward St and its residents have suffered too much development over last 20 years - need to enhance this street by restoring public realm</p> <p>Concerns about plan for new station entrance on eastern end of Durward St which would affect Kempton Court significantly</p>	<p>Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.</p> <p>Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.</p> <p>Detailed designs of the new Crossrail entrances and public realm works on Durward Street are subject to approved planning application. Future public realm proposals will be subject to a separate planning application and consultation process.</p>

			Support improved walkway through to Hanbury St and walkway garden from Brady Street to Cambridge Heath Road.	Support noted.
70	Resident	Durward St, E1	<p>Objects to proposals for demolition of North Durward St properties in KPT3. North Durward St properties built for key workers who have contributed to Tower Hamlets/ Whitechapel community should not be destroyed. Masterplan does not support sustainability - proposes demolition of new built housing.</p> <p>Questions integrity of Council process and lack of consultation with local residents.</p> <p>Refers to existing Crossrail plans to improve public realm on Durward St.</p> <p>Note's issues with condition of Vallance Gardens since Crossrail.</p>	<p>Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.</p> <p>Noted. Public realm improvement works undertaken by Crossrail are subject to on-going discussion. The SPD acknowledges these within KPT1 and KPT3.</p> <p>Noted. This is a matter to be raised with Crossrail and LBTH Highways and not for the SPD.</p>

			<p>construction, Spring 2013</p> <p>Lack of confidence in Council to deliver changes to KTP1 given long-standing issues with Whitechapel Road and market</p>	Support noted.
81		Durward St, E1	<p>Objects to proposals for KPT3.</p> <p>Notes lack of consultation of Durward St residents.</p> <p>Notes missed opportunity to improve existing social housing estates.</p>	<p>Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) to be removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.</p> <p>Disagree. The Masterplan boundary does encompass a number of social housing estates to both the north and south of Whitechapel Station/Road. As set out in the Wider Interventions Delivery table (Page 40), it is the intention of the Masterplan that a Whitechapel Estate Capacity and Improvement Study be undertaken to explore housing regeneration opportunities for these estates.</p>
184	Resident	Whitechapel	Requests that SPD commits to definite re-provision of the leisure centre facility.	Noted. The SPD already confirms a commitment to re-provision of the leisure centre facility on site or within the locality (Page 25 and 26).
191/192	Resident	Durward St, E1	Request removal of KPT3 -	Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North

<p>plus 111/112/1 16/119</p>			<p>demolition of North Durward St properties. If KPT3 is retained in plan request that a final deadline for confirmation or removal of the plans for Durward Street is set to provide more certainty to existing residents.</p> <p>Masterplan proposes a reduction in types and choice of housing - proposes replacing family housing with flatted development.</p> <p>Notes the name 'Durward Street Gardens' is misleading as it does not provide a 'garden'.</p> <p>Durward St is not run-down empty St - photo in Masterplan is misleading.</p>	<p>Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives of the Masterplan is to deliver 3,500 new homes by 2025, including substantial amounts of new family and affordable homes (Page 11). A minimum of 35% affordable provision with new residential development will be sought, as per policy SP02 in the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and policy DM3 in the adopted MDD (2013). Furthermore, housing provision will be guided by policies SP02 and DM3, which seek to provide a balance of housing types, including family homes.</p> <p>Noted. The Masterplan place names for the 6 Key Place Transformation are based on the key features and characteristics proposed within the design guidance which may be delivered in future. A significant new public open space which could include substantial planting / greenery is the reason 'gardens' has been used for this sub area.</p> <p>Noted. The photograph used on page 25 reflects the existing conditions on this section of Durward Street and is not intended to depict a rundown or empty street; rather it seeks to acknowledge the heritage asset of Trinity Hall</p>
--------------------------------------	--	--	---	---

				building.
208	Resident	Durward St, E1	<p>Objects to KPT3.</p> <p>Object to lack of consultation.</p> <p>Missed opportunity to improve existing social housing estates.</p>	<p>Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.</p> <p>Disagree. The Masterplan boundary does encompass a number of social housing estates to both the north and south of Whitechapel station/Road. As set out in the Wider Interventions Delivery table (Page 40), it is the intention of the Masterplan that a Whitechapel Estate Capacity and Improvement Study be undertaken to explore housing regeneration opportunities for these estates.</p>
144	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Objects to KPT3 re demolition of north Durward St and also impact on Kempton Court	Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward St properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.

