

APPENDIX 2

Spitalfields: 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 Spitalfields 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 Whitechapel and LBTH Market Services 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

4) Summary of comments made on made on the Proposed Area

Support	Objection	Neutral	No comment	Petition	Concerned	Total
23	608	7	1	2	0	641

*5 objection letters were submitted individually. 1 of the 5 objection letters included the 2 petitions and 603 signed proforma letters. Of the 603 signed proforma letters 307 were from businesses including market stall holders and 32 were from residents.

** This number does not include the petitions. The first petition was signed by 654 separate signatories in objection to the area. The second petition was signed by 918 separate signatories in objection to the area being designated and identifying an alternative area.

Comments made by statutory bodies and neighbouring authorities

- 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) note that the proposed boundary does not encompass the whole of Brick Lane & Fournier Street Conservation Area or a small part of the Wentworth Street Conservation Area. It is normally advocated that the boundaries should respect Conservation Area boundaries.
- Marine Management Organisation has no comments.
- The Environment Agency outlined that the area is not identified as being in an area of Flood Risk.
- The Coal Authority has no comments.
- The City of London highlights the importance of strong links between the City Fringe and City itself. Characteristics of the city are now found in the City Fringe.
- Transport for London (TFL) state the area includes Commercial Street and Bishopsgate which form part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). It is also stated that TFL operates numerous bus services in the area and has London Overground, London Underground and Cycle Hire infrastructure in the area. The proposed route of Crossrail runs through the area.

Summary of matters raised in support:

- The proposed Area is agreeable and representative of the heart of Spitalfields.
- The proposed boundaries are commensurate with other boundaries adopted by the Council ie. Responsible Drinking Zones.
- The Area is manageable in terms of policy making.
- The boundaries should include Old Truman Brewery.
- Keen to be included within Area boundary (*this relates to one community based organisation*).

Summary of matters raised in objection:

- The Old Truman Brewery Site should not be included in the area for a number of reasons as follows: it is distinct in land use, character, physical form from the surrounding area and its inclusion is therefore inconsistent with the proposed Area. The site is physically contained and

physically separate from the surrounding area. It is a strategic site, akin to the Bishopsgate Goodsyrd site, with a wide sphere of influence beyond the local or neighbourhood level.

- The proposed Area is too large and does not form a coherent or consistent neighbourhood.
- Character areas within the proposed Area were identified which highlight distinctive characteristics and the incoherence of the area. The character areas include a specialised restaurant area, large floor plate contemporary architecture, fine grain street patterns and areas attracting international tourism.
- An alternative Area, to the south east of the proposed area is proposed. It is smaller in scale and largely residential.
- A Neighbourhood Development Plan for the area is not deliverable.
- More planning policy could hinder growth. There is already a detailed and adopted planning framework for the area.
- There will be unknown implications for the Old Truman Brewery Site which represents 9.1% of the application site.
- A neighbourhood plan for the proposed Area is not deliverable and would result in an inefficient use of resources including LBTH resources.