

Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement 2017 - 2031



Neighbourhood Plan Consultations Statement submitted by the Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Planning Forum on the 25th October 2017 (amended 9th November). To have effect until 31st December 2031



1. TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
Basic Conditions and Tests to be Met.....	3
Brief History	3
2. Consultation methods	4
Physical delivery of letters	4
Social Media.....	4
News Media	6
Google Search	6
Events.....	6
3. Composition of the Community.....	9
Membership Data.....	10
Survey – composition of respondents	11
4. Survey	13
5. Regulation 14 Consultation.....	13
6. Regulation 14 responses.....	21
Policy – Density and Infrastructure	22
Policy – Community Infrastructure levy (CIL).....	24
Policy – Estate Regeneration	26
Policy – Empty Sites	34
Policy – Grandfathering Residents Associations	35
Policy – 3D Model	35
Policy – Broadband Access	36
Policy – Construction Management and Communication	38
Policy – Sustainable Design.....	40
Policy – Air Quality.....	41
Other Comments	42
Residents comments	42
7. Appendices	43

1. INTRODUCTION

BASIC CONDITIONS AND TESTS TO BE MET

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2). Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- (b) explains how they were consulted;
- (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

BRIEF HISTORY

The Forum started in the autumn of 2014 when local Councillors distributed letters across the Isle of Dogs inviting residents to discussions about the scale of development underway. Conversations were also had with major local businesses.

It was quickly decided to set up a Neighbourhood Planning Forum for the Isle of Dogs. There were no pre-existing groups which covered the whole area nor did we have a Parish/Town Council in place.

At that point in time LBTH only had two applications windows a year so we had to very quickly apply to be recognised otherwise we would have had to wait another six months.

We had numerous meetings across the area cumulating in a meeting on Tuesday 25th November 2014 where we agreed our constitution, area and to apply to be recognised.

We submitted our application to LBTH to be recognised on the 1st December 2014. The LBTH consultation on our application ran between Monday 5th January 2015 and Monday 16th February 2015.

From February 2015, onwards we waited for recognition while the Council discussed various permutations of the area. First suggesting that the Area exclude site allocations until we pointed out that would dis-enfranchise both the Chair of the Forum and a then Deputy Mayor for Tower Hamlets.

In November 2015, it was suggested by LBTH that we add the rest of Poplar ward to the Area (therefore making it congruous with the OAPF area). As no public consultation had taken place either with the new area or the original area we declined the suggestion.

We were finally recognised by Mayor John Biggs in Cabinet on the 6th April 2016

But the northern third of the applied for area was removed by the Council and a new smaller Area was imposed on the Forum whose northern boundary was the docks.

In the summer of 2016 we took the decision to follow an unusual strategy having lost time while waiting for recognition. We decided to undertake a two-stage process;

2. A 'quick' Neighbourhood Plan with urgent policies to deal with the applications we expect in the new few years. A more limited Plan with a limited number of policies.
3. To then be replaced by a 'long' Neighbourhood Plan with a full set of policies, in effect a normal Neighbourhood Plan. Work will officially start on this on the 30th Oct 2017.

We consulted with AECOM who were then providing technical support on this option and they agreed that this was a viable strategy.

We did this due to the speed and pace of ongoing development, we knew we would 'miss' several large planning applications if we did a 'normal' Neighbourhood Plan.

2. CONSULTATION METHODS

PHYSICAL DELIVERY OF LETTERS

We started in 2014 delivering letters from Councillors using LBTH headed paper to advertise meetings, why and what we were doing. This was before we had an agreed name, area and logo.

SOCIAL MEDIA

From the beginning the Forum has actively used social media. Given that the population of the area is both younger and more educated than average in the UK we believe that social media use is higher than average in the UK. It has therefore been an important part of our communication and consultation strategy.

Facebook

We have used Facebook extensively as a communication and consultation tool

Canary Wharf and Isle of Dogs Residents Group – was set up by and then administered by two members of the Forum committee. It was set up around the same time that the Forum started for many of the same reasons, to help build a community. It has been an important consultation tool and has allowed us to have conversations across the community about a wide range of subjects.

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1458438024296291/>

8,378 members as at September 2017

Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Planning page – specifically set up for the Forum

<https://www.facebook.com/IsleofDogsNeighbourhoodPlanningForum/>

353 likes as at September 2017. In the first week of October 2017 we had 2,190 reaches.

Twitter

We have our own Twitter account at

<https://twitter.com/IsleofDogsForum>

350 followers as at September 2017 but some of our Tweets are re-tweeted

Email newsletter

We use Mailchimp to send emails to people signed up to receive our newsletters

We currently have 727 subscribers to our newsletters and have sent 62 newsletters since the beginning of 2015.

We know many of these emails have been re-broadcast within other email groups

Nextdoor

A local communication website which is geographically organised

425 members as at September 2017 all in the OAPF area

Streetlife

The predecessor to Nextdoor with thousands of residents as members. It was an important communication tool as it complemented Facebook. It closed in early 2017 when it was taken over by Nextdoor.

Website

Our website is

<http://www.isleofdogsforum.org.uk>

We currently average about 235 unique visitors a week

Other

Our YouTube video – has been viewed over 1,100 times

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JH57RTK-esk>

NEWS MEDIA

We have two main local newspapers in the area which are also free to pick up in certain locations within the Area

East London Advertiser

They have run six stories mentioning the Forum specifically

<http://www.eastlondonadvertiser.co.uk/home/search?submitted=true&searchSlot=true&q=isle+of+dogs+neighbourhood+planning+forum&Submit=true>

The Wharf

They have run eight stories mentioning the Forum specifically

<http://www.wharf.co.uk/search/?q=isle%20of%20dogs%20neighbourhood%20planning%20forum>

But they have both covered wider development stories as well which are useful to us or the work of individual Forum members.

GOOGLE SEARCH

If you search Google for the term ‘isle of dog’s neighbourhood planning forum’ you get 12,800 responses from a variety of different sources. This provides some evidence of our wider engagement.

EVENTS

Our website has a fuller list of events & meetings here
<http://www.isleofdogsforum.org.uk/meeting-notes.html>

But here are some of the main events we have helped organise or have attended.

Queen’s 90th Birthday Street Party 4th June 2016 Glengall Grove

Although not explicitly a Forum event it was organised by members of the Committee Forum as a way of meeting lots of people.

The Forum had a stall at the event advertising what it did, asking people to fill in our survey and answering questions. Up to 300 people passed through the event.

Mudchute Farm Agricultural Show

Saturday 1st July 2017 - Sunday 2nd July 2017

We had a stall for both days between 11am and 5pm. Several thousand people passed our stall and a large number stopped to ask questions

Church fete 2016

Christ Church, Isle of Dogs Fete Sunday 17th July, between 2 and 5pm in the garden of Christ Church Vicarage

We had a stall at the fete and several hundred people attended and many stopped at our stall to ask questions

Summer Fete Canary Wharf College 2016 & 2017

Attended the summer fete at Canary Wharf College which was open to the wider community, several thousand people attended each year and we had a stall running both in 2016 and 2017.

Hustings

We organised as the Forum two hustings events in elections which were chaired by the Chair of the Forum, Richard Horwood.

By-election to elect the Mayor of Tower Hamlets – Tuesday 9th June 2015 at St Johns Community Centre

Approximately 70 people attended the husting including the main party candidates and the eventual winner of the election John Biggs

General Election 2017 – 31st May 2017 at Seven Mills Primary school. Approximately 40 people attended including the main party candidates and the winner of the election Jim Fitzpatrick MP

Ask the Mayor Spring 2017 two events

The Mayor of Tower Hamlets has regular Q&A sessions across the Borough. It was decided that the Isle of Dogs Ask the Mayor session would include the GLA, TfL and the Forum. The GLA & TfL were there to talk about the Opportunity Area Planning Framework for the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar.

The first one on the 8th February was at Jack Dash House. The Mayor, Deputy Mayor, Council, GLA & TfL officers attended.

150 people turned up but the capacity of the room was only 100 so 50 people were turned away. As a result, a 2nd meeting was offered at George Green a month later.

Our video was shown at the event and we were also asked to contribute to the initial speeches with our Chair speaking last.