231	Statutory consultee	GLA	<p>Notes Masterplan is unclear what will happen to Durward Street Gardens open space and retail frontage if over station development is not possible (suggest showing alternative option).</p> <p>Strongly support Med City campus</p> <p>Plan should acknowledge barriers to delivery of high density development, including abnormal costs of decking over station and railway cuttings, safeguarding LU infrastructure and ensuring continued public transport network during construction</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD will be subject to further review during its period to 2025 and can consider alternative design options.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Council has undertaken a Viability Report to support the SPD which has assessed new development at Whitechapel station factoring in high level embedded infrastructure and construction costs over the station.</p>
254	Statutory consultee	TfL Property	<p>TfL Property very supportive of Masterplan and welcome a joint partnership with the Borough.</p> <p>Supports the principle of high density development at this location (Site 1a ) as an iconic structure.</p> <p>Request Site 1a - Figure 17 is redrawn to show taller building.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The 'Birdseye view' in Figure 17 is an illustrative sketch and it is not considered necessary to redraw taller</p>

			<p>Request that due to the construction costs of over station development (OSD), OSD (Site 9 )will need to be tall, high density, mixed use, including residential and retail, development.</p> <p>Supports the principle of iconic, high-density development as a town centre focal point.</p> <p>Suggest retail uses included within site 10.</p>	<p>buildings.</p> <p>Noted. The current text within the SPD under 'Creating a Landmark Station' is appropriate in accommodating higher density development. Proposals for taller buildings will be further assessed against Policy DM24 in the MDD.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Council considers that the leisure centre site will first prioritise housing led development should a leisure centre facility not be provided on site. Complimentary town centre uses including retail and leisure are welcomed as part of a mixed use development.</p>
	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	OSD should not harm Whitechapel's Conservation Areas with height parameter set.	Noted. The Council has undertaken a thorough baseline survey and urban design analysis. Higher density development is considered acceptable in principle within the district centre in this location. Any iconic or landmark building will be expected to protect and enhance affected conservation areas. The Council is satisfied that Policies



			<p>Welcome opportunity to provide new frontage to Whitechapel Road, consistent with historic frontages</p>	<p>DM24 and DM27 of the MDD will ensure place sensitive design. It is not considered necessary to establish a building height parameter in this location because taller buildings will be assessed against Policy DM26.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details or location	Representations Summary (KPT4: Med-City Campus)	LBTH Response
3	Resident	Mount Terrace, E1	<p>Concerns about proposals/uses for land around Mount Terrace (eg A3 - effect on amenity)</p> <p>Initial Barts plans showed land in front of Mount Terrace as meadowland. Masterplan should be amended to show this.</p>	<p>Disagree. Indicative proposals for development on land in front Mount Terrace on Whitechapel Road include appropriate scale and land uses associated with Whitechapel District town centre.</p> <p>Disagree. The site provides an opportunity to strengthen Whitechapel district centre as a key gateway site on the south side with active frontage onto Whitechapel Road and associated complimentary town centre land uses.</p>
9	Organisation	QMUL (agent: CBRE)	Suggest more flexible uses for sites along New Road (not restricted to health and education uses i.e. potential for office and	Agree. Amendment to text Page 29, under 'Regeneration of New Road', 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet:

			residential uses).  Request development brief for QMUL estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complementary town centre commercial and community uses with active frontages at lower street levels</li> </ul> <p>Agree. Amendment to text Page 37, Under 'Design and Development Brief' – add bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>QMUL</li> </ul>
44	Statutory consultee	Barts Health NHS Trust	<p>Suggests KPT4 be rebranded 'New Road Regeneration'.</p> <p>Requests demolition of Outpatients building.</p> <p>Requests more flexibility about location of Green Spine</p>	<p>Disagree. The borough together with the GLA and QMUL support 'Med City' campus concept as a new strategic area of London and the UK economy focusing research and life sciences. The SPD recognises the importance of regeneration of New Road with the Delivery Schedule on Page 29.</p> <p>Disagree. The text confirms that prior to any redevelopment of the Outpatients Building, potential restoration must first be explored in the context of the New Road Conservation area.</p> <p>Noted. The Open Space and Movement Strategy (Figure 10) sets out the broad principles of scale, layout and location of new open space and public realm at the Key Place Transformations. The Council consider that the wording to support these plans do not require amending as the sub areas plans are illustrative only (Figure 25).</p>

			<p>Request re-appraisal of RLH Conservation Area</p> <p>Suggest iconic building should be on south side of Mount Terrace not northern side</p> <p>Suggest emphasise residential density.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council will consider re-describing its Conservation Area's in consultation with English Heritage.</p> <p>Disagree. The Western gateway is considered suitable for an iconic and landmark building to mark the entrance to Whitechapel district town centre.</p> <p>Agree. LBTH to emphasise higher density residential within 'Creation of a Med City Campus' (Page 27).</p>
151	Landowner	Cavell Properties/SARL (agent: DP9)	<p>4 owners of sites on Ashfield Street/Georgian terraces are committed to working in partnership for the comprehensive regeneration of this overall area</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
152	Landowner	Cavell Properties/SARL (agent: DP9)	<p>Strongly support vision for high density residential development on these sites</p> <p>Concern that the representations made during the preliminary stage of consultation, by Green Oaks Estates and London Newcastle, have not been taken into account</p> <p>Suggest housing offer requires minimum of 35% should be subject to viability.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council has taken into account the views of Green Oaks Estates and London Newcastle participation in the preliminary consultation prior to the statutory consultation. These are broadly reflected in the land use, scale, layout and form of plans on the site (former Bart's and London Charity site).</p> <p>Disagree. The Council has undertaken its own supporting viability assessment appropriate to this level of strategic planning and considers development is financially viable over the lifetime of the plan, applying</p>

