

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LVRPA	Fig 1.1 'London context' which does show the Regional Park boundary should be amended to include the full extent of the Park area which continues to the Thames. The boundary is shown correctly in the London Plan – Map 2.8 London's Strategic open space network for example.	1	Introduction	4	Fig 1.1	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	Fig 1.2 refers to the East London context and shows the relationship with Upper Lee Valley, Royal Docks and London Riverside, but these aren't referred to in the text, especially for the wider east London and London-wide benefits and effects they may cumulatively bring about.	1	Introduction	5		Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	Should show industrial land relocated out of the Olympic Park	1	Introduction	6	Fig 1.2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	ET and SHG support the overall purpose of the Document in providing supplementary guidance to the London Plan and that, when adopted, it will be a material consideration which may assume considerably more weight should (1) the document be endorsed by the constituent Boroughs and (2) the prospective Mayoral Development Corporation be established, as proposed, with both plan making and planning decision making powers.	1	Introduction	13		Supporting - No change
LBN	We consider that the first paragraph should be more positively worded to describe this as place where industrial decline and deprivation is being successfully tackled by the massive investment centred around the Olympics and Stratford City and by the building of well connected successful neighbourhoods with healthy thriving communities. It needs to be more definite on the achievement of convergence	1.1	Vision	3		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	Para 2 should highlight how the combination of the Olympic park venues/legacy infrastructure plus the implementation of the development sites in the wider area, revives this place. Para 4 should include reference to Pudding Mill Lane as part of new neighbourhoods lying between Bromley by Bow and the Olympic Stadium. A clear position on the athletic, sporting and entertainment legacy of the Stadium should be set showing that this has benefited people locally in terms of jobs, education, social inclusion, health and the ability to nurture talent and sporting excellence.	1.1	Vision	3		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	The creation of sustainable economic growth driven by Olympic and Legacy developments should be given much greater prominence in the delivery of the 2030 vision.	1.1	Vision	3		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	The final paragraph is lacking in meaning and ambition. Twenty years after the Games, it s one of the best places in London to live and work the best Legacy there could be from 2030. This is not thinking big enough. We suggest an amendment along these lines: In 2030 this area has become a well known and celebrated place in London s story providing the very best that a modern city can offer a lively and exciting place where people want to be because of its uniquely diverse range of work, social and leisure experience	1.1	Vision	3		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	The vision sketches out a broad picture of a series of fully developed, regenerated and successful places in 2030 which is welcomed. However, the vision for the character(s) of the area(s) does not specifically highlight the key priorities that become evident elsewhere in the document and are set out in the boroughs' adopted and emerging Core Strategies. It might be helpful to include the broad key elements that fit with the convergence agenda within the vision itself, including employment and economic development in addition to achieving a significant supply of family housing within the areas overall mix of new housing. For example, the convergence agenda's seven core outcomes set out in section 1.4 could be incorporated into the vision statement itself to give them more prominence and weight.	1.1	Vision	3		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LTGDC	LTGDC support the vision set out in the SPG, and the general thrust of this section.	1.1	Vision	3		Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
BioRegional	We are concerned that the legacy of the Games makes no commitment to continue to follow the commitment (Defray, 2008) to sustainability as an overarching focus, which has been a key part of the vision for the 2012 site since the original 'Towards a One Planet Olympics' brochure, which accompanied London's bid to host the games. With 6,800 homes being built a possible model for the 2012 Olympics Park is to be developed upon the Ecotown design principles which are set out in the Ecotowns PPS addendum and developed in the BioRegional/CABE 'What Makes an Ecotown?' report.	1.1	Vision	3		Accept - Review and amend
Landprop Services	Support	1.1	Vision	3		Supporting - No change
Lend lease	The Vision – We support the twenty year vision timeline and the aspiration to create 'one of the best places in London to live and	1.1	Vision	3		Supporting - No change
RICS	RICS applauds the Vision expressed in this section and the goal of Convergence, as set out in the Strategic Regeneration Framework and endorsed by the Mayor. In launching research, commissioned with University of Westminster, into the way in which London has prepared for Legacy in the preparation for 2012, we would highlight the need for investment, commitment and a clear direction in preparing for integration and the transformation of the Olympic Park and its adjacent neighbourhoods <a href="http://www.rics.org/site/scripts/press_article.aspx?pressreleaseID=640">http://www.rics.org/site/scripts/press_article.aspx?pressreleaseID=640</a>	1.1	Vision	3		Supporting - No change