We extensively advertised the event through social media and local Councillors delivered letters advertising the event. Due to the importance of these events we cancelled our own meetings in this period so as to not conflict.

George Green School 7th March 2017

This time 200 people attended, all the tickets were sold out. We live-streamed the event through social media and had around 1,000 page views (although some of them were repeat views by the same people). We also loaded the video onto Facebook for people to view. Again, the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, Council, GLA & TfL officers attended as well as local Councillors.

This time the Forum presented first and our video was also shown. We extensively advertised the event through social media and local Councillors delivered letters advertising the event.

External audience

While the main purpose of the Forum is to engage, people based on the Isle of Dogs it is also important to raise more widely issues that we have. The following is a sample only;

New London Architecture - Neighbourhood Tour - Isle of Dogs Cycling Tour Wednesday 31 May 2017 10:30-12:30. Two members of the Forum helped arrange the route and helped guide the tour which was led by Peter Murray of the NLA

Sir Peter Hendy Red Bus Tour 17th July 2017 – charity tour of development sites in East London organised by Peter Murray of the NLA

We gave David Gauke MP, Chief Secretary to the Treasury (at the time of the visit) a tour of the Isle of Dogs on the 13th February 2017 – which also included Mayor John Biggs, Berkeley Homes, Canary Wharf Group and a civil servant from the Treasury Housing team.

Other meetings

Members of the Forum attend other events on the Isle of Dogs in which the work of the Forum is mentioned even if not the main purpose of the meeting for example meetings of the local island GP surgeries.

3. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMUNITY

The area generally has a population which is among the most mixed in the country, it is younger, more international and more educated than most areas. It also has a high turnover of residents.

The only data available on the demographic, religious, educational breakdown date is from the 2011 Census data available by 2014 wards (which match the Area that the Forum applied for in 2014). We believe that the smaller area approved in April 2016 has the same characteristics.

Isle of Dogs – Demographic Composition

Data sourced from Tower Hamlets Ward Profiles issued by LBTH Corporate Research Unit, based on 2011 Census

Population

Years	Canary Wharf	Blackwall & Cubitt Town	Island Gardens	Total	LBTH
0-15	1,971	2,256	2,291	6,518	
as a % of total	15.8%	16.7%	16.1%	16.2%	19.7%
16-64	10,101	10,790	11,215	32,106	
as a % of total	80.8%	79.7%	78.9%	79.8%	74.1%
65+	428	485	714	1,627	
as a % of total	3.4%	3.6%	5.0%	4.0%	6.1%
Total	12,500	13,531	14,220	40,251	

Ethnic Mix

All other	24.0%	24.0%	20.0%	22.6%	11.0%
Black	6.0%	7.0%	4.0%	5.6%	7.0%
Bangladeshi	15.0%	15.0%	14.0%	14.6%	32.0%
Mixed	6.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.6%	5.0%
White other	20.0%	18.0%	19.0%	19.0%	12.0%
White British	29.0%	32.0%	39.0%	33.5%	33.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Housing Tenure

Living rent free	1.6%	1.3%	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%
Private rented	49.0%	46.1%	42.4%	45.7%	32.6%
Social rented	22.4%	24.5%	22.1%	23.0%	39.6%
Owner occupier	27.0%	28.1%	33.9%	29.8%	26.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Religion

Religion not stated	22.7%	18.6%	15.3%	18.7%	15.4%
No religion	20.7%	22.1%	23.8%	22.3%	19.1%

Other religion				0.0%	
Sikh				0.0%	
Muslim	19.5%	18.3%	16.6%	18.1%	34.5%
Jewish				0.0%	
Hindu		5.2%		1.7%	
Buddhist			1.8%	0.6%	
Christian	29.6%	32.8%	36.9%	33.3%	27.1%
Total	92.5%	97.0%	94.4%	94.7%	96.1%

Labour market participation

In employment	69.1%	68.9%	68.2%	68.7%	57.6%
Unemployed	5.4%	5.3%	5.6%	5.4%	6.7%
Student	3.1%	3.6%	3.9%	3.6%	5.5%
Retired	3.2%	2.9%	4.4%	3.5%	4.7%
Student	8.0%	8.2%	7.0%	7.7%	9.9%
Looking after home	5.8%	5.1%	5.3%	5.4%	7.0%
Long term sick	2.4%	3.0%	2.8%	2.7%	4.5%
Other	2.9%	3.0%	2.8%	2.9%	4.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Qualification

No qualification	8.9%	9.4%	10.7%	9.7%	15.6%
Level 1	6.6%	7.0%	7.5%	7.1%	9.8%
Level 2	6.3%	7.2%	7.6%	7.1%	9.2%
Apprenticeship	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%
Level 3	7.6%	8.8%	8.9%	8.5%	10.8%
Level 4 and above	60.1%	56.9%	54.5%	57.0%	43.6%
Other	9.9%	9.9%	9.8%	9.9%	10.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

MEMBERSHIP DATA

In 2014, we collated membership data as part of the preparation for our submission to the Council to be recognised. But we stopped asking for and collating this data after the end of the consultation period so will not be wholly representative almost three years later.

Male	45%
Female	55%

Ethnic Mix

Arab	1	1%
Bangladeshi	10	9%
Black British	1	1%
Chinese	3	3%

Indian	3	3%
Other white	13	11%
Turkish	1	1%
White & Black	1	1%
White & mixed	0	0%
White British	77	68%
White other	3	3%
Yugoslavia	1	1%

International Mix – where a nationality was declared

Cypriot	1	7%
French	2	13%
Hungarian	2	13%
Italian	3	20%
Lithuanian	1	7%
Polish	3	20%
South African	1	7%
Spanish	2	13%

Age Composition

19 to 29	12
30 to 39	24
40 to 49	26
50 to 59	20
60 to 69	14
70 +	15

SURVEY – COMPOSITION OF RESPONDENTS

We asked people in 2015/16 to complete a survey, the following tables are a reflection of the respondents who did volunteer demographic data.

Female/Male ratio

	Ratio	Number of respondents
Male	41.39%	137
Female	58.01%	192
Other	0.60%	2

Age/Range

Age Range	Ratio	Number of respondents
0-9	0.00%	0
10-19	0.90%	3
20-29	6.93%	23
30-39	33.43%	111
40-49	31.02%	103
50-59	14.46%	48
60-69	8.73%	29
70-79	4.22%	14
80+	0.30%	1

Ethnic Origin

Ethnic Origin	Ratio	Number of respondents
White British	52.31%	170
White Irish	2.15%	7
White: Traveller of Irish Heritage	0.00%	0
White: Gypsy/Roma	0.00%	0
White: Other	28.92%	94
Black or Black British: African	0.31%	1
Black or Black British: Caribbean	0.62%	2
Black/Black British/Other Black Background	0.62%	2
Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi	0.92%	3
Asian or Asian British: Pakistani	0.92%	3
Asian/Asian British/Other Asian Background	2.15%	7
Mixed/Dual Heritage: White & Black Caribbean	0.31%	1
Mixed/Dual Heritage: White & Black African	0.00%	0
Mixed/Dual Heritage: Any other mixed background	1.54%	5
Other ethnic groups: Vietnamese	0.31%	1
Other ethnic groups: Chinese	2.15%	7
Other ethnic groups: Any other Group	1.23%	4
Prefer not to say	5.54%	18
If other, please state if you wish:		25

Answered 325**Religion**

Religion	Ratio	Number of respondents
No religion	32.52%	106
Agnostic	3.68%	12
Muslim	2.76%	9
Christian	50.31%	164
Jewish	0.61%	2
Buddhist	1.23%	4

Sikh	0.00%	0
Hindu	0.61%	2
Humanist	1.23%	4
Prefer not to say	4.60%	15
Other religion	2.45%	8

Disability?

Disabled	Ratio	Number of respondents
Yes	6.13%	20
No	93.87%	306

4. SURVEY

In July 2016, we launched a detailed survey with 33 questions. We made it available to residents online and on paper (the results were then transcribed to the online version).

401 people completed the survey

Appendix 1 shows a summary of the results.

We have also on Facebook run other smaller surveys about specific issues

5. REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION

Started on the 8th March 2017 and officially ended on the 19th April 2017 but we never formally closed any of the consultation periods and continued to receive and include comments after the formal end date.