			<p>Suggest high development density should apply across the whole area</p> <p>Concern regarding Med City Campus with too much emphasis on health and education land uses on these sites, land uses too prescriptive, should be emphasis on residential and supporting uses on these sites. Suggest Med-City boundary is redrawn.</p> <p>Support high-density development at Ref Site 14 and 15.</p> <p>Suggest should be clear presumption in SPD in favour of tall and large scale</p>	<p>adopted planning policies, including minimum levels of affordable housing. Detailed planning proposals will be subject to viability testing in accordance with CS Policy SP02 and Policy DM3 of the MDD at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD promotes higher density development within the boundary of the Whitechapel District Centre and major development sites identified within Key Place Transformations sub areas. It is not considered appropriate to apply similar density levels across the wider Masterplan area.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council recognises that Figure 9 in Section 5: Spatial Concept is a broad spatial reflection for the future of the area of Whitechapel and will not in all locations precisely map the existing and future leading land uses of 'Med City'. The principles and objective of the Med City campus concept diagram is appropriate, however in response the Council will amend the text to note that the southern areas of the campus will reflect a more residential led development type under 'Med City Campus' on Page 12.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD promotes higher density development within the boundary of the Whitechapel</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>buildings of central London scale.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Request the SPD should not presume the location, scale nature of the new public spaces, provide flexibility and private amenity space should also be referred to in SPD.</p> <p>Concern about impact of pedestrian routes along Philpott Street.</p> <p>Request land uses at lower levels are specified and differentiated between areas within Med City campus according to landownership</p>	<p>District Centre and major development sites identified within the Key Place Transformations sub areas. The appropriate scale of building heights will be considered against Policy DM26 and the town centre hierarchy.</p> <p>Disagree. The Open Space and Movement Strategy (Figure 10) set out the broad principles of scale, layout and location of new open space and public realm at the Key Place Transformation 4. The Council consider that the wording to support this plan does not require amending as the sub areas plans are illustrative only (Figure 25) and will be subject to detailed design. Private amenity space is covered by policies within the MDD.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council has not determined the exact nature of this space within the document. The Open Space and Movement Strategy (Figure 10) set out the broad principles of scale, layout and location of new open space together with routes and will be subject to detailed design a later stage.</p> <p>Agree. The principles and objective of the Med City campus concept diagram (Figure 9, Page 12) is appropriate, however in response the Council will amend the text to denote that the southern areas of the campus will reflect a more residential led development type under 'Med City Campus' on Page 12.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>PD too prescriptive in terms of layout, design, key routes and landmark buildings on site - needs more flexibility.</p> <p>SPD should support any proposals, which enhance and protect heritage assets in this location.</p> <p>Under 'Delivery schedule' landowners should be amended from 'Greenoaks Estates' to landowners.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Masterplan provides planning guiding for these aspects and the Council consider there is the appropriate balance to guide new development applying place making and urban design principles supported by baseline analysis and consultation.</p> <p>Agree. Heritage is acknowledged on this site ref 13 on Page 28 and in Delivery Schedule ref 13 and 15 on Page 29.</p> <p>Agree. Text to be amended accordingly on Page 37.</p>
239	Statutory consultee	GLA	<p>Creation of Med-City campus strongly supported, as is inclusion of start-up business space.</p> <p>Concern that inclusion of 'New Homes' as key intervention compromises land available for non-residential development in Whitechapel. Suggest amendment to text on Page 28 (see attached letter).</p> <p>Request to consider further work to develop site allocation documents for site (and similar sites) as a way of underpinning delivery of lower value</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council considers that a research and academic led mix use development should incorporate the provision of new housing to meet the needs of borough residents. This is not considered to detract from promoting the new Med City campus and reflects the current nature of the area within it context as an existing diverse residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>Noted. Section 7 'Delivering the Vision: Delivery Strategy' (Page 37) considers and recommends further design and development briefs for major sites within the Masterplan area to provide detailed planning guidance</p>

			floorspace.	towards planning application stage.
249	Landowner	QMUL (agent: CBRE)	<p>Recommend definition of concept of Med City should also include complementary uses such as student accommodation and intermediate housing to cater for key workers.</p> <p>Suggests Med City should also create opportunities to encourage incubator activities and meet needs of industry in this sector.</p> <p>Request buildings outlined for delivery of Med City should be safeguarded for delivery of Life Sciences facility together with alternative uses for university and hospital if not required in delivering vision for Med City.</p> <p>Suggest alternative wording for Page 29 (see full response).</p>	<p>Noted. The Masterplan Initiatives under 13' Creation of a Med City Campus' (Page 27).</p> <p>Noted. The planning guidance for new land uses at Med City should be able incorporate affiliated industries and activities.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD make sufficient safeguards to ensure other land uses can be delivered should research and academic land uses not be realised.</p> <p>Disagree. The current wording is considered appropriate.</p>
265	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	<p>Suggest The development of sites 13a – 13d should relate positively to the Georgian and Victorian frontages along New Road, which are of a consistent scale.</p> <p>Suggest Site 14b provides a setting to the Grade II* listed Church of St Augustine with St Philip's Church. Welcome the</p>	<p>Noted. The New Road Conservation area allows for sufficient protection of these historic frontages and new proposals will be assessed against Local Plan policies to ensure the protection and enhancement of these heritage assets.</p> <p>Agree. Amendment to ensure heritage is acknowledged on this site - ref 13 on Page 28 and in Delivery Schedule</p>