OPLC	Re -word. The Olympics will have benefits before 2030. So this part can be removed. It should not necessarily be written that it has suffered from an industrial past but that has suffered from the decline of industry. We could say directly after the games there is excellent access to amenity and this will become one of the best places in London to live and work.	1.1	Vision	3		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	We welcome the context this section provides in terms of recognising the public investment and ensuring convergence. Moreover, we support the following statement in Para 3 of that section: a place of choice where people will aspire to live and bring up their families, and where businesses choose to invest because of unrivalled opportunities and some of the best transport links in the capital.	1.2	London's O&POG's Legacy	3		Supporting - No change
RICS	The achievements so far are extensive and align with other initiatives in east London, such as those at Stratford City, but the scale of the transformation needed to roll out Legacy benefit across east London over the next 20 years to achieve Convergence, as set out in the Strategic Regeneration Framework, means that the identification of key priorities and investment decisions now are crucial in order to join up the Olympic Park area and Stratford City with the Royal Docks and N17 Enterprise Zones so that regeneration can spread across east London. RICS supports the overall approach to delivering fundamental economic, social and environmental change in east London (London Plan Policy 2.4) as set out in this very detailed consultation document. We would though highlight the need to focus also on regeneration to the west of the Olympic Park in London Borough of Tower Hamlets as the key connection between Stratford and the City of London where there is considerable deprivation and where investment to improve the public realm and create prosperity would underpin the physical integration of the regeneration achievements in the Olympic Park/Stratford and Canary Wharf area	1.2	London's O&POG's Legacy	3		Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	This paragraph is welcomed, setting the regeneration context for the OLSPG area and particularly in its recognition of the significant	1.2	London's O&POG's Legacy	3		Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	Welcome text that notes Investment and change that has been brought about by the delivery of the infrastructure, permanent venues and parklands associated with the 2012 Games.	1.2	London's O&POG's Legacy	3		Supporting - No change
BioRegional	Concerned that discussions about convergence and inheritance appear to have resulted in a loss of some of the commitments set on in the Olympics to date. From the 2012 bid through the sustainability strategy to LOCOG fit-out the Games continues to follow on the initial commitment to deliver a environmental and a socially sustainable development. We believe that the commitments that the legacy acts as sustainable blueprint for wider development in East London and across the capital should be honoured.	1.2	London's O&POG's Legacy	3		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	Fig 1.1 provides useful context. Lea Valley Park diagram is difficult to see and should be shown more schematically for a drawing of this scale. We would prefer to see the removal of the aerial view background and an outline of the London boroughs.	1.2	London's O&POG's Legacy	4	Fig 1.1	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
RICS	The identification of Metropolitan Stratford in the settlement hierarchy and the ambition to create the scale of housing and commercial development over the next 20 years draws on its existing role as an international and national transport hub and the associated development, as well as retail development. It is well situated within the OLSPG area to provide employment in retail, offices and leisure in particular and has good transport links each of the sub-areas where housing is planned. The consultation rightly highlights the barriers of the River Lea and major trunk roads to connectivity within east London and elsewhere and highlights the vulnerability in this area to disruption to the Blackwall Tunnel approach. We would also highlight the major barrier that the River Thames creates in integrating London's economy and communities, with only two crossings provided in east London via the Blackwall Tunnel and Woolwich Ferry. The case for the proposed east London river crossing is needed now more than ever with the substantial increase that 29 000 new homes, increased employment and an increase of 1.35 m sq m commercial floorspace will create, as well as the	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	The four key themes for delivering the vision, namely, to Create a New Place, Growth and Investment, Metropolitan Stratford, Improved Connectivity seem to expand on elements of the vision. Unfortunately this serves to highlight a lack of structure in the vision and it would be useful to see how these themes derive from it. More crucially delivery must consider timescales/phases, key players and main drivers that will affect how and when things happen. Consideration of the current economic context, present socio-economic factors and environmental and physical constraints need to be properly factored in. Legal mechanisms (e.g. compulsory purchase, planning controls), funding and financing methods, social infrastructure providers (e.g. colleges, universities and health service) programmes need to be referenced. Under Metropolitan Stratford what is meant by rebalancing the capital. Is this another way of saying convergence? Under Improving Connectivity we feel that Stratford High Street (A118) is a major barrier particular in terms of providing coherence to the Southern Olympic Fringe set out later in the document. It should be mentioned here.	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