The following tables describe the main events that took place after we were recognised in April 2016. A more detailed list of all meetings is available on our website here;

<http://www.isleofdogsforum.org.uk/meeting-notes.html>

2016 Dates

	Plan Version	Action	Location	
Tuesday 14 th June 7pm		Meeting	St Johns	Consultation meeting – 45 attendees
Thursday 7th July 7pm		Meeting	Alpha Grove CC	Consultation meeting follow on to 14 th June meeting – 8 attendees
Saturday 9th July 3pm-4.30pm		Meeting	CW Idea	Consultation meeting follow on to 14 th June meeting – 5 attendees
16 th September		Email		Release of draft Vision statement
Wednesday 23 rd November 7.30pm		Meeting	Alpha Grove CC	Meeting to discuss detail of the plan – 30 attendees
Wednesday 30th November 7.30pm		Meeting	Canary Wharf College	Meeting to discuss detail of the plan – 6 attendees
Saturday 3 rd December, 3pm		Meeting	CW Idea	Meeting to discuss detail of the plan – 8 attendees
Thursday 8 th December, 5pm- 8.30pm		Drop in	CW Idea	Drop in session
12 th December	V2	Email		Start of public consultation of V2 of the Neighbourhood Plan
Tuesday 13 th December	V2	Meeting	St Johns CC	Forum AGM and agreement on core policies – 25 attendees + 9 proxy votes

Meeting Locations

Alpha Grove CC – Alpha Grove Community Centre, Alpha Grove
 CW Idea – Canary Wharf Ideas Store, Canary Wharf
 St Johns CC – St Johns Community Centre, Glengall Grove
 Attic Bar – Pan Peninsula, Millharbour
 Jack Dash – Jack Dash House, Marsh Wall
 George Green – George Green Secondary school, Manchester Road
 Seven Mill – Seven Mills Primary school, Barkantine

2017 Dates

	Plan Version	Action	Location	
Thursday 26th January 11am	V2	Meeting	Attic bar	Meeting with developers and stakeholders – about 20 attendees
Wednesday 8 th February 7pm	V2	Meeting	Jack Dash	1st Ask the Mayor meeting – 100 people able to enter, 150 tried to enter
Tuesday 7 th March	V3	Email		Start of Regulation 14 consultation – email sent 4pm to members
Tuesday 7 th March 7pm	V3	Meeting	George Green	2 nd Ask the Mayor meeting – 200 attendees
Wednesday 8 th March	V3	Email		Email sent to statutory consultees and stakeholders
Friday 7th April 4pm - 6pm	V3	Drop in	CW Idea	Consultation drop in sessions – 23 people attended the sessions between the
Saturday 8th April 3pm-5pm	V3	Drop in	CW Idea	“ “ 7 th April and the 18 th April
Wedn. 12th April 10am-12pm	V3	Drop in	CW Idea	“ “
Thursday 13th April 4pm-7pm	V3	Drop in	CW Idea	“ “
Tuesday 18th April 6pm-8pm	V3	Drop in	CW Idea	“ “
Wednesday 19 th April	V3	Deadline		Technically the end of Reg 14 consultation but we kept consultation open after this date
Thursday 27th April 4pm-7pm	V3	Drop in	CW Idea	Consultation drop in sessions
Saturday 29th April 3pm-5pm	V3	Drop in	CW Idea	“ “
Saturday 6th May 3pm-5pm	V3	Drop in	CW Idea	“ “
Wednesday 31 st May 7pm		Husting	Seven Mill	General Election Husting organised by Forum – about 40 attendees
13 th July 2017	V7	Email		Release of updated policies following Reg 14 consultation
Thursday 20 th July 2017 7pm	V7	Meeting	Seven Mill	General Meeting to discuss plan at Seven Mills school – Mayor John Biggs and Council planning officer in attendance – about 50 attendees
Friday 21st July 12-2pm	V7	Drop in	CW Idea	Consultation drop in sessions at CW Ideas Store -
Saturday 22nd July 3-5pm	V7	Drop in	CW Idea	“ “ “
Monday 24 th July 7pm		Meeting	St John	Joint meeting with St Johns TRA to discuss ASDA planning application – about 35 attendees

Advertising of Consultation

Facebook, Twitter, Nextdoor and email were all used to advertise the start of the Regulation 14 consultation.

We also used the Facebook advertising facility to boost our posts.

For example, at the start of the Regulation 14 consultation we reached 2,998 people on Facebook, 42 of whom then engaged with the post, this cost us £30

We also advertised the General Election husting this reached 2,760 people with 84 post engagements for £16

Letter delivery

We delivered approximately 16,000 letters to as many homes as we could access on the island during the consultation period. We believe there are about 20,000 addresses in the area but there were some buildings like Pan Peninsula that we could not access for security reasons and a few estates we ran out of time to deliver to. But with members inside some of these buildings we are comfortable that with the exception of some buildings first occupied in late 2016 that we have reached every building.

Developer and stakeholder meeting

On the 28th January 2017 at 11am we offered a meeting to local stakeholders. It was held in the Attic Bar at the top of Pan Peninsula on Millharbour.

The following groups /stakeholders were invited and most sent attendees;

One Housing Group	Local housing association
LBTH Planning Team & Councillors	
Queen Mary University	
Berkeley Homes	Developer active in the Area
Chalegrove	“ “
Argent	“ “
Ballymore	“ “
Canary Wharf Group	“ “
Greenland	“ “
Mace	“ “
Galliard	“ “
London Communications Agency	PR / Communications organisation with clients in the Area
Your Shout	“ “
Bell Pottinger	“ “
Newington Comms	“ “
DP9	“ “
Curtin & Co	“ “
Met Police	Local policing teams invited
UKPN	Electricity supplier
Thames Water	Water & sewage supplier

Statutory & Stakeholder Consultee's

We emailed on the 8th March 2017 the following statutory consultee's and other stakeholders as part of the Regulation 14 consultation.

We have also had meetings or conversations with many of these organisations before or during the Regulation 14 consultation which are also detailed below. Some of these meetings were specifically about the NP or else the NP was part of a wider conversation.

Developers Rolfe Judd, Meadows and Greystar were not included in the 8th March email but the NP was discussed with them as part of other meetings related to several live planning applications they were working on.

Organisation	Role /	Method of consultation
London Borough of Southwark	Neighbouring planning authority	Email March 2017
Royal Borough of Greenwich	Neighbouring planning authority	Email March 2017
Homes and Communities Agency	Statutory consultee	Email March 2017

Transport for London	Statutory consultee	Various including meetings
English Heritage	Statutory consultee	Email March 2017
Coal Board	Statutory consultee	Email March 2017
Sport England	Statutory consultee	Email March 2017
Port of London Authority	Statutory consultee	Various including phone conversation and chats
Greater London Assembly Planning Team	Statutory consultee	Various including meetings
Natural England	Statutory consultee	Email March 2017
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee	Email March 2017
Canal & River Trust	Statutory consultee	Various including meetings
London Fire Brigade	Statutory consultee	Email March 2017
Neighbourhood Planners London	Group of London Forums which publish map of NP progress	Email March 2017
Planning Magazine	Trade magazine that advertises progress of NP nationally	Email March 2017
Unmesh Desai AM	London Assembly Member	Email March 2017
Jim Fitzpatrick MP	Local MP Poplar & Limehouse	Email March 2017 + GE husting
One Housing Group	Local housing association	Various including meetings
Limehouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum	Neighbouring Forum	Various including meetings
LBTH Planning Team & Councillors		Various including meetings
Queen Mary University Berkeley Homes	Active role in the community Developer active in the Area	Various Various including meetings
Chalegrove	“ “	“ “
Argent	“ “	“ “
Ballymore	“ “	“ “
Canary Wharf Group	“ “	“ “
Greenland	“ “	“ “
Greystar	“ “	“ “
Rolfe Judd	“ “	“ “
Meadows	“ “	“ “
Mace	“ “	“ “
Northern and Shell	“ “	“ “
Galliard	“ “	“ “
London Communications Agency	PR / Communications organisation with clients in the Area	Plus conversations at consultation events or at meetings
Your Shout	“ “	“ “
Bell Pottinger	“ “	“ “
Newington Comms	“ “	“ “
DP9	“ “	“ “
Curtin & Co	“ “	“ “
Snapdragon Consulting	“ “	“ “

Met Police	Local policing teams	Various including meetings
UKPN	Electricity supplier	Various including meetings
Thames Water	Water & sewage supplier	Various including meetings

We did not consult Highways Agency or Network Rail Infrastructure as they have no operations or assets in the Area. LB Lewisham was not consulted due to the limited shared boundary we have with them. We only share a boundary on the river Thames with them and have no physical connections.