			<p>opportunity to provide public space in front of the church (site 14a) which could considerably enhance its setting.</p> <p>Suggest Site proposals 14 and 15 should have regard for the settings of the grade II listed 43 – 69 Philpot Street.</p>	<p>ref 13 and 15 on Page 29</p> <p>Agree. As above.</p>
153	Landowner	Cavell Properties/ SARL (agent: DP9)	Concerned that Med-City campus does not become an obligation for developers in this area.	Noted. The SPD sets out a flexible land use framework to promote the med city campus but this also provides the opportunity for a wider range of uses, including residential.
253	Landowner	QMUL (agent: CBRE)	<p>Request that Floyer House located north of Ashfield Street is included as a site for delivery of Med City campus</p> <p>QMUL support approach to site 15 in Masterplan, although consider that buildings towards Whitechapel Road are most appropriate for delivering QMUL's expansion.</p> <p>Suggest having regard to needs of hospital/university when considering whether to retain Outpatients Building</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council has undertaken a baseline analysis of sites for the 'Med City Campus' and does not consider it necessary to incorporate this site at the date of this SPD being produced.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD considers that all sites identified within the KPT4 Med City campus as being appropriate for redevelopment.</p> <p>Disagree. The text confirms that prior to any redevelopment of the Outpatients Building's potential restoration must first be explored in the context of the New Road Conservation area.</p>



Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details or location	Representation Summary (KPT5: Raven Row)	LBTH Response
47	Resident	Adelina Grove, E1	<p>Concerns about tall building on Safestore site (amenity - helipad and ambulances).</p> <p>Concerns about demolition of historic property on Raven Row.</p>	<p>Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only.</p> <p>Noted. Heritage assets will be assessed as part of any comprehensive redevelopment and subject to MDDDD Policy DM24 and DM27 and heritage legislation.</p>
244	Resident	Sidney St, E1	Suggest that people need affordable housing that is really affordable.	<p>Noted. One of the key objectives of the Masterplan is to deliver 3,500 new homes by 2025, including substantial amounts of new family and affordable homes (Page 11). A minimum of 35% affordable provision with new residential development will be sought, as per policy SP02 in the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and Policy DM3 in the adopted MDD (2013). Furthermore, housing provision will be guided by policies SP02 and DM3,</p>

				which seek to provide a balance of housing types, including family homes.
165	Landowner	Safestore (agent: GVA)	<p>Support the SPD identification of the Safestore site to deliver high density residential development.</p> <p>Suggest that to deliver affordable housing, it is subject to viability, and balance of housing types. Request reference to 'especially affordable homes' and 'especially affordable family homes' be reworded on Page 31 and 33. Request reference to affordable homes be reworded in Delivery Schedule on Page 33 under 'Project Rationale'.</p> <p>Request rewording of mix of uses being a list of Possible uses on Page 31 and 33.</p> <p>Welcome the flexibility of the SPD about retention of storage use either on the site or re-provision of this space elsewhere in the Borough (accords with pre-app advice from LBTH).</p> <p>Timescale in Delivery Schedule and Phasing Plan do not match - suggest</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council has undertaken its own supporting viability assessment appropriate to this level of strategic planning and considers development is financially viable over the lifetime of the plan, applying adopted planning policies, including minimum levels of affordable housing. As a result, it is not considered necessary to amend this part of the statement. Detailed planning proposals will be subject to viability testing in accordance with CS Policy SP02 and Policy DM3 of the MDD at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council has undertaken a detailed analysis through baseline work in consultation with stakeholders and in the context of Local Plan policy to set out the land use framework appropriate to this sub area.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Agree. Amendment to text regarding timescales</p>

			timescale is amended to short-term (2013-2018).	accordingly on Page 33 and Page 38.
105	Registered Provider	London Quadrant (agent: DP9)	<p>With regard to sites 18a, 18b and 18c (in KPT5) high density residential development supported.</p> <p>Requests the new leisure use should be flexible and not specific to hotel use.</p> <p>Request the new open space should be flexible in terms of location and scale and private amenity space should be referenced.</p> <p>Request community use should be referenced as possible option rather than definite inclusion.</p> <p>Timescale to be amended to short-medium term.</p> <p>Suggest district centre be extended to include KPT5.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Disagree. This reflects the existing planning permission and is an appropriate land use to compliment the district town centre.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD establishes the principles of approximate scale and location of new open space to support new residential development particularly at higher densities. Private amenity standards are subject to polices within the MDD.</p> <p>Disagree. Community infrastructure is essential to support new development. The nature and scale is subject to and infrastructure assessment at planning application stage</p> <p>Agree. Amendment to text regarding timescales accordingly on Page 33 and Page 38.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD cannot alter statutory boundaries set out within the adopted MDD, which was subject to an Examination in Public.</p>