ODA PDT	To create a new place The focus on creation of a 'new place' is welcomed given the development opportunity provide by an extensive part of the OLSPG area that has the potential to provide a new place or new places, centred on the Olympic Park. This, however, does represent the core OLSPG area, while the wider OLSPG area is a wider mix of diverse existing communities, whether at Hackney Wick, Homerton, Leyton or Chobham/Maryland. It might be appropriate for this section to include wording that recognises this context and the diversity of the places and populations that make up the OLSPG area.	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Growth and investment The focus on economic and housing growth and ensuring that local communities benefit from this change is welcomed and supported.	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	Metropolitan Stratford The highlighting of the move of Stratford towards the status of Metropolitan Centre is welcomed as reflecting the significant change that is taking place in the scale and role of the town centre uses. It would be helpful for the OLSPG to provide some pointers help define when it will be considered that Stratford has reached the status of a Metropolitan Centre.	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Improved connectivity This highlights the need for improved local connectivity and highlights the significant local barrier that is presented by the A12. The recognition in the text here that the Olympic Park project has delivered a range of new physical connections that will improve future local connectivity is welcomed. While the investment in public transport has improved regional connections there remains substantial overcrowding that will also need to be fully overcome.	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		Partial change considered appropriate
BioRegional	We are concerned that the aspects of delivering the vision do not include a focus on environmental sustainability in terms of resource consumption and climate change (as set out in the Olympics sustainability commitments) or for social sustainability, including for the different qualitative and quantitative aspects of social sustainability. We are concerned that these are reflected both in the standards for new homes and commercial development as well as for the overall vision for development of the area. We note that the Context (section 3.2) does not mention environmental sustainability at all as providing a context or focus for the Park's legacy.	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		Partial change considered appropriate
Landprop Services	Support	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Lend lease	Delivering the Vision - As part of the delivery of this vision a clear timetable of success milestones should be agreed with all parties both public and private sector. A flexible framework should be provided and steered by the MDC to ensure these milestones can be achieved and adjusted as the scheme progresses.	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Lend lease	Metropolitan Stratford – Lend Lease views Stratford as the foundation for wider success in the Olympic Legacy area. This area encompasses Stratford old town including the high street, along with Stratford City which includes the Athletes Village, Chobham Academy, Westfield and The International Quarter. The International Quarter aims to provide circa 15,000 end user jobs for Stratford and the wider area. This aspiration aligns with the OLSPG’s aspiration for sustainable development.	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		Supporting - No change
National Federation of Artists Studio Providers	Delivering the Vision: the new place will be surrounded by “old places”. Improved connectivity, growth and investment in the Opportunity Area are all welcome: new opportunities need to build on the cultural, social and financial investment made over the years by a number of longstanding and locally and internationally well-respected arts, cultural and heritage groups. NFASP would particularly drawn your attention to the c1,000 artists studios based in the 5 host boroughs.	1.3	Delivering the Vision	5		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	Fig 1.2 shows far too much boundary detail of opportunity areas they only need to be shown by name and general location. Ilford Town Centre should also be labelled. Again removal of the aerial view background as this presently reduces clarity of the detail. The label Economic driver is not explained and should perhaps be better described as key economic hub/centre	1.3	Delivering the Vision	6	Fig 1.2	Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	Fig 1.3 Deprivation In London there should be a more detailed explanation of this. It should say what the key measures are and what particular problems exist e.g. if crime is an issue what sorts of crimes. A failure to understand these underlying issues means that they cannot be properly appreciated and tackled properly.	