

APPENDIX 2: SUMMARY OF THE REPRESENTATIONS

The table below outlines the headline key issues raised during the regulation 19 consultation on the Local Plan and an overview of the further work that the council has undertaken to address these issues.

Summary of representations	Our response
Delivering sustainable growth	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location and distribution of growth: the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar has too much growth at the expense of other areas (e.g. Whitechapel and central parts) 	<p>The London Plan establishes opportunity areas in London where high growth is to be encouraged, as they have good access to services, transport and employment opportunities, as well as available developable land. The Isle of Dogs and South Poplar is one such area.</p> <p>Moreover, the assumed distribution of growth is based on the best available data in relation to planning permissions, site allocations and available land, having assessed delivery constraints (e.g. conservation and land use restrictions). The locations of growth do not dictate where growth should go; it represents our understanding of where growth is coming forward. The growth areas in the plan are a result of the extensive work undertaken with the GLA through the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. This considers where land is available to develop and the probability of it coming forward for development. The land availability in the borough reflects the history of the borough's development and changing role from industrial to residential uses.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health impact assessments should only be required where major development schemes are anticipated to have significant implications for people's health and well-being (as per the London Plan). 	<p>No change. The Local Plan confirms that all major developments will be required to undertake a rapid HIA. This is consistent with the approach set out in the London Plan.</p> <p>Due to local circumstances (as evidenced in the Tower Hamlets Health and Wellbeing Strategy), the requirement also applies to certain types of developments (e.g. schools) and certain areas (e.g. poor air quality). We only require more detailed HIAs on developments of a scale referable to the GLA. We consider this to be proportionate. However, we recognise that the wording of the policy could be clarified to make it clearer what is required.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exemption of schemes from vacant building credit has been challenged. 	<p>Disagree. Vacant building credit is not appropriate in Tower Hamlets because it has the potential to adversely affect our affordable housing target.</p>
Creating attractive and distinctive places	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further clarity is sought on how development exceeding the density guidelines set out in the London Plan will be assessed. 	<p>We propose minor modifications to include more guidance on the cumulative impacts of development and the relevant density matrix range from the London Plan.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local community groups consider that the historic gasholders should be afforded greater protection and incorporated within new development 	<p>We propose minor modifications (e.g. gasholders no 2 and no 5 at Marian Place in Bethnal Green will be referenced in the supporting text)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some consultees have challenged the basis for defining the locally designated views and landmarks 	<p>No change. More information on how the views and landmarks (e.g. borough-designated views and the skyline of strategic importance) have been defined will be set out in a background paper as these have been derived from the Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Guidelines.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general thrust of the tall building policy is supported by developers and landowners. However, some have objected to the extent of the tall building zones where they have aspirations to develop tall buildings within close proximity of the zones 	<p>Development of tall buildings is not precluded outside of these zones, including within opportunity areas and site allocations. Outside of these zones, proposals will be subject to additional criteria to ensure they have an acceptable impact on the townscape, provide sufficient distance from other tall buildings and unlock strategic infrastructure constraints.</p> <p>Further clarification on the definitions and scope of the policy is set out in the minor modifications table.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tall building zones should also cover the opportunity areas, site allocations and areas of high accessibility to public transport (e.g. Whitechapel). 	<p>Opportunity areas cover a significant proportion of the borough's land area but are necessarily suitable for tall buildings due to accessibility, heritage and townscape constraints. Tall buildings are directed to existing clusters which are located in the opportunity areas and some of the site allocations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire safety – the impact of the Grenfell disaster should be considered 	<p>Fire and safety considerations are specifically addressed in the Local Plan (see parts 3 and 6). In relation to tall buildings, consideration of public safety requirements will need to be demonstrated as part of the overall design, including the provision of evacuation routes (see policy D.DH6).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design policies are overly restrictive (e.g. stepped down approach to building heights in the Isle of Dogs). 	<p>The policies offer an appropriate balance between flexibility and prescription. In the Isle of Dogs, tall buildings will be carefully managed to ensure the continued preservation of the skyline of strategic importance in Canary Wharf and long distance views, especially from Maritime Greenwich world heritage site. A number of tall building proposals are planned or underway and the tall building zones reflect the location of these emerging clusters.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of consultation on the tall building zones and the evidence base. 	<p>Consultees were given the opportunity to scrutinise the evidence (Tall Building Study) well in advance of the regulation 19 consultation.</p>