110	Registered Provider	London Quadrant (agent: DP9)	<p>Broadly supports proposals for KPT5.</p> <p>Suggests greater flexibility in Masterplan to allow for different site designs/schemes to come forward.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council has undertaken a detailed analysis through baseline work in consultation with stakeholders and in the context of Local Plan policy to set out the land use framework appropriate to this sub area.</p>
160	Landowner	KTS Group (agent: NLP)	<p>Welcome the identified urban block on site bounded by Cavell Street, Raven Row, Sidney Street and Stepney Way (and including our clients site).</p> <p>Strongly support Masterplans objective for high density residential development on this site.</p> <p>Notes that Masterplan suggests LBTH's aspiration for comprehensive development, however SPD should recognise that phased approach could be taken to each site within KPT5.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Masterplan for this site at Cavell Street, Raven Row, Sidney Street and Stepney Way seeks to create the framework for phased development. The Council cannot however predict when the market will deliver this and will continue to work with and encourage landowners and developers to co-operate with one another towards a comprehensive solution across these sites.</p>

			Notes Masterplans aspiration for site for improved permeability, public realm enhancements and open space, however request SPD should be clear that these would be intimate, enclosed in scale/nature.	Disagree. The Council seeks to secure high quality publicly accessible open space for existing and future communities in accordance within the Green Grid Strategy and Policy DM10 in the MDD.
197	Resident	Newark St, E1	Suggests Safestore site could be arts/theatre/music venue and/or sports centre and outdoor swimming pool	Noted. The SPD has specified new leisure uses and community facilities to be provided on site.
266	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	Notes proposals for site 19a (Royal Mail post office depot ) does not relate well to the height and scale of Whitechapel road.  Notes that site 19b provides the setting to the historic elements of the Royal London Hospital.	Noted. The plans are illustrative and site is identified for iconic and high quality architecture, which will in turn improve townscape along Whitechapel Road especially with regard to the existing building.  Noted. New proposals at this site will be required to consider their impact on existing heritage assets in accordance with Policy DM27 of the MDD.
	Landowner (Agent: Gerald Eve)	Royal Mail Group	Royal Mail broadly supportive of the Masterplan  Requests retention of the delivery offices on site to ensure continuity of operation and employment on site and be added to commercial land uses at lower levels.  Request that within figure 27 that ref 19a is demarcated with a proposed 'landmark building'	Support noted.  Agree. Text amendment to Delivery Schedule ref 19a and 19b (post office depot site) Page 33 to include re-provision of post office operation on site.  Agree. Text amendment within Figure 27, p30 demarcating a 'proposed landmark' building.

			Request within 'Project rationale' that ref 19b acknowledging the site constraints of building over the East London Line (ELL) overground cut and royal mail tunnel on p33 via a bullet point	Agree. Text amendment to Delivery Schedule ref 19a and 19b (post office depot site) of Page 33 to include under 'Project Rationale' reference to constraints of ELL and rail mail tunnel.
--	--	--	---	---

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details or location	Representation Summary (KPT6: Cambridge Heath Gateway)	LBTH Response
10	Residents Association	Chair - Albion Yard Residents Association	Concerns about proposals to create public space in KPT6 (amenity).	<p>Noted objection with regard to KPT6. Proposals for KPT6 amended to exclude Albion Yard resident's parking/refuse land, with provision of screening along boundary. (See Figure 32)</p> <p>The Masterplan is promoting the provision of new public open space as set out in the Open Space and Movement Strategy (Page 13). All public spaces will be planned in accordance with MDD policies DM10 and DM23, which cover aspects including safe design.</p>
246	Resident	Sidney St, E1	Does not support larger Sainsbury's store due to impact on smaller, independent shops.	Noted. One of the key ambitions is to the strengthen Whitechapel District centre, and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page10). This will also include supporting local small and large scale businesses. One of the key interventions proposed by

				KPT1 is to diversify retail and leisure activity.
96	Resident	Trinity Hall, Durward St, E1	Objects to KPT6 open space behind Albion Yard.	<p>Noted objection with regard to KPT6. Proposals for KPT6 amended to exclude Albion Yard residents parking/refuse land, with provision of screening along boundary. (See Figure 32)</p> <p>The Masterplan is promoting the provision of new public open space as set out in the Open space and Movement strategy (Page 13). All public spaces will be planned in accordance with MDD policies DM10 and DM23, which cover aspects including safe design.</p>
97	Resident	Albion Yard, E1	Objects to KPT6 open space behind Albion Yard.	<p>Noted objection with regard to KPT6. Proposals for KPT6 amended to exclude Albion Yard residents parking/refuse land, with provision of screening along boundary. (See Figure 32)</p> <p>The Masterplan is promoting the provision of new public open space as set out in the Open space and Movement strategy (Page 13). All public spaces will be planned in accordance with MDD policies DM10 and DM23, which cover aspects including safe design.</p>
145	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Does not support demolition of Sainsbury's.	Noted. The SPD considers that the redevelopment of the Sainsbury store is necessary to deliver comprehensive regeneration benefits to the area.
15	Resident	Albion Yard, E1	Object to proposals for KPT6 with concerns	Noted objection with regard to KPT6. Proposals for