1.4	Convergence	7		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	The bid objective the most enduring legacy of the Olympics will be the regeneration of an entire community for the direct benefit of everyone that lives there should be given more visual prominence as it remains as important today as when it was first set out.	1.4	Convergence	7		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	We welcome the recognition of the Strategic Regeneration Framework and support for its 7 Core Outcomes. Final Para should substitute the words The OLSPG cannot make convergence happen, .....much with The OLSPG supports a wider suite of measures	1.4	Convergence	7		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p7] We welcome the restatement in the draft SPG of the Mayor’s commitment to the Strategic Regeneration Framework and its guiding principle of convergence, and are pleased that the document seeks to provide a spatial planning context for this objective. Note that in June 2011 the Host Boroughs agreed a Convergence Draft Action plan as a basis for consultation. This proposes three new themes under which SRF activities would be grouped, streamlined from the original seven outcome areas to which the draft SPG currently refers. The SPG should be revised to reflect these themes, which are: • Creating wealth and reducing poverty • Supporting healthier lifestyles • Developing successful neighbourhoods.	1.4	Convergence	7		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	The reference and linkage to the SRF convergence agenda at this point of the document is welcomed as helping to establish association with the wider context of the host boroughs within which this strategy sits and the role that the OLSPG can play in achieving the convergence outcomes that are sought. However, this section should also take the opportunity to link the overall challenge that the convergence seeks to address to the formal adopted and emerging planning policy produced by the local planning authorities. While Section 1.5 clearly sets out the hierarchy of policy documents, it would be helpful to address the specific policy context that these present, and is understood to be generally reflected in the specific of this draft document. Consider adding additional text to refer to the specific local planning policy context, including the focus of current adopted and emerging Core Strategies and Area Action Plans to this section and the evidence base that has been used to inform these.	1.4	Convergence	7		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
BioRegional	We are concerned that the six core outcomes set out here do not correspond to the original commitment for sustainability of the Olympics site which set out an explicit commitment for environmental sustainability. We also feel it is important here to set out the links to the Mayor of London's climate change strategy and action plan for the capital and commitments for leadership and actions under the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group . We would ask that the OLSPG list the borough documents on which plans are being made. A number of documents are referenced but it is difficult for the reader to cross reference them without clear signposting.	1.4	Convergence	7		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Lend lease	Convergence – Lend Lease supports the principles of convergence and the benefits of a co-ordinated East London action plan would no doubt generate significant benefits. The production of the Strategic Regeneration Framework by the Olympic host boroughs is welcomed, however co-ordination with the other Olympic initiatives is required to achieve maximum effectiveness.	1.4	Convergence	7		Supporting - No change
London Sustainable Development Commission	The LSDC recommends that the next iteration of the SPG includes environmental indicators on design quality; road traffic and air quality; open spaces and biodiversity; and carbon emissions and adaptation to climate change, which would have the highest impact on the health of those living in the area.	1.4	Convergence	7		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Sustainable Development Commission	The LSDC therefore recommends that open space provision should be included in the convergence criteria.	1.4	Convergence	7		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Wildlife Trust	1. Create three tiers of development principles instead of the two that are currently deployed. Below are three suggested headings that can easily be re-worded to convey three tiers: a. Overarching Development Principles b. Supporting Development Principles c. Development Principle Sections.	1.4	Convergence	7		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Wildlife Trust	2. Make sustainability and convergence the two Overarching Development Principles from which all other Supporting Development Principles spring.	1.4	Convergence	7		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Wildlife Trust	5. Add Biodiversity as a Supporting Development Principle giving reference to the Olympic Park Biodiversity Action Plan (or the future "QEOP Legacy BAP" ) within a national, regional and local context. This section can also include the appropriate management of the built environment, parklands and public realm as a means to deliver the BAP's targets for habitats and species.	1.4	Convergence	7		Partial change considered appropriate
