

APPENDIX 2

Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Planning Area Public Consultation Summary

1) Role of this document

This document provides a summary on the level of representation, and the matters discussed within representations, during the formal public consultation period for the applications to establish a Neighbourhood Planning Area made by Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Planning Forum.

The report takes account of relevant planning matters in representations submitted to the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.

This paper has been prepared by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets for public information and to inform the Council's decision making process. It is not intended to address any of the issues raised during the consultation period.

2) Consultation activities undertaken by the Council

The formal public consultation period ran from 5 January to 16 February 2015. Consultation activities undertaken by the Council were carried out in accordance with Neighbourhood Planning Regulations. Activities undertaken were as follows:

- Provision of consultation information and application material on the Council's website (www.towerhamlets.gov.uk).
- Provision of consultation information and application material to the Idea Store Canary Wharf and Cubitt Town Library for inspection by interested parties.
- Provision of information to elected Councillors in the relevant areas.
- Publication of a Public Notice in East End Life.

These activities also followed the principles of the guidance for the production of policy documents as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

3) Approach to categorising representations made

During the public consultation period, the public are able to make representations on the contents of the area and forum applications submitted to the Council. Typically, representations are made by local residents, local Councillors, landowners, businesses, interests groups, statutory consultees and neighbouring Local Authorities. Representations were not made by all parties directly consulted.

This document presents representations in no particular order. Representation figures calculate submitted responses and as such do not limit representations to one per household or one per business. The following categories have been used to categorise representations:

Support	Have stated explicit support, or support has been inferred from the contents of the representation
Object	Have stated explicit objection, or objection has been inferred from the contents of the representation
Neutral	Have offered comments but not determined if they object or support the application

Petition	A written objection signed by multiple signatories
No comment	Where no comment has been made and no position on the matter can be inferred
Concerned	Do not state they object but highlight areas of concern

The following summaries have been derived from an analysis of the consultation responses. Please note, representations did not always specify support or objection to the area and Forum. The summary of responses paraphrases comments made by representors and, to avoid repetition, makes reference to the same matter once only.

When analysing the representations, regard is given to legislative requirements related to the Forum and Area proposals.

4) Summary of responses related to the Area based application

Number of representations received

Support	Objection	Neutral	No comment	Petition	Concerned	Total
2	4	7	16	0	6	35

Comments made by statutory bodies and neighbouring boroughs

- Natural England offers advice related to protected landscapes, protected species, local wildlife sites, best most versatile agricultural land and opportunities for enhancing the natural environment.
- Historic England (English Heritage at the time of submission) noted the proposed Area includes a number of designated heritage assets including four Conservation Areas, 52 listed buildings/structures, of which one is Grade II* and three are Grade I, a Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden and an Archaeological Priority Area. The Registered Historic Park and Garden of Island Gardens is also covered by the Greenwich Maritime World Heritage Site.
- The Environment Agency identified that the area is within Flood Zone 3. Sources of flood risk include tidal from the Thames upriver of the Thames Barrier, tidal and fluvial from the River Lea, and pluvial and urban drainage between the docks and defences.
- Marine Management Organisation has no comments.
- The Coal Authority has no comments.
- City of London outline that any future proposals for Billingsgate must consider the Tower Hamlets Managing Development Document Site Allocation for Billingsgate.
- Transport for London (TFL) noted that the Isle of Dogs is identified as an Opportunity Area by the London Plan and as such is seen as capable of accommodating substantial numbers of new jobs and homes.

Summary of matters raised in support:

- Two statements of support relating to the area were made with no reasons for this support identified.

Summary of matters raised in objection:

- Inappropriate to include strategic sites and the experience gathered from the High court Judgement in a case by Daws Hill Neighbourhood Forum Area vs Wycombe District Council.
- The strategic development site, Westferry Printworks, is excluded from the Area.

Summary of matters raised as concerns:

- Concerned the area is too large and diverse to embrace the true principles of neighbourhood planning and would make consensus almost impossible. The proposed area includes numerous housing estates, five community centres, four GP's, six primary schools, one secondary school, five dentists and three principal open spaces.
- Experience of the operation of different residential estates is that they function as different 'neighbourhoods'.
- Guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance reveals that Neighbourhood Planning is intended to relate to much smaller areas.
- There are key physical differences between the densely developed area immediately adjacent to Canary Wharf and the less densely developed housing in more traditional streets to the south of the Island.
- The Asda Crossharbour site (*Site Allocation 19: Crossharbour Town Centre of the Managing Development Document*) is of significance beyond the Isle of Dogs area and should be excluded from the Neighbourhood Planning Area.
- The inclusion of the Wood Wharf site (*Site Allocation 16 Wood Wharf of the Managing Development Document*) is seen as unnecessary as the planning context for Wood Wharf is well established. It should be excluded from the Area.
- All Canary Wharf Group interests, including Wood Wharf and North Quay Place should be excluded from the Area.