			<p>about public space in KPT6 regarding impact to Albion Yards residents parking.</p> <p>Concerns about proposed new public space (amenity, privacy).</p>	<p>KPT6 amended to exclude Albion Yard residents parking/refuse land, with provision of screening along boundary. (See Figure 32)</p> <p>The Masterplan is promoting the provision of new public open space as set out in the Open space and Movement strategy (Page 13). All public spaces will be planned in accordance with MDD policies DM10 and DM23, which cover aspects including safe design.</p>
17	Resident	Albion Yard, E1	<p>Concerns about the public space in KPT6 regarding the Albion Yards residents parking and refuse</p> <p>Concerns about creation of public space (with regard to privacy, security and amenity)</p>	<p>Noted objection with regard to KPT6. Proposals for KPT6 amended to exclude Albion Yard residents parking/refuse land, with provision of screening along boundary. (See Figure 32)</p> <p>The Masterplan is promoting the provision of new public open space as set out in the Open space and Movement strategy (Page 13). All public spaces will be planned in accordance with MDD policies DM10 and DM23, which cover aspects including safe design.</p>
28	Resident	Albion Yard, E1	<p>Concerns with proposal for new public space in KPT6 with regard to Albion Yard residents parking</p> <p>Concerns about creation of new public space in KPT6 (privacy, security)</p>	<p>Noted objection with regard to KPT6. Proposals for KPT6 amended to exclude Albion Yard residents parking/refuse land, with provision of screening along boundary. (See Figure 32)</p> <p>The Masterplan is promoting the provision of new public open space as set out in the Open space and Movement strategy (Page 13). All public spaces will be planned in accordance with MDD Policies DM10 and DM23, which</p>



				cover aspects including safe design.
68	Resident	Albion Yard, E1	<p>Object to open space proposed in KTP6 due to issues with privacy, refuse storage</p> <p>Notes that if 2nd Crossrail entrance doesn't open new green space could become deserted at night, issues with crime etc.</p>	<p>Noted objection with regard to KPT6. Proposals for KPT6 amended to exclude Albion Yard residents parking/refuse land, with provision of screening along boundary. (See Figure 32)</p> <p>Disagree. The Masterplan is promoting the provision of new public open space and new routes as set out in the Open space and Movement strategy (Page 13). All public spaces will be planned in accordance with MDD policies DM10 and DM23, which cover aspects including safe design.</p>
149	Landowner	Sainsbury's (agent: Turley Associates)	<p>Suggest deleting point about community facilities/leisure centre Suggestions for Delivery schedule table (Page 34 and 36).</p> <p>Suggest add new section 'the provision of a tall landmark building (s) in this location will improve the legibility of the centre and creating a catalyst for regeneration for the centre as a whole'.</p>	<p>Disagree. Community infrastructure is essential to support new development. The type, nature and scale will be subject to the planning application process. However the Council is agreeable to making a minor amendment to wording to make reference for 'leisure facilities'. This still provides the opportunity to assess the potential for the relocation of the leisure centre, but also recognises the potential for alternative leisure / community uses should a leisure centre not be deliverable. Page 35.</p> <p>Disagree. Policies, DM24, DM25 and DM26 in the MDD will assess taller buildings.</p>

			Whilst broadly supported, it is important not to be too prescriptive about the details of KPT6 at this early stage of potential scheme evolution. Suggest text amendment.	Disagree. The Council has undertaken a detailed analysis through baseline work in consultation with stakeholders and in the context of Local Plan policy to set out the land use framework appropriate to this sub area.
190	Resident	Whitechapel	Supports plan to redevelop existing Sainsbury's store  LBTH should consider redeveloping some of social housing estates to north of station behind Sainsbury's	Support noted.  Noted. The Masterplan boundary does encompass a number of social housing estates to both the north and south of Whitechapel station/Road. As set out in the Wider Interventions Delivery table (Page 40), it is the intention of the Masterplan that a Whitechapel Estate Capacity and Improvement Study be undertaken to explore housing regeneration opportunities for these estates.