National Federation of Artists Studio Providers	Convergence: by some standards, the 5 boroughs surrounding the proposed OLSPG area are ahead of London wide averages. The clusters of artists studios in East London represent a co-location of artistic activity, community and enterprise which has an international reputation, and which is one of the largest, if not the largest such cluster-location in the world. Many individual studios have already made considerable contributions to the neighbourhoods in which they are located (see examples and case studies in Investing In Communities: The provision of affordable artists' studios: A role for Spatial Planning and a wide variety of other NFASP case studies NFASP is clear that this studio grouping of artists studios can help the 5 boroughs in their aspiration to deliver to the 7	1.4	Convergence	7		Supporting - No change
NHS East London and City	In Section 1.4, the ambition of convergence for seven core outcomes is described as follows: 'over the next 20 years, residents in these boroughs will achieve the London average expected in successful communities'. This needs further explication as it is not clear what indices this ambition relates to.	1.4	Convergence	7		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
NHS East London and City	Convergence We welcome the clear strategic focus on convergence. However we are concerned that the treatment of the strategic goal of convergence by requiring a separate statement on convergence in large planning applications may be misunderstood and limit the scope of what developers understand as being important in achieving this goal. We welcome the development of further guidance on how this principle can be met. However the convergence outcomes, indicators and targets should be built into the planning application assessment process. Any additional statement within the application should contribute to this assessment by identifying the full range of contributing factors within the application.	1.4	Convergence	7		Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
RICS	The boundaries of the OLSPG area and planning powers support the aims of Convergence in addressing the scale of social deprivation in this area of east London and in providing the spatial context to roll out change in the Host Boroughs and beyond to begin the process of regeneration across east London. What is rightly not covered by this consultation, but what will be essential in delivering its goals, is an overview of the initiatives surrounding the OLSPG area where these will need to be joined up with delivery in the area, and where consistency of approach is needed. The LDFs of the Host Boroughs in particular, as well as in the Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework (LLV OAPF 2007) are relevant and will be essential in the drive further integrate the Olympic Legacy in regeneration more widely and to align efforts. The approach to the selective release of industrial land to provide the substantial housing planned is a core element of the approach, and balancing this with the need to meet, the growth in local employment	1.4	Convergence	7		Supporting - No change
OPLC	How will the OLSPG encourage Convergence? Convergence outcomes are referred to throughout but not defined or signposted.	1.4	Convergence	7		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	This section is far too detailed. It should say what the purpose is in one paragraph rather than several speculating as to what its status may or may not be. It is not a Framework for Local Development Plans it is detailed supplementary guidance to the London Plan.	1.5	Purpose of the Guidance	9		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBTH	· [p9] We note “the Mayor’s intention to achieve a consensus with the four affected boroughs about how the OLSPG can be best articulated and delivered”, and the aspiration for the boroughs and the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation to endorse the final document. As we note above, we generally share the Mayor’s vision for the area as set out in the OLSPG, and would expect to be able to pursue such an endorsement subject to resolution of the issues set out in this consultation response.	1.5	Purpose of the Guidance	9		Supporting - No change
LBH	Question the status and weight of the OLSPG as depicted in paragraphs 7 and 8 of this section. It is recommended that the GLA seek Legal advice is to clarify the status and weight of the document in relation to the Boroughs Local Development Plan documents.	1.5	Purpose of the Guidance	9		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	The role of the OLSPG as guidance supplementing and applying London Plan policy to the area in question is noted and the intention that the document in its final form will represent a consensus between the Mayor and the four boroughs is welcomed. It is noted that while this section makes reference to a “Strategic Environmental Assessment” and “Equalities Impact Assessment”. Whilst an ‘Integrated Impact Assessment Scoping Report’ was produced in the early stages of OLSPG preparation process, no assessment document accompanies this consultation. Should this assessment not be produced alongside the OLSPG then this is likely to impact on the weight that can be given to the final document when making planning decisions. It may be helpful to clarify whether an assessment will be produced or whether it this is seen as being more appropriate to the formal development plan making processes of the boroughs and prospectively, the proposed Mayoral Development Corporation. Consider providing clarity on whether, given the preparation of an Integrated Impact Assessment Scoping document, it is intended to produce an Integrated Impact Assessment, or a Stra	1.5	Purpose of the Guidance	9		Partial change considered appropriate