Meeting our housing needs	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to the housing mix and how it interacts with the threshold approach to viability (policy S.H1) 	We propose minor amendments to the supporting text - so that schemes meet/deliver at least 35% affordable housing and 70/30 affordable rented and intermediate split can seek a more flexible mix without providing detailed viability evidence. As a minimum, such proposals must generally meet the Local Plan requirements for the delivery of family housing in the affordable rented tenures and must provide a minimum of 10% of family housing in the market housing tenure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing rents and products (greater acknowledgement of build to rent and co-living) 	These products do not meet local need in Tower Hamlets and are not considered acceptable to reduce the affordable housing requirement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach to incremental development (contrary to government policy) 	The purpose of this policy is to ensure that the affordable housing requirements for developments are fairly and equitably applied on all residential developments. Incremental developments would still be able to provide viability assessments to demonstrate delivery constraints where required, so this policy adds no additional burden to that which would apply to any residential development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off-site provision / contributions (affordable housing) 	50% affordable housing off-site requirement has been viability assessed and found to be viable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the requirement for two lifts for the most accessible form of housing which is socially rented (Greater London Authority) 	Comment noted. Further evidence on the rationale behind this requirement will be undertaken to strengthen our position at the independent examination.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sites (affordable housing) 	No change. Affordable housing contributions are considered necessary due to the role that smaller sites play in delivering housing (which is due to grow following the new London Plan approach to small sites) and the affordable housing need in the borough. It has also been tested and found viable in the Local Plan Viability Assessment and as such we are confident that the policy will not affect the delivery of small sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student housing – too restrictive 	We propose a minor amendment to give more flexibility to student housing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing target will not be met 	We accept that the Local Plan needs to address the current London Plan target. We acknowledge that at the point in time in which we assessed the housing trajectory there is a small shortfall in the last 5 years of the plan. The Housing Delivery Strategy outlines how we will seek to overcome this and indicates the plan will be regularly monitored and reviewed if delivery does not increase. The GLA have accepted this position and consider the trajectory to be sound.
Delivering economic growth	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policies are over-protective of employment uses and will prejudice redevelopment opportunities (e.g. non-employment locations). 	No change. It is considered the scope of employment land as defined in the plan is in line with national and London Plan policy and definitions. The employment designations are considered to be appropriate and backed by evidence. There is also scope for some level of non-employment floorspace where it supports the function of the area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of employment: Period of active marketing should be reduced from 12 to 6 months. 	No change – this is based on guidance from the Mayor of London's Central Activities Zone SPG.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% target for employment floorspace in the City Fringe is too low. 	It is considered that the 20% figure is a useful overall target, as the Tower Hamlets Activity Areas are more mixed in nature but encompass parts of other designations such as the Whitechapel LEL where a higher proportion of employment space would be anticipated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum floorspace limits on residential development in the Preferred Office Locations and Central Activities Zone are considered to be too restrictive (e.g. 25% residential in the secondary POL). 	Targets are seen to be appropriate to protect employment/CAZ functions in these important areas. However, policy wording will be amended to give more flexibility on 25% in the secondary POL and 50% in the Central Activities Zone (Zone C).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable workspace threshold (10% of new employment floorspace within major commercial schemes) needs to be more fully justified and should be subject to viability testing. 	Further justification will be provided in the supporting text. The threshold has been viably tested and this confirms that the 10% discount of market rent is easily viable. The justification for the threshold will be set out in the addendum to the Tower Hamlets Growth Sectors and SME Workspace Study (2016).