The following local organisations we have either met to discuss the NP, have members in common between both organisations or have been kept informed about progress. Many members of these organisations are also active on social media and will have seen regular news updates about the Forum and the NP.

Organisation	Method of Contact
Trinity Buoy Wharf	Meeting
London Docklands Museum	Phone conversation + chat
Millwall Rugby Club	Meeting + members in common
2nd East London Scout Group	Various chats + members in common
Dockland Scout Project Training Centre	Meeting
AICVC	Members in common
Poplar Rowing Club	Members in common
East End Community Foundation	Meeting
Mudchute Allotments	Meeting where NP was mentioned
Mudchute Farm	Meeting
Docklands Settlement	Meeting
Island Sports Trust	Meeting
Friends of Island Gardens	Members in common
Docklands Sailing Centre	Members in common
Friends of Island History Trust	Members in common
Various residents associations across the Area	Variuous

Other organisations listed under the ‘The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012’ as consultee’s include;

(i) to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003

We have been in communication with BT/EE, Vodafone, O2, Virgin Media and Hyperoptic over the last few years about how we can work together to improve communication in the area. We have had meetings with O2, Virgin Media and Hyperoptic in the last two years. Plans for a communication workshop to be organised by the Forum in spring 2017 were delayed by the General Election.

(i) a Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006(7) or continued in existence by virtue of that section;

Tower Hamlets Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) is the local body responsible. A meeting was held with the CCG in April 2016 followed by regular meetings with Isle of Dogs Community Stakeholders Meeting, Healthy Alliance and GP Surgery practises.

(n) bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area;

No such formal groups exist solely in the Area with the arguable exception of Cubitt Town Bangladeshi Association which receives some grant funding from LBTH.

(o) bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area;

There are a number of Christian churches and Muslim mosques in the area. Members of which are members of the Forum or signed up to receive Forum emails. Regulation 14 letters also delivered to several of the mosques.

(p) bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area

The main business of the Area is development so we have focussed our efforts on speaking and meeting with developers active in the Area. Many small businesses and other organisations use the 'Canary Wharf and Isle of Dogs Residents' Facebook group to also advertise their events. This group is administered by two Forum Committee members and has been used to heavily advertise the Forum and the NP. East London Business Alliance was approached some time ago for a meeting which never happened. Individual businesses have been approached and some are members.

(q) bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area.

REAL based at Jack Dash House have attended Healthy Alliance meetings where Forum and its work has been advertised. 6% of our survey respondents also self identified as disabled.

While not local a member of HM Treasury Housing Team attended a public tour of the Area with David Gauke MP. We also had a meeting with DCLG in 2015 about the Forum.

We received Reg 14 responses from the following organisations or stakeholders;

Tower Hamlets Council
 Mayor John Biggs, Executive Mayor Tower Hamlets
 Greater London Authority
 Transport for London
 DP9 on behalf of Northern & Shell Westferry Printworks
 DP9 on behalf of Hondo Enterprises

Historic England
 Quod on behalf of One Housing Group (OHG) and Argent
 Port of London Authority
 4estatesgroup – a group of OHG residents from the four OHG estates in the Area
 Alpha Grove Freeholders Association
 Canal & River Trust
 AGFA

The full responses can all be found here;

<http://www.isleofdogsforum.org.uk/consultation-responses.html>

6. REGULATION 14 RESPONSES

This chapter provides a digest of the Consultation response from each organisation and the Forum's resulting revisions.

General drafting points

The Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Plan Policies document has been edited during the review process to ensure consistency of language and to reinforce the intention of the document. In particular, we have strengthened the evidence and the 'story' behind

We also have updated the NP for the latest LBTH draft Local Plan information and the GLA OAPF DIFS which some members of the Forum have been given access to in their roles as local Councillors.

Where a Consultation response has been used in full, such drafting consistencies have also been applied. For instance, if a response states a policy "must" this will be written as "shall" in the Policy document.

The two most common response statements

The London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH), in particular, but others also make statements about the role of the Forum....

1. That our policies go beyond "Land Use", this is true but specifically allowed by the following national Neighbourhood Planning guidance.

"Neighbourhood planning can inspire local people and businesses to consider other ways to improve their neighbourhood than through the development and use of land. They may identify specific action or policies to deliver these improvements. Wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non-land use matters should be clearly identifiable."

Neighbourhood Planning Guidance Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 41-004-20140306

We believe that all of our policies ensure sustainable development.

2. Role of the Forum- that we have written in a role for the Forum after Plan

This is true but this power is not specifically excluded. There are two options;

The Forum extends its life for another five years when our five year recognition ends. This has recently been done by another Forum.

The Forum is replaced by an Isle of Dogs Town or Parish Council (our preferred option)

Glossary changes

- As forums have limited lifespans, and as ours will have an ongoing role in applying our policies, the Forum is now defined as including a successor or similar organisation (which may be a town/parish council for the Isle of Dogs).
- We've clarified what we mean by 'Infrastructure'.
- We've defined 'Sustainable Development' as how it's used in national planning policy. This is important, as sustainable development is relevant to 'land use'. We may do more work on this.
- Other defined terms have been added to simplify the drafting of the individual policies.

POLICY – DENSITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

D1 – DENSITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The Greater London Authority (GLA) questions whether the proposed policy conforms with the London Plan and it also queries how these policies would work and whether they can be considered “sound”.

The London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) raises concerns about whether this policy is counter to national legislation and the London Plan. It also questions whether it is overly burdensome on developers and to which type of developments it would impact. The Borough also stated that it did not believe that the wording was clear in some instances.

LBTH suggests that policy D1(2) would require developers to pay twice and would potentially deliver infrastructure that end users such as the NHS or community groups would not want.

Other respondents such as Quod on behalf of One Housing Group and Argent expressed support for this policy.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum believes that the policy as stated does support the London Plan and other appropriate legislation. In particular this policy is linked to the very highest density developments and the intent of the policy is and continues to be ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is in-place.

As it refers to developments with the highest levels of development, the Forum continues to believe this policy is sound.

The Forum is not objecting to development, regardless of density, as long as there is the necessary infrastructure to support it.

The Forum is in support of the London Plan, but we also believe that the Isle of Dogs is the only area in London faced with such levels of growth.

However, it is also clear that existing approaches are not working as the necessary infrastructure is not being delivered. It is therefore appropriate to continue to seek to ensure infrastructure delivery takes place in a timely manner in the areas where it is needed.

Since our Neighbourhood Plan was issued for the Regulation 14 Consultation, the outcome of the OAPF Development Infrastructure Funding (DIF) study is becoming clearer and we have amended the Policy document to reflect recent information. We have also modified wording in the document in light of some of the comments received.

In addition, we have included a definition of the Sustainable Development in the Policy Document glossary.

We have accepted comments about clarity and amended the wording to suit. We have also amended wording where comments have suggested a misunderstanding of the intent of a policy.

- As with the other policies, this is now expressly to support ‘Sustainable Development’.
- Now limited to dense residential towers and hotels.
- How the Infrastructure is ‘identified and guaranteed’ has been clarified.
- Specific Infrastructure need only be included where feasible and subject to demand, and need not be provided on the actual site.
- Instead of making the GLA’s SPG a policy – recognising it was not drafted as such – our policy instead requires developers to specify how their proposal conforms to the SPG, including how it is exceptional: not just of exceptional design.
- Includes an updated list of infrastructure types reflecting the GLA’s infrastructure funding study.

D2 – GLA’S LONDON HOUSING SPG

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA states that it is not necessary to repeat the Housing SPG, but suggests that further interpretation could be applied in the Neighbourhood Plan Area to create a “more specific and sound policy”.