Avivia	Want formal consultation if MDC boundary to be changed	1.5	Purpose of the Guidance	9		General comment - No change
BioRegional	We have doubts that the expressed purpose to 'maximise investment and economic areas', without any explicit reference or focus on environmental sustainability or social sustainability , except integrating this development into the surrounding areas, is likely to deliver the sustainability legacy that the 2012 games has always promised.	1.5	Purpose of the Guidance	9		Accept - Review and amend
National Federation of Artists Studio Providers	Purpose: NFASP’s recent and widely welcomed booklet for planners title sets out how planners, private and third sector bodies and development agencies have successfully enabled new artists workspace to be developed and existing workspace to be strengthened and retained. NFASP commends this advice to be built strategically and practically into the OLSPG.	1.5	Purpose of the Guidance	9		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
RICS	The purpose of the OLSPG is clear in providing a framework below the guidance in the London Plan to provide a strategic focus for Borough LDFs in east London to support the work and decisions of the Host Boroughs, investors and other bodies and for this guidance to shape development and planning decisions as a material consideration. The Delivery Study that sets out OLSPG area infrastructure needs is an essential component of regenerating east London to redress the historic under-investment from which the area has suffered for many years. As Supplementary Guidance to the London Plan the OLSPG will have considerable significance. There is some complexity in planning guidance in London, especially with the introduction of Neighbourhood Plans that will, as part of the Borough LDFs, have statutory status. The relationship of the OLSPG and other Supplementary Guidance to the emerging National Planning Policy Framework may create some unforeseen consequences as both neighbourhoods and local business identify their priorities for the future and its significance in the planning hierarchy becomes clear. This document is though a very detailed assessment	1.5	Purpose of the Guidance	9		General comment - No change
LBH	This diagram may need to be further refined based on the legal advice requested to clarify the legal status and weight of the OLSPG.	1.5	Purpose of the Guidance	10		Partial change considered appropriate
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	ET and SHG support the Spatial Strategy set out in Section Two, particularly the need for a long term vision for the area; for a planned approach to regeneration and change as well as the promotion of the further managed release of appropriate industrial sites.	2	Spatial Strategy	13		Supporting - No change
LBH	The area of change that has been mapped around Hackney Wick Station should reflect the boundaries of the Other Industrial Area as per the Council's Core Strategy and therefore be extended further west. The OLSPG also identifies the managed transition of the small triangle of SIL west of the station on Figure 2.B.3 however does not indicate on any figure what this land will be released to. Council intends to amend the Core Strategy Proposals Map to remove this portion of land from SIL and include this as part of the OIA designation which will permit employment led mixed use development. It is therefore recommended that this triangle also mapped as an Area of Change.	2	DP Introduction Maps	14	Fig 2.2.1	Accept - Review and amend
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	On Figure 2.2.1 Leyton Orient Football Club's Brisbane Road Stadium is shown with a green wash. This suggests that the Stadium is an area of open space. The stadium is not an area of open space and this green wash should therefore be removed. The stadium is a developed mixed use site.	2	DP Introduction Maps	14	Fig 2.2.1	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	This should show Stratford High Street (A118) as this is a key Legacy issue - as it how it is treated will play a significant role in the interrelationship of sites developing out from the Stadium site towards Bromley by Bow.	2	DP Introduction Maps	15	Fig 2.2.2	Accept - Review and amend
LBH	It is unclear what Industrial land use designations are mapped in figure 2.2.2 - it is questioned if 'Industrial' includes both existing SIL and OIA as some but not all OIA has been mapped for instance i.e. the land around MUSV is OIA as per the Council's Core Strategy however has not been identified?	2	DP Introduction Maps	15	Fig 2.2.2	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	Labelling is incorrect. Highspeed 1? Should be CTRL and blue.	2	DP Introduction Maps	15	Fig 2.2.2	Accept - Review and amend
LBN	Fig 2.2.3 Again show Stratford High Street clearly. We strongly recommend that the OLSPG is consistent with Newham Core Strategy Stratford and West Ham Spatial Diagram which shows Strategic Sites and key route parallels where connections should be developed see: <a href="http://newhamconsult.limehouse.co.uk/events/14029/images/highresRGB/1923851_0_1.pdf">http://newhamconsult.limehouse.co.uk/events/14029/images/highresRGB/1923851_0_1.pdf</a> . The red arrows on this plan are of unclear meaning and should be substituted for key connections. It should show a highway hierarchy which may helpful in defining principal legacy routes that should be reflected on the key diagram. It seems odd having already provided a London and East London context diagram to still be showing high level transport links and none of the key local rail and bus connections.	2	DP Introduction Maps	16	Fig 2.2.3	Partial change considered appropriate