Revitalising our town centres	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The retail thresholds within district and neighbourhood centres and neighbourhood parades (e.g. 60% of ground floor units should be A1 retail along primary shopping frontages) should be removed. 	The thresholds are considered appropriate as they maintain a pre-dominance of A1 use while allowing suitable flexibility for a range of other uses to come forward.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 200 square metres retail threshold outside of town centres is not justified 	The purpose of the threshold is to ensure that out-of-centre retail development, such as large convenience stores, does not harm the vitality and viability of town centres. Where individual retail units exceed the size thresholds set out in this policy, applicants will be expected to submit an assessment of impact to town centre vitality and viability in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Betting shops should not be excluded from primary shopping frontages, neighbourhood centres and neighbourhood parades in town centres 	Emerging evidence indicates that the recent proliferation of betting shops is having a negative impact on the vitality and viability of the borough's town centres. It is about protecting the attractiveness and vitality of primary frontages, keeping out uses with more negative social impacts, such as betting shops.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request to change the status of Canary Wharf to a Metropolitan Centre 	The London Plan makes it clear that Canary Wharf has the potential to be reclassified as a Metropolitan Centre over the plan period. We also recognise that Canary Wharf

	is now fulfilling this role which has been sufficiently recognised in the Local Plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hot food take aways – using a 200 metres buffer zone is contrary to national policy (assumes all hot food takeaways offer limited choice and same poor standard of food; no evidence provided of link between harm and proximity to takeaways) 	It is acknowledged that hot food takeaways are not the only source of foods that contribute to unhealthy lifestyles, and that not all hot food takeaways provide unhealthy/poor quality food. Nonetheless, within Tower Hamlets, the overwhelming majority of hot food takeaways do provide food of poor nutrition. Our approach is more permissive than that proposed in the new London Plan and additional evidence is being compiled to support the council's position.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes suggested to some of the town centre boundaries (e.g. Brick Lane and Crisp Street) 	We do not feel it is appropriate to extend or amend the town centre boundaries at this stage. We will review all town centre boundaries on an annual basis in order to reflect potential changes or extensions.
Supporting community facilities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over allocation of schools, health and leisure facilities without clear justification 	<p>Sufficient leisure and health facilities have been identified to meet the borough's future needs which will be partially met through the re-provision of existing facilities on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocates more primary school sites than is required for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council has a statutory requirement to deliver enough places but cannot guarantee any of the site allocations will be bought forward for delivery. The site allocations require comprehensive redevelopment and land assembly alongside major infrastructure to support large-scale housing and employment on relatively constrained development plots at high densities. The delivery of new schools will need to be carefully planned to ensure they can sensitively integrated into the overall development, whilst meeting the appropriate standards (including play space). Due to these constraints, in some instances, a site may only be able to deliver a 1 form of entry primary school. For some sites when they come forward for delivery, demand in that particular area may indicate that only a 1 form of entry primary school is required. <p>The over allocation of secondary schools is also due to the uncertainty of sites coming forward in the right locations at the right time (4 out of 5 sites are required). The majority of existing secondary schools have limited capacity to meet future needs arising from this growth. Secondary school sites generally require larger plots as well as good access to public transport and services, particularly due to the fact that they have a wider catchment area than primary schools. Demand varies considerably across the borough; some areas have a surplus, whilst others have a deficit. Land is scarce in the borough and there are only a limited number of available and suitable sites to accommodate new or expanded secondary schools. Other issues (particularly poor air quality and viability constraints, such as costs of decontamination) may also render an allocated site incapable of delivering a primary or secondary school when it comes forward during the plan period.</p> <p>Further work is being undertaken to assess the latest school place projections following the household survey which took place at the end of 2017, thus enabling us to determine which school sites should be prioritised.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to include a specific policy on indoor sport facilities – no sufficient base to address future priorities and needs (Sport England) 	Indoor sport facilities are a type of community facility and the Indoor Sport Facilities Strategy tells us where they will be located. Minor amendments will be made to the policy wording to ensure that sport facilities are not lost to other types of development.
Enhancing open spaces and water spaces	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of playing pitch evidence (Sport England) 	An additional action plan has been developed alongside the Open Space Strategy to address the concerns of Sport England. This identifies specific locations where the identified playing pitch needs of the borough can be best met.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some consultees are requesting the de-designation of strategic open space (e.g. Metropolitan Open Land and Millwall Outer Dock) and green grid links (e.g. Green Spine) 	No change. The designations are given statutory protection.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Double or triple counting: policy requirements on top of the Community Infrastructure Levy 	Where open space is delivered to a sufficient standard in line with the policies set out in the Local Plan, it will be considered as payment in kind.