LBTH states that if the intent is to turn the SPG recommendation into Policy then this section would need to be rewritten as a policy as it continues to read as a recommendation

DP9's responses on behalf of Hondo Enterprises (which owns the City Harbour NCP Car Park on Selsdon Way) and Northern and Shell (regarding the Westferry Printworks) expressed support for this policy.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum has followed the advice offered and modified this policy as an addition requirement in D1 (as D1(4)), which requires developers to specify how they comply with this guidance.

Policy D2 is now a recommendation as we continue to believe the SPG is an important set of guidance and it should be followed by all developers.

POLICY – COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

CIL1 – NEIGHBOURHOOD POT

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

LBTH comments that this is a repetition of existing policy and should not be repeated within the Neighbourhood Plan.

The GLA makes a similar comment across all CIL policies.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum acknowledges that this Policy is a repeat of government regulations but we have included it with the Neighbourhood Plan for clarity since it has not been made explicit in the LBTH draft Local Plan.

As the fastest growing place in the UK, the community will have a wide range of projects that it will wish to receive investment. It is essential that the Neighbourhood Pot is used only for that purpose unless otherwise agreed by the community through a Neighbourhood Plan. We believe this is crucial to meet Sustainable Development requirements.

Redrafted to be a simpler policy statement: *“To support Sustainable Development in the Area, the Neighbourhood Pot shall be spent on projects identified in this Plan.”* The balance has been redrafted as explanation of the policy.

CIL2 –LONG TERM COMMUNITY FINANCING

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

LBTH does not believe this Policy is in accordance with CIL regulations and that it will consult regularly with local people including the Forum on how the 25% of the pot is spent.

GLA's comment in CIL1 above would also apply to this Policy.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum believes it is the local expert on the Isle of Dogs and through its membership and relationships with other bodies within its area. This means the Forum has excellent access for consultation and engagement.

As long term community financing is an LBTH neighbourhood CIL priority, and to support Sustainable Development in the Area, the Forum will, however, continue to consult with LBTH in this matter.

Expressly tied to Sustainable Development, and consultation with the Council added.

CIL3 – CIL TO PROJECT MANAGE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

LBTH's response to this policy is the same as for CIL2.

Quod, which responded on behalf of the One Housing-Argent Joint Venture (JV), recommends removing items 10. Stock conditions survey of estates, 11. Options appraisal of estate and

12. Advice and support to residents in estate regeneration as it believes these items are project management activities and therefore not appropriate.

GLA's comment in CIL1 above would also apply to this Policy.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum believes this Policy meets the requirement to 'support the Sustainable Development of the Area'. Spend on projects can only be by agreement between LBTH and the Forum and should take place after appropriate consultation has taken place on the scope of the project.

LBTH may lack the human resources to deliver all the projects required and identified by the GLA, TfL, its own Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan. Previously, the London Docklands Development Corporation was able to deliver projects because it was dedicated to a specific area and had dedicated resources.

This policy therefore requires LBTH to use some CIL already received to employ for a fixed period of time project managers and other dedicated staff to be based in the Isle of Dogs & South Poplar OAPF area or to be dedicated to that area. Those project managers will be dedicated to assisting in the delivery of projects identified by LBTH, TfL, GLA and the Forum.

Those CIL funds can also be used to pay for external assistance and consultants required in the delivery of those projects and the 'long' Plan.

Expressly tied to Sustainable Development, and allows for CIL to be spent on managing, as well as delivering, projects.

CIL4 – ALL CIL TO BE SPENT IN THE AREA

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

LBTH's response again suggests this Policy is not in accordance with CIL regulations.

GLA's comment in CIL1 above would also apply to this Policy.

Quod, on behalf of One Housing-Argent, supports this policy in its response: "The JV support that the Draft Neighbourhood Plan calls for LBTH to focus CIL & S106 spending on the Isle of Dogs as one of the areas undergoing the most intensive development."

FORUM RESPONSE

The DIFS statement is expected to identify a minimum of £240m shortfall in funding for the OAPF area and the LBTH Local Plan identifies a £640m shortfall borough-wide. Given that the Forum's area has also seen a historical underspend of S106, the Area has already accumulated a long list of existing Infrastructure needs: not just those required to cope with future development.

Together, this means that the Forum believes that LBTH must focus CIL & S106 spending on those areas undergoing the greatest and most intensive development, especially the Isle of Dogs.

Expressly tied to Sustainable Development, and requires all unspent s106 to be spent here too, referencing recent GLA and LBTH assessments that the necessary Infrastructure costs will exceed potential sources of income leaving a funding gap.

POLICY – ESTATE REGENERATION

- Now starts with a detailed introduction and explanation about why these policies should be in our neighbourhood plan and why they fit sustainable development principles.
- Numerous detailed changes proposed by affected residents' groups.
- ER9 (recommendations for housing regeneration) now included as a recommendation: not a policy, together with additional recommendations on profit margins and favouring social rent homes over shared ownership on cost grounds.

ER1 – RIGHT TO VOTE TO APPROVE OR REJECT FINAL PROPOSALS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The 4 Estates Forum (4EF) provided comprehensive recommendations across the Estate Regeneration policies. The comments for this Policy propose some rewording for emphasis and / or clarity and some additional evidence.

The Alpha Grove Freeholders Association (AGFA) aligns its comments with the 4EF response.

The GLA notes that the Mayor of London is seeking to improve Estates Regeneration across the city and recommends full and transparent consultation. The authority also notes the availability of draft good practice guidance.

Quod on behalf of One-Housing-Argent recognises this is an important issue for the community, but states that this is not a land use policy and therefore not appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan.

LBTH states that ballots would require changes to the Borough’s planning application process and that such changes have to pass a series of tests. LBTH does not believe that such changes would pass the required tests.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum has included this policy as it provides a formal process to secure residents’ buy-in to proposals. It also supports sustainable development. As Estate Regeneration impacts people’s homes and lives the Forum fundamentally disagrees with any suggestion that this is not an appropriate policy.

We also note that such votes have been used on a number of occasions across the area so are not considered onerous by all developers.

The Area includes many housing association managed Estates, some of which were built some years ago. The question of their long-term future is therefore a live subject on the Isle of Dogs. This policy will apply to all Estates where there is a single landowner.

Residents ‘own’ the buildings they live in, whether they are freeholders, Leaseholders or Tenants. They must be actively involved in the decisions over their future homes.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development by ensuring positive engagement of the directly affected community.
- Obligations qualified so as only where ‘reasonably practicable’, to reduce risk of their being struck out as excessively onerous.
- All development options must allow for the tenants’, leaseholders’ and freeholders’ rights in ER5 and ER6.

ER2 – CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

4EF has made comprehensive recommendations across the Estate Regeneration policies. The comments for this Policy propose some rewording for emphasis and / or clarity.

AGFA’s response noted in ER1 also applies to this policy.

The GLA’s response noted in ER1 also applies to this policy.

Quod on behalf of One-Housing-Argent recognises this is an important issue for the community, this type of policy is not a land use policy and therefore not appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan. It also emphasises the complexity of a simple yes/no vote and its implications on the ability for all residents to engage in an informed way.

LBTH states that elections are not a planning matter and therefore this policy cannot be delivered. It also states that planning applications could not be refused if this policy is not followed.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum has included this policy as it provides a formal process to secure residents' buy-in to proposals. It also supports sustainable development. As this impacts people's homes and lives the Forum fundamentally disagrees with any suggestion that this is not an appropriate policy.

Neighbourhood Planning is explicitly allowed to write policies which are not specifically about land use.

We also note that such votes have been used on a number of occasions across the area so are not considered onerous by all developers.

The Area includes many housing association managed Estates, some of which were built some years ago. The question of their long-term future is therefore a live subject on the Isle of Dogs. This policy will apply to all Estates where there is a single landowner.

Residents 'own' the buildings they live in, whether they are freeholders, Leaseholders or Tenants. They must be actively involved in the decisions over their future homes.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development by ensuring positive engagement of the directly affected community.
- Wording of the options also to be approved by residents and landlords, with one option to be for no change.
- Involve independent bodies, expert in consultation and managing elections, with specific voting rights and processes determined by the adjudicating bodies.