LVRPA	It would be helpful if this relationship could be shown graphically on the 'Future Key Diagram' Fig 2.2.3 by adding the Regional Park boundary.	2	DP Introduction Maps	16	Fig 2.2.3	Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	If this proposed connection includes a new bridge crossing, BW would be keen to see more details as soon as possible.	2	DP Introduction Maps	16	fig 2.2.3	General comment - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	The 'Future Key Diagram' at Figure 2.2.3 is supported, particularly the identification of key industrial land areas to be retained for employment use and the removal of the Industrial Land designation from sites such as at Bromley-by-Bow, which are appropriate for release to allow for their regeneration for residential and mixed use development	2	DP Introduction Maps	16	fig 2.2.3	Supporting - No change
OPLC	Canning Town and it's connection with Metropolitan Stratford should be shown.	2	DP Introduction Maps	16	Fig 2.2.3	Accept - Review and amend
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	2.4 Overarching development principles This section needs to also promote new business, training and employment within the Northern Fringe Area. Leyton Orient Football Club provides opportunities for this through both its existing club facilities, the existing commercial business space within the stadium site, and through future commercial business space realised through development of the stadium. The overarching development principles need to be used for the promotion of sustainable development within the Northern Fringe Area. This includes the promotion of mixed use development that maximises the use of previously developed land and provides for a variety of needs within a single development. Mixed use development can provide homes and jobs as well as accommodation for growing local businesses.	2	DP's	17		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	5th bullet should say social, community and cultural.	2.1	DP Introduction	13		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Welcome the aim to secure "a quality of development that matches or exceeds that achieved elsewhere in the capital" but could perhaps increase this focus by seeking to secure a quality of development that matches the best achieved elsewhere. Revise sentence to read: "a quality of development that matches or exceeds the best that has been achieved elsewhere in the capital".	2.1	DP Introduction	13		Accept - Review and amend
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	The Spatial Strategy set out at Paragraph 2.2 is supported with the proposed new urban structure and the identification on Figure 2.2.1 of the main strategic development opportunities as 'Areas of Change', particularly the new District Centre at Bromley-by-Bow together with the land to the north.	2.2	The spatial strategy	13	Fig 2.2.1	Supporting - No change
BioRegional	We are not clear from the current approach what checks and balances are in place to ensure that regeneration of the OLSPG area does not negatively impact upon other areas – to ensure that there is convergence of sustainability of communities across the Capital and into Kent and Essex, as well as leadership on developing in a sustainable manner, to the benefit rather than at the expense of, other locations.	2.2	The spatial strategy	13		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
BioRegional	We are concerned that the protection of Open Spaces includes all areas that currently designated as urban open land and that the development of industrial areas that are derelict includes reference to previous transport and biodiversity corridors so that the physical development attends due regard to transport mobility (motorised and non-motorised) and is supported by a green infrastructure strategy and action plan.	2.2	The spatial strategy	13		Partial change considered appropriate
BioRegional	We agree with the commitment set out to avoid 'unacceptable impacts on the environment' but feel that this needs to be clearly defined to ensure that development is within environmental resource limits (as measured using ecological foot printing methodology or similar) and therefore has reduced embodied and operational carbon emissions so that both the development process and future in-use community and business CO2 emissions enable London's carbon footprint to reduce, rather than continue to rise.	2.2	The spatial strategy	13		Partial change considered appropriate
Landprop Services	include Sugar house lane.	2.2	The spatial strategy	13		Accept - Review and amend



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