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details or location	Representation Summary (Section 7: Delivery Strategy)	LBTH Response
60	Organisation	Project Architects	Suggests local architectural practices are involved in regeneration of Whitechapel	Noted. The Council welcomes continued dialogue with a range of stakeholders through the lifetime of the Masterplan. Under 'Delivery Bodies' the SPD identifies a wide variety of groups and organisations that can

				provide the basis of a future stakeholder group, building on the Council's existing consultation database.
150	Landowner	Sainsburys (agent: Turley Associates)	Suggest Development Brief is not required for site  Requests short timescale within Phasing Plan and on Delivery Schedule	Noted. However, 'Planning Delivery Tools' (Page 37) is recommending design and development briefs for major development sites as 'suggested' tools of delivery.  <b>Agree.</b> Amendment to Phasing Plan and Delivery Schedule to 'short-term' for Sainsbury's site. (See Figure 34, Page 38)
161	Landowner	KTS Group (agent: NLP)	Suggests no need for development and design brief for this site	Noted. However, 'Planning Delivery Tools' (Page 37) is recommending design and development briefs for major development sites as 'suggested' tools of delivery.
188	Resident	Whitechapel	Suggest LBTH should consider establishing a local stakeholder steering group	Noted. Under 'Delivery Bodies' the SPD identifies a wide variety of groups and organisations that can provide the basis of a future stakeholder group, building on the Council's existing consultation database.
252	Landowner	QMUL (agent: CBRE)	Support Council's approach for adopting development briefs for detailed elements of the Masterplan to assist with delivery of	Support noted.

			large/complex sites (including Med City/Life Sciences faculty)	
267	Statutory consultee	English Heritage	Delivery bodies section should include EH regarding old RLH	Agree. Amendment to text on Page 37, under 'Other Key Partners' insert 'English Heritage'
171	Developer	Zen Developments (agent: NLP)	Suggest Zen Developments working in partnership with owners of major site on Vallance Rd and Hemming St - opportunity for mixed use scheme inc. commercial floorspace and new residential units	Agree. The Council acknowledges these medium scale sites and suggests a design and development brief approach or via the Council's pre-applications service.  Amendment to text Page 37, Delivery Strategy, add new point under 'Design and Development Briefs':  <i>Other medium scale sites within the Masterplan boundary</i>  And amendment to text on Page 40 to insert new row entitled 'Medium Scale Sites'

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details or location	Representation Summary (Section 7: Phasing Plan)	LBTH Response
75	Resident	Durward St, E1	Note Durward Street phasing is scheduled to begin in 2019 - does the council expect residents of Durward Street to live through 7 years of building works and then have our homes put under compulsory purchase order	Noted objection to KPT3. Proposal to redevelop North Durward st properties (nos. 73-95 plus 57-71) removed from Masterplan and public space to be re-designed.

Comment ID	Consultee type	Organisation Details or location	Representations Summary (Section 7: Wider Interventions)	LBTH Response
61	Organisation	Project Architects	Hopefully initiatives 'bleed' out into surrounding areas too, its a very underrated area with phenomenal potential	Noted. The Council expects the regeneration benefits in Whitechapel to extend into other areas of the borough.
241	Statutory consultee	GLA	<p>Note options for Cycle Superhighway route 2 upgrade will be developed in conjunction with LBTH</p> <p>Plan should acknowledge that existing bus stops are currently located as appropriately as possible and there would be a presumption against significant changes</p> <p>Request clarify reference to 'facilities and stands updated and shelter capacity increased'</p> <p>Recognise need to provide more stand space to allow further routes to terminate near the station and improve interchange experience</p> <p>Suggest using LBTH CIL contributions to lower Vallance Road to enable use by double deck buses (to increase capacity).</p>	<p>Noted. The Council welcomes partnership working with GLA and TfL with regard to Whitechapel Road Public Realm Improvements' project that will consider the need for upgrading Cycle Superhighway 2.</p> <p>Disagree. The level of strategic planning within the SPD does not intend to demarcate detailed street layouts in the plans. This will be included with design proposals for Whitechapel Road Public Realm Improvements'</p> <p>Noted. The SPD is referencing bus infrastructure that may be required and recognise further consultation with TfL is essential as part of any upgrades in the future.</p> <p>Noted. Future plans for Whitechapel Road with be in consultation with TfL.</p>

			<p>Suggest Plan should make reference to taxi and private hire vehicles and identify locations for suitable set down/pick up areas</p> <p>Suggest clarity of implications for using section 106 contributions on development viability have been taken into account</p>	<p>Noted. The LBTH CIL is subject to a separate planning consultation unto which TfL a statutory consultee. Currently the SPD does not identify this specific intervention as being required.</p> <p>Disagree. This is too detailed for the Masterplan but it will be considered as part of a detailed public realm improvements strategy.</p> <p>Noted. The Council has undertaken its own viability assessment to support the SPD and considers the proposed level of development is viable on individual development sites identified within the KPT sub areas in the context of applied infrastructure requirements.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Consultee type</b>	<b>Organisation Details or location</b>	<b>Representation Summary (Further comments)</b>	<b>LBTH Response</b>
40	Resident	Durward St, E1	Concerns about lack and method of consultation	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.