ER3 – RESIDENT PARTICIPATION IN A TRANSPARENT, INCLUSIVE, OBJECTIVE DECISION MAKING PROCESS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

4EF has made comprehensive recommendations across the Estate Regeneration policies. The comments for this Policy propose some rewording for emphasis and / or clarity.

AGFA's response noted in ER1 also applies to this policy.

The GLA's response noted in ER1 also applies to this policy.

LBTH makes the same comment as for ER2.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum has included this policy as it provides a formal process to secure residents' buy-in to proposals. It also supports sustainable development. As this impacts people's homes and lives the Forum fundamentally disagrees with any suggestion that this is not an appropriate policy.

We also note that such votes have been used on a number of occasions across the area so are not considered onerous by all developers.

The Area includes many housing association managed Estates, some of which were built some years ago. The question of their long-term future is therefore a live subject on the Isle of Dogs. This policy will apply to all Estates where there is a single landowner.

Residents 'own' the buildings they live in, whether they are freeholders, Leaseholders or Tenants. They must be actively involved in the decisions over their future homes.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development by ensuring positive engagement of the directly affected community.
- Cost of stock condition to be borne by the landlord, not the developer: residents' right to scrutinise.
- Financial details of all options to be published.
- Independent advice for residents at landlord's expense.

ER4 – RIGHT OF RETURN

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

4EF has made comprehensive recommendations across the Estate Regeneration policies. The comments for this Policy propose some rewording for emphasis and / or clarity. It is also keen to explain any potential adverse consequences.

AGFA's response noted in ER1 also applies to this policy.

The GLA's response noted in ER1 also applies to this policy.

Quod on behalf of One-Housing-Argent recognises this is an important issue for the community, this type of policy is not a land use policy and therefore not appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan.

LBTH states that planning policy cannot specify end users and that includes specifying a right to return. It does state that rewording the policy would allow protection of the number of parking spaces and gardens.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum has included this policy as it provides a formal process to secure residents' buy-in to proposals. It also supports sustainable development. As this impacts people's homes and lives the Forum fundamentally disagrees with any suggestion that this is not an appropriate policy.

The Area includes many housing association managed Estates, some of which were built some years ago. The question of their long-term future is therefore a live subject on the Isle of Dogs. This policy will apply to all Estates where there is a single landowner.

Residents 'own' the buildings they live in, whether they are freeholders, Leaseholders or Tenants. They must be actively involved in the decisions over their future homes.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development by ensuring positive engagement of the directly affected community.
- The use of temporary accommodation should be minimised, locally provided, and periods made as short as practically possible.
- Right to return to the same estate: not just the same area. No adverse financial consequences, including rent, service charges and removal costs.

ER5 – TENANTS’ RIGHTS AND COSTS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

4EF has made comprehensive recommendations across the Estate Regeneration policies. The comments for this Policy propose some rewording for emphasis and / or clarity.

AGFA’s response noted in ER1 also applies to this policy.

The GLA’s response noted in ER1 also applies to this policy.

Quod on behalf of One-Housing-Argent recognises this is an important issue for the community, this type of policy is not a land use policy and therefore not appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan.

LBTH states that this Policy relates to individuals rather than to property so is therefore not a planning issue. It repeats the comment that the planning system does not manage elections.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum has included this policy as it provides a formal process to secure residents’ buy-in to proposals. It also supports sustainable development. As this impacts people’s homes and lives the Forum fundamentally disagrees with any suggestion that this is not an appropriate policy.

The Area includes many housing association managed Estates, some of which were built some years ago. The question of their long-term future is therefore a live subject on the Isle of Dogs. This policy will apply to all Estates where there is a single landowner.

Residents ‘own’ the buildings they live in, whether they are freeholders, Leaseholders or Tenants. They must be actively involved in the decisions over their future homes.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development by ensuring positive engagement of the directly affected community, and subject (where relevant) to LBTH’s legal obligations.
- Security of tenure, and rent levels (unless more rooms), to be unchanged. Right to choose new services.
- Social rents based on local incomes, rather than affordable rents based on market rates.

ER6 – LEASEHOLDER AND FREEHOLDER RIGHTS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

4EF has made comprehensive recommendations across the Estate Regeneration policies. The comments for this Policy propose some rewording for emphasis and / or clarity. It also states that this Policy has been proposed because the Estate Regeneration National Strategy also lists an ‘early buyback’ option.

AGFA’s response has reinforced 4EF’s statement on this Policy. It proposes adding four additional Land Use-related policies to this Policy. These additions include the creation of Community Land Trusts; encourage freeholders to engage as business partners within any future

regeneration; representation on appropriate committees and LBTH encouragement for freeholder groups to collectively build under the “Community Right to Build Order” regulations.

The GLA’s response noted in ER1 also applies to this policy.

Quod on behalf of One-Housing-Argent recognises this is an important issue for the community, this type of policy is not a land use policy and therefore not appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan.

LBTH states that this Policy relates to individuals rather than to property so is therefore not a planning issue. It repeats the comment that the planning system does not manage elections.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum has included this policy as it provides a formal process to secure residents’ buy-in to proposals. It also supports sustainable development. As this impacts people’s homes and lives the Forum fundamentally disagrees with any suggestion that this is not an appropriate policy.

The Area includes many housing association managed Estates, some of which were built some years ago. The question of their long-term future is therefore a live subject on the Isle of Dogs. This policy will apply to all Estates where there is a single landowner.

Residents ‘own’ the buildings they live in, whether they are freeholders, Leaseholders or Tenants. They must be actively involved in the decisions over their future homes.

The AGFA recommendations will be considered for the Long Plan.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development by ensuring positive engagement of the directly affected community, and subject (where relevant) to LBTH’s legal obligations.
- As for tenants’ rights where applicable. No extra ground rent or service charges, except for agreed extra services. Any expected extra costs to be explained before voting on the options.
- Equity shares and values, and rights to upsize or downsize, to be determined by the qualified independent body in consultation with the relevant residents’ groups.

ER7 – ESTATE SMALL BUSINESSES, RETAILERS, AND COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

LBTH commented that this would have to be reworded in relation to development and not end users. Discounted retail rents may be possible but such an approach would need sufficient evidence to suggest this is necessary and the viability of ER7.2 would have to be considered and whether it would result in a reduction of other provisions.

4EF notes that “the estates where we live can only function with the retailers and community organisations on our estates and therefore we welcome this section.”

FORUM RESPONSE

As well as the Forum’s views outlined in other ER policy responses, we feel that small businesses, retailers and community organisations are crucial to creating a community on the Island. This in turn means this Policy is important to sustainable development.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development by ensuring positive engagement of the directly affected community, and subject (where relevant) to LBTH’s legal obligations.
- Maintaining what would be sub-market rents for existing commercial leaseholders (if the redevelopment leads to higher market rents) to be subject to the viability of the proposed development.

ER8 – PUBLIC PROFIT REINVESTMENT

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

4EF has made comprehensive recommendations across the Estate Regeneration Policies. The comments for this Policy propose some rewording for emphasis and / or clarity. It also suggests income raised by LBTH and other public bodies such as the Canal and Rivers Trust (CRT) should be treated differently to each other.

AGFA’s response noted in ER1 also applies to this Policy.

The Canal and Rivers Trust is concerned that this requirement conflicts with its national agenda and role by requiring it to ring fence specific funds for use in any one area, particularly if such funding is applied to an activity, such as affordable housing, that is outside of its charitable objectives.

The GLA’s response noted in ER1 also applies to this Policy.

Quod on behalf of One-Housing-Argent specifically supports this Policy.

LBTH states that there is no planning mechanism to deliver this requirement. It also states that stock transfer is a separate legal contract and that the planning system cannot control another organisation’s spending (such as the Canal and River Trust).

FORUM RESPONSE

LBTH, due to the stock conditions transfer terms, may be in line to receive a 50% share of any profits from Estate regeneration. The Canal & River Trust is a public body that also generates large sums in the Area which has historically been spent elsewhere.

This Policy will help ensure that LBTH’s decisions can be shown to be impartial, as it is an explicit requirement that any profit made from Estate regeneration is re-invested back into the local community. Currently LBTH has a conflicted role due to its profit share if re-development were to happen.