Managing our waste	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objections to the safeguarding of Ailsa Street, Empson Street and Bow Midlands (part of the LLDC Strategic Industrial Land designation) as areas of search and the safeguarding of part of Clifford House within the Empson Street SIL 	No change. The sites and areas of search are required to meet the London Plan apportionment.
Protecting and managing our environment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zero carbon standards – not justified 	LBTH recognises that the Written Ministerial Statement in 2015 changed the government's position in relation to zero carbon. It also indicated that the government would be commencing the requirements of the proposed amendments to the

	<p>Planning and Energy Act 2008, as announced in the Deregulation Act 2015. This has yet to occur, and the WMS does not outweigh the development plan. This policy maintains our current policy position and is in line with the GLA's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance and draft London Plan.</p> <p>We have also assessed the viability and deliverability of the zero carbon requirements. This confirms that both the onsite requirements and offsite payments are viable and deliverable. In exceptional circumstances, developments will be able to submit viability information to demonstrate why these standards cannot be met and these will be assessed during the development management process.</p>
Improving connectivity and travel choice	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safeguarded wharves – greater scope to incorporate a broader mix of uses in association with development. The Port of London Authority, however, requests a separate policy to raise the profile of the wharves, facilitate the use of freight and adequately assess the cumulative impacts of future developments. 	<p>No change. We consider that sustainable freight should be covered under a composite policy and that sufficient detail and protection of safeguarded wharves is provided.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further clarification on the scope of the policies and links to relevant supporting evidence including studies and guidance (Transport for London) 	<p>We propose amendments to the plan to address points of clarity and to link the policies to relevant supporting evidence and studies.</p>
Delivering sustainable places	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some respondents argue that some of the requirements relating to site allocations are too onerous and should take more account of viability, site constraints and market conditions. This includes the mix of affordable housing units and the provision of strategic open space and schools. 	<p>We propose minor modifications to the text to take account of discussions with developers and landowners but the general thrust of the site requirements will be retained.</p> <p>Detailed viability work has been undertaken to consider the financial implications arising from the implementation of these policies. This concludes that the site allocations are viable and capable of being delivered (subject to negotiation on the provision of infrastructure and affordable housing at the planning application stage).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New bridges / crossings (e.g. Aspen Way) and newly identified routes should be included as part of the infrastructure requirements 	<p>Developers are not expected to deliver all of the proposed bridges and routes and these matters have been taken into account in the delivery considerations of the relevant site allocations. The majority of these routes have been identified in the plan, as set out in the Green Grid Strategy Update. We are proposing minor modifications to the site allocation maps to reflect the update.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some developers / landowners have proposed boundary changes to the site allocations 	<p>These matters will need to be discussed at the examination in public. However, none of these changes would significantly affect the strategic direction of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The site allocation boundaries are based on existing planning application information or have been carried forward from the existing adopted Managing Development Document. These boundaries may change over the course of the plan period in response to development opportunities. The precise location of these boundaries will be determined at planning application stage.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accuracy of figures and diagrams 	<p>We will make minor amendments to the figures and diagrams, where necessary. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the location of the gasholders at Marian Place gas works and The Oval; the reconfiguration of some of the routes; and clarification on the status of bridges (existing or proposed). <p>We will also make it clear that these figures are for illustrative purposes only and some of the details may be subject to change through the development management process.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site context 	<p>Additional information will be provided regarding the context of a site for the purposes of accuracy and clarification (e.g. Bow Common gasworks will include references to the adjacent conservation area and local nature reserve).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific requirements: Greater flexibility over the delivery of strategic open space and other types of infrastructure 	<p>No change. New strategic open space is required to meet the needs arising from the development as well as help address existing deficiencies across the borough.</p> <p>The Local Plan provides sufficient flexibility to take account of site-specific and local market circumstances over the course of the plan period.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient capacity to accommodate full-sized playing pitches 	<p>New strategic open space will be consolidated to facilitate sport and recreation opportunities within the site allocations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some developers and landowners are objecting to the non-allocation of sites 	<p>No change. The capacity of these sites does not meet the housing threshold of delivering a minimum of 500 units in addition to social infrastructure. As such, none of these are suitable as site allocations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land contamination should be a delivery consideration to ensure that appropriate assessments are carried out prior to development (Environment Agency) 	<p>Minor change – additional wording will be included in the delivery considerations of the relevant site allocations.</p>