4	Resident	Mount Terrace, E1	Broadly supports Masterplan vision - will benefit community	Support noted.
7	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Complaint about lack and method of consultation	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
62	Organisation	Project Architects	Keen to be involved with project	Noted. The Council welcomes continued dialogue with a range of stakeholders through the lifetime of the Masterplan.
27	Resident	Albion Yard, E1	Concerns with lack of consultation	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December, 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
120	Statutory Consultee	City of London (COLC)	COL no comments or objections to Masterplan	Noted no objection to Masterplan.
133	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Suggest tourist trail of Art Deco buildings in area - would attract tourists and revenue to	Noted. The Council expects the Masterplans objectives of promoting further cultural activity in the area will

			area	directly enhance the local visitor economy.
76	Residents Association	Durward Street North Residents	Strongly object to lack of consultation, especially with Durward st residents.	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December, 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
268	Organisation	Tower Hamlets Racial Equality Council	Object to Councils consultation on SPD	Noted. The Council is satisfied it has undertaken sufficient detailed public consultation on the SPD in accordance with statutory regulations and as set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). See Consultation Strategy (September 2013) and Consultation and Engagement Report (December, 2013) for full details of the consultation activities undertaken.
143	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Notes that there has been so many new buildings over the past 20 or so years, any more new development would make life unbearable for residents in core area	Noted. The Masterplan aims to better manage, in a coordinated approach, the expected growth that will arise from the arrival of Crossrail to Whitechapel in 2018. The proposed interventions in the Masterplan seek to benefit the whole community in Whitechapel, and enhance the quality of life for all, through the delivery of new homes, community infrastructure, jobs and enhanced public realm.



113	Registered Provider	London Quadrant (agent: DP9)	Notes that images should be annotated or text added to indicate clearly that they are indicative only	Noted. Images are already titled as 'illustrative'.
200	Resident		Issues about readability of Masterplan	Noted. The document has been written in the clearest language for all readers and where technical terms are used these are explained where possible.
115	Statutory Consultee	Natural England	<p>NE broadly support approaches and conclusions in Masterplan</p> <p>NE would welcome Masterplan encouraging as much Green Infrastructure (GI) as possible</p> <p>Supports provision of new open green spaces</p> <p>Suggest inclusion of permeable paving surfaces and other SUDS to manage flood risks</p> <p>Suggests liaising with LWF with regard to nature reserve</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>Noted. The Masterplan proposes to enhance green infrastructure, including the provision of a new Green Spine through the heart of the area, a number of new public green spaces, and the greening of key routes through the area, including Whitechapel Road.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Council's MDD policies covers SUDS and flood risk issues. New proposals will be assessed in more detail at the planning application stage against Policy DM13.</p> <p>Noted. The Council welcomes engagement with NE and LWF with regard to biodiversity within Whitechapel.</p>

182	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	<p>Supports references to greener roofs, SUDs, reducing water run-off and flood risk assessment requirements.</p> <p>Supports section on climate change.</p> <p>Supports the need for more open spaces in the Masterplan area.</p> <p>Supports sustainable design principles.</p> <p>Supports references to enhancing Green Grid linked to the Green Spine proposal.</p> <p>Requests more guidance and a commitment that the buildings in the green spine area will maximise SUDS and in particular with green roofs and walls which would improve biodiversity and help adapt and mitigate to climate change.</p> <p>Suggest working with Highways Planning Manager who is leading on the SWMP who may have information and actions to manage surface water flood risk in this area.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Council's MDD polices covers SUDS, biodiversity and climate change issues. New proposals will be assessed in more detail at the planning application stage against Policy DM11 and DM13.</p> <p>Noted. The Council's welcomes EAs proposed partnership working with LBTH highway department on this specific issue.</p>

90	Resident	Walden St, E1	<p>In general supports vision to improve housing and job offer and enhance public realm</p> <p>Concerns about loss of areas unique character through tall buildings and chain stores</p> <p>Questions what is being proposed to improve safety (lighting and traffic issues)</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. Any proposal for tall buildings would be subject to the criteria listed in Policy DM26 in the adopted MDD (2013). This requires proposals for tall buildings to respond to their local context including existing townscape, views, heritage assets and amenity. All proposals will be subject to the Policies DM24 and DM25 in the MDD (2013), which will require place-sensitive design and deal with any environmental impacts. It should also be noted that the sketches/CGIs contained within the Masterplan are illustrative only. In addition one of the key ambitions is to the strengthen Whitechapel District centre and this includes expanding and diversifying town centre activity (Page 10) and supporting local businesses.</p> <p>Noted. One of the key objectives and interventions proposed in KPT1 is transforming and improving the quality of the public realm, which will include considering issues of lighting and traffic (Page 18). As per the Delivery Schedule on Page 19, LBTH will undertake a comprehensive Public Realm Improvement Scheme, in which different</p>

				improvement schemes will be considered for Whitechapel Road and surrounding highways, and gateways, in the Masterplan area.
134	Resident	Kempton Court, E1	Suggests priority should be given to the needs of older people when planning new housing in Masterplan area	Noted. Specialist housing has been identified within the Masterplan KPT4 Med City ref 15 (Page 29) and KPT 5 Raven Row (Page 32). Furthermore, specialist housing will be guided by Policy DM5 of the MDD which seek to provide specialist housing including accommodation for elderly persons.