The docks require long term maintenance and investment to stay open and working. It would seriously damage the character and attractiveness of the Area if the docks were further reduced

or closed to shipping, and would imperil both the docks', and the Area's, long-term sustainability. It is therefore essential that the docks' long-term future not be put in doubt as the result of further significant funds generated from them being spent elsewhere. They are an asset of the Area, and without them we would no longer be an island.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development by ensuring positive engagement of the directly affected community, and subject (where relevant) to LBTH's legal obligations.
- Infrastructure investment or maintenance now stated to be examples of reinvestment.

ER9 – RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HOUSING REGENERATION

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

4EF has made comprehensive recommendations across the Estate Regeneration Policies. It welcomed this Policy.

AGFA's response noted in ER1 also applies to this Policy.

The GLA's response noted in ER1 also applies to this policy.

Quod on behalf of One-Housing-Argent specifically supports this policy.

LBTH states that recommendations are not planning policy matters as they do not manage the development or use of land. Where they do influence development, or use of land they would need redrafting so development schemes can be assessed against them.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum has removed this as a Policy as they are recommendations. We do, however, continue to support these recommendations as the basis for future development.

POLICY – EMPTY SITES

ES1 – USE OF EMPTY SITES

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA and TfL were both supportive of this policy. Responses on this policy were mainly concerned with the precise wording of this policy that would be a burden on developers. TfL is concerned that it may not be possible to release some empty sites with “complex operational interfaces”.

LBTH commented that this policy should be reworded slightly to require developers to submit a proposal for empty sites as part of their application. It was also concerned about which developments will be subject to this Policy. The council also suggests that the list of proposed uses should be limited to the “low impact uses” to reduce the effect on the planning process. LBTH is also concerned that as written the Policy could be construed as “buying planning permission”.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum notes that there is a lack of available sites within its area and that there are a number of locations where development has been delayed. The Forum continues to believe that in such circumstances that such sites should not lie dormant and that they should be used for the benefit of the community. The drafting of this policy has been amended to reflect the responses received.

- Redrafted intro to: *“To support Sustainable Development in the Area, developers shall submit a proposal, feasibility study and impact assessment for a meanwhile use on their sites when they submit their substantive planning applications in case construction is delayed by more than six months after gaining full and final planning consent.”*
- ‘Meanwhile use’ subject to appropriate complex operational interfaces (e.g. TfL uses). Potential uses now listed in order of priority.
- Developer’s incremental costs to be in lieu of CIL or s106 payment, and calculated net of Business Rate Relief as well as normal development costs.

POLICY – GRANDFATHERING RESIDENTS ASSOCIATIONS

GR1 – HELPING ESTABLISH NEW RESIDENTS’ ASSOCIATIONS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA acknowledges that the high-density developments in the Isle of Dogs may require new approaches, although such an approach may need to be evidenced based. The LBTH also suggests that this Policy will not meet the Planning Conditions tests.

DP9 on behalf of Hondo Enterprises supports the principle of forming residents’ associations but questions the requirement for a monetary contribution from Landlords.

FORUM RESPONSE

The experience among the Forum’s members suggests this is the only approach that will reliably lead to the creation of such associations. A formally recognised residents’ association will enable landlords to have an organisation to discuss issues with, and enable residents to have a formal role in the management of their buildings.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development in the Area.
- Limited to large residential developments with at least 50 apartments, and which have to be dealt with by a development committee of LBTH (excluding call-ins).
- To be included in s106 agreements.

POLICY – 3D MODEL

3D1 – 3D MODEL FOR PLANNING AND 3D2 – 3D MODEL FOR APPLICATIONS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA is supportive of this policy but believes redrafting is required to demonstrate how the model would be used for planning purposes. It also suggests clarifying the developers’ contribution requirements for model development and maintenance.

The Canal and Rivers Trust is also supportive and is particularly interested in the “impacts it may identify in terms of visual impact, overshadowing of our water spaces and wind microclimate conditions generated by new tall buildings”.

DP9 on behalf of Hondo Enterprises believes this requirement is overly onerous.

LBTH does not believe this policy is relevant and suggests planning decisions could not be influenced by this policy. It also raises concerns with the ownership of the data and the ongoing costs of the model.

FORUM RESPONSE

As a result of the Consultation, these policies have been amended so they will only apply to developments that have to be dealt with by LBTH's development committee. We continue to believe this is an appropriate policy. We also note that computer-aid-design (CAD) models will be used in the design and development of the majority of developments and these will provide the necessary information required.

Data ownership and on-going costs have been successfully dealt with by other organisations so it should not be overwhelming difficult for the Isle of Dogs Area.

There are also initiatives underway across London that this Policy supports. This Policy is not seeking a new model or an Area-specific model, simply that a model is available that is updated with new developments in the simplest possible way.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development in the Area.
- Publicly accessible online subject to LBTH's legal obligations (e.g. data protection).

POLICY – BROADBAND ACCESS

BBA1 – FIBRE TO THE PREMISES

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA states that broadband is a commercial matter but adds that it is developing a new policy as part of the revised London Plan that will consider broadband implementation. Working with providers, developers and other key stakeholders, the Mayor will develop guidance/good practice to increase awareness and relevant capability amongst London boroughs and developers on the effective provision of digital connectivity.

DP9 on behalf of Northern and Shell states that broadband is a matter for statutory providers and therefore should not be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.

LBTH suggests that this matter may have already been covered in recent changes to the building regulations.

FORUM RESPONSE

The UK Government is committed to high-speed broadband as a basic standard and it is also required for sustainable development, as implied by the GLA's comments.

We acknowledge and welcome the commentary regarding broadband and the updated London Plan and we will incorporate this revised GLA policy when it is available as part of the development of the Forum's Long Plan.

The Forum also notes that a number of recent developments in the Area do not have fibre to the home, requiring expensive or difficult retro-fitting. Without dedicated fibre, it will be impossible to

supply broadband delivering super-fast broadband to all homes. Given our closeness to Canary Wharf and several data centres of national importance in the wider area it is essential for the competitiveness of the Area that all new developments can supply the fastest possible speeds.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development in the Area.
- Limited to large residential developments which have to be dealt with by a development committee of LBTH (excluding call-ins).

BBA2 – BROADBAND RESILIENCE AND CHOICE

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA and DP9/Northern and Shell comments in BBA1 also apply to this policy.

LBTH does not believe this policy, meets the requirements of the NPPF that six specific conditions are met.

FORUM RESPONSE

The UK Government is committed to high-speed broadband as a basic standard and it is also required for sustainable development, as implied by the GLA's comments.

We acknowledge and welcome the commentary regarding broadband and the updated London Plan and we will incorporate this revised GLA policy when it is available as part of the development of the Forum's Long Plan.

The Forum also notes that a number of recent developments in the Area do not have fibre to the home, requiring expensive or difficult retro-fitting. Without dedicated fibre, it will be impossible to supply broadband delivering super-fast broadband to all homes. Given our closeness to Canary Wharf and several data centres of national importance in the wider area it is essential for the competitiveness of the Area that all new developments can supply the fastest possible speeds.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development in the Area.
- Limited to large residential developments which have to be dealt with by a development committee of LBTH (excluding call-ins).
- To be included in s106 agreements.

BBA3 – MOBILE NETWORK RESILIENCE

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

LBTH states this policy would need to be modified as legislation determines statutory consultees. It also says evidence will be needed to demonstrate limitations are due to development and not network capacity limitations. The Borough says that this policy would be more justifiable if it required the loss of communications infrastructure to be re-provided if there is an unacceptable loss of connectivity in the wider area.

FORUM RESPONSE

This Policy supports sustainable development. In addition, it ensures that residents, visitors and workers do not suffer from poor mobile phone access. Mobile broadband is a critical feature of modern life but tall buildings can block mobile phone signals and, given the scale, height and density of development already experienced in the Area, poor network reliability and access results.

The Forum notes that the O2 network has been impacted by network issues since September 2016 when a new building started to block signals from an existing base station. As it can take 18 months or more to implement a new mobile phone base station, this means O2 users will suffer from an extended period of poor service. The more advance notice that mobile phone providers have of disruption, the quicker they can re-configure their network.

- To support Sustainable Development in the Area, mobile phone companies shall be consultees in the planning application process. (They cannot be made “statutory” consultees as originally drafted.)
- Limited to large developments which have to be dealt with by a development committee of LBTH (excluding call-ins).
- The following wording was substantially redrafted: “developers shall in their planning applications provide evidence that they have co-ordinated with any mobile phone providers who have base stations within 500 meters of a relevant development location, in relation to the impact such development may have on mobile phone signals from such mobile base stations. Such developers shall have agreed where feasible to allow communication infrastructure within or on their buildings. If a development site already contains communication infrastructure, developers shall have agreed to ensure the re-provision of the same in any new development so that there is no loss of connectivity to the wider area.”

POLICY – CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

CC1 – CONSTRUCTION COORDINATION

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA notes that a core aspiration of the OAPF is to address the impacts of construction on the area. In addition, TfL is working closely with the Council to develop a strategy for the area, including coordinating the private sector and enabling communications with local residents. As part this strategy consideration to a variety of mitigation measures will need to take place, including the role of river freight and consolidation centres.

LBTH says that the Forum has no role in development management beyond consultation so the Forum’s consent cannot be a condition of planning permission. It suggests that an alternative approach is to require the council to consult on construction management plans, which would include the Forum as well as the wider resident population.

FORUM RESPONSE

Residents are usually unaware of construction plans until a development begins despite the potential for disruption to their lives. The local community's local knowledge, awareness of other developments and the ability to communicate with the wider community brings significant benefits and can reduce the impact on the residents. Through working with developers and the community the Forum can materially improve construction management, making life easier for the developer and residents.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development in the Area.
- LBTH shall also consult the Forum in developing construction management plans in the Area.

CC2 – CONSTRUCTION COMMUNICATION

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA's comments in CC1 also apply to this Policy.

LBTH says this Policy would be implemented by the Environmental Health Department and not Planning so cannot be controlled by planning permission. It also expresses a concern that this Policy could lead to more developers may seek to use environmental legislation to secure a change in working hours.

FORUM RESPONSE

Many developers already contact the Forum when changing hours and so this Policy should not be seen as onerous. When the Forum is not informed, it is unable to communicate with residents leading to their frustration and unhappiness.

There is also sometimes a lack of communication between developers and other stakeholders as to what is happening in a small area with tightly packed and large developments. The Forum can disseminate any changes of working practises or hours to the wider community and to other stakeholders. Simply being copied into any email communication to or from LBTH would meet this policy requirement.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development in the Area.

CC3 – CONTROL OF DUST AND EMISSIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA's comments in CC1 also apply to this Policy.

LBTH says it is unclear to which data this Policy refers. It notes the Council's role in determining the suitability of any assessments and any mitigation as well as to monitor the impact. As the related documents are already public consultation documents, they can already be consulted upon. Also, Forum agreement cannot be a condition for planning permission.

FORUM RESPONSE

The GLA's SPG defines the data referred to in this Policy. But converting the SPG recommendation into Policy, development can be controlled to the highest standards. This includes dust and applies the same Nitrogen Oxides emissions standards applied in the Ultra-Low Emissions Zone to non-road mobile machinery.

With more intense construction, underway in the Area than anywhere else in the UK, and in a geographically limited space, it is essential that construction is undertaken to the highest standards.

Simplified and redrafted to: *“To support Sustainable Development in the Area, construction management plans shall specify how they comply with the GLA's Supplementary Planning Guidance ‘THE CONTROL OF DUST AND EMISSIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION’ released in July 2014 or any successor or replacement guidance. Subject to the parties' legal obligations, all relevant data shall be shared with the Forum using such method as shall be reasonably determined by the Forum.”*

POLICY – SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

SD1 – SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA says that the Mayor welcomes the Plan's focus on protecting the environment and health. It is concerned, however, on how this Policy can be technically implemented and whether the proposed approach would affect the viability of development proposals.

DP9 in its responses on behalf of Hondo Enterprises and Northern and Shell, says that this is a duplicate of a LBTH Local Plan requirement and does not need to be repeated in the Neighbourhood Plan.

LBTH says national guidance is clear that the Home Quality Mark can only be voluntary. It does suggest, however, that if the Forum considers this necessary because of the nature of development within the Area, that it could try to evidence the need to make it mandatory for developments exceeding the London Plan density matrix.

FORUM RESPONSE

The Forum notes that these policies are in the draft LBTH Local Plan. That new Local Plan, however, is likely to be adopted after the Neighbourhood Plan and it is therefore desirable to set these standards as soon as possible. LBTH has said it will strongly encourage schemes to use the Home Quality Mark.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development in the Area.
- Limited to large developments which have to be dealt with by a development committee of LBTH (excluding call-ins).

POLICY – AIR QUALITY

AQ1 – AIR QUALITY

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The GLA says that the Mayor welcomes the Plan's focus on protecting the environment and health. It is concerned, however, on how this Policy can be technically implemented and whether the proposed approach would affect the viability of development proposals.

LBTH says this Policy needs to be proportionate and not applied to all developments (including household extensions). It also comments on applicability of international treaties and the use of Climate Change and Environmental laws in a single Policy. Further it believes the Forum's standards are too onerous and it may not be possible to measure and / or model. It also believes this Policy needs to "more positively worded" to follow NPPF requirements. Lastly, LBTH states that planning policy cannot require end users to alter their behaviour.

FORUM RESPONSE

To ensure this Policy is applied suitably, the Forum requires it to be applied only to applications that are considered by LBTH's development committee. We have also amended this Policy so developers are required to consider appropriate measures that will allow future residents to modify their behaviour by including suitable capabilities within their developments.

Air Quality is a major concern of residents both within the Area and London as a whole and the Forum believes that every opportunity should be taken to address this concern.

- Expressly tied to Sustainable Development in the Area.
- Limited to large developments which have to be dealt with by a development committee of LBTH (excluding call-ins).
- Added that developments should enable occupants to take steps to minimise adverse impacts on air quality, for example (and without limitation) by installing electric vehicle charging points if they are providing parking spaces, providing adequate cycle parking, resident travel plans, or member to car clubs.

OTHER COMMENTS

Responses were received from a number of other organisations with comments that are not captured in the previous sections.

General comments were received from:

Mayor John Biggs, Executive Mayor Tower Hamlets, the Port of London Authority and Historic England provided general remarks without commenting on any specific policy. All were generally encouraging in their remarks.

Savills responded on behalf of Thames Water, the statutory water and sewerage undertaker across Tower Hamlets. It states that a key sustainability objective for Local Plans should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it requires to serve it and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure.

The utility also states that it is essential to ensure that adequate water and sewerage infrastructure is delivered prior to development to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment, such as sewage flooding of property, pollution of land and watercourses, or water shortages with associated low-pressure water supply problems. It therefore proposes the inclusion of a specific Infrastructure and Utilities' Policy.

4EF also proposed an additional Policy, "Intermediate Affordable Housing" that any additional affordable housing provided should follow Tower Hamlets policy guidelines. 4EF provides evidence and justifications for its recommended addition.

AGFA has also included four additional Policies to be incorporated into ER6. These are outlined in the response to ER6 comments above.

The Forum welcomes these recommendations for new policies. In order to remove the requirement to conduct an additional Regulation 14 consultation before the formal review of the Quick Plan, the Forum does not wish to add new policies at this stage. The Forum has updated the definition of infrastructure to capture Thames Water's input and added this input as a recommendation. Thames Water's proposal will be considered for the Long Plan.

RESIDENTS COMMENTS

We received during the engagement process only two objections from residents.

One verbal comment in the 20th July 2017 meeting was against the principal of voting for estate regeneration. The resident felt that would make it too easy for a developer to get permission to knock down estates. We believe that the process will ensure that before a vote takes place that residents have enough information to make an informed choice.

A copy of the detailed policies was provided to the individual but no further comments were received.

We received a phone call from another resident. He did not think there should be any policies as regards estate regeneration and that there should be no engagement at all on this subject. He feels that his leasehold rights mean that any engagement can only be between individual leaseholders and their landlord and that nobody else should be involved in that relationship.

We do not believe the NP policies contradict nor replace his leasehold rights. They simply determine under what conditions a planning application is submitted and do not for example have anything to say about what happens later in the process.

No written response was received.

7. APPENDICES

Please see separate document for all appendices to this document.