RICS	The aims of the guidance are clearly set out in developing communities in east London and in bringing new infrastructure and employment opportunities. The settlement hierarchy means that Stratford and the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park will be central to the network and green links that radiate to the surrounding District and local centres and Stratford is well located as the major transport hub in east London with strategic links to the UK and beyond.	2.2	The spatial strategy	13		Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	This section and Figure 2.2.1 are helpful in identifying the scale and focus of the opportunities for change in the OLSPG area. In making reference to the applicability of the guidance to the other sites and locations that are not 'areas of change' within the guidance it would be helpful to recognise the differences in scale and type of opportunity that these represent for change. Suggest final sentence is amended to read: "The development principles that the Guidance sets out should be applied to the whole of the OLSPG area as well as each 'area of change', recognising the differences in scale and type of opportunity in each place, in order to maximise the regeneration benefits of the 2012 Games".	2.3	Key areas of change	13		Accept - Review and amend
RICS	The 200 hectares chosen as areas of change are concentrated in the area surrounding Stratford and to the north east in the Leyton area, close to neighbourhoods where most new housing is to be delivered and within the central area itself, with relatively little to the west, where this might help integrate regeneration with wider neighbourhoods in Tower Hamlets.	2.3	Key areas of change	13		General comment - No change
Neptune Group	We support the identification of Fish Island as an area of change	2.3	Key areas of change	14	Fig 2.2.1	Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	The intention behind the six development principles "to make all of East London a place where people will choose to settle and stay ..." is welcomed and supported.	2.4	Overarching development principles	13		Supporting - No change
LBN	We welcome the inclusion of Convergence as a development principle. This provides a useful focus for the development of work around the CIL and also for developers and partners to consider in drawing up schemes that reflect genuine local aspirations and objectives. Overall we would wish to ensure that that the area is dealt with in a comprehensive manner to have the best opportunity to create mixed and balanced communities. There is a large amount of housing proposed and it must come forward underpinned by the right quality and quantity of infrastructure. The SPG should make a general point about comprehensive development and dissuade piecemeal development.	2.4	Overarching development principles	17		General comment - No change
LBH	This Guidance promotes around 29,000 new homes, which in turn will increase the area's population by around 60,000 people. The Learning Trust would like to ensure that the child yield estimates are calculated correctly and are not too conservative. Their understanding is that social housing will be allocated to families on the basis of 1-2 adults per one bedroom and 2 children to one bedroom. A 5 bedroom home would thus be inhabited by 7-8 children (depending on genders); a 4 bedroom home would have capacity for 1-2 adults and 5-6 children.	2.4	Overarching development principles	17		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	It is recommended that the population estimates are double checked to ensure that the education provision that is planned does not end up being insufficient.	2.4	Overarching development principles	17		Accept - Review and amend
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	The overarching Development Principles set out at Paragraph 2.4 are supported in general terms. Whilst the importance of 'convergence' is recognised and the 'outcomes' set out in Appendix 1 are highly relevant and laudable, they are also very general and, in the context of specific applications fairly nebulous. Without more detailed guidance on this matter (which is not advocated), Statements setting out how schemes over 100 units will help achieve such outcomes are likely to be equally generalised. Accordingly, the extent to which the preparation of such Statements should be a requirement of the SPG and the benefits to be derived from such a statement is questionable.	2.4	Overarching development principles	17		Partial change considered appropriate
Inclusive London	Inclusion London recommends a seventh overarching development principle is added under 'Accessible development', stating that the development of the Olympic/Paralympic boroughs and surrounding areas should be accessible and inclusive to all Londoners, including disabled people. This principle should be at the core of the whole development. Reference to the details in the Appendix 3 could be made under this principle. 'Sustainable development' is a development principle, so is disappointing that there is no mention of the importance of accessible development in this section.	2.4	Overarching development principles	17		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Lend lease	Overarching Development Principles – We agree with the six principles as detailed and would suggest that further coordination and cooperation between public bodies would aid their delivery. We would also support increased emphasis on education, from primary through to tertiary and engagement with these bodies.	2.4	Overarching development principles	17		General comment - No change
London Wildlife Trust	Whilst convergence as a guiding principle is at the core of the OLSPG, we strongly recommend the Mayor to include sustainability as a second and equal guiding principle underpinning the vision of the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park (the Park).	2.4	Overarching development principles	17		Partial change considered appropriate
RICS	The overall aim of bringing sustainable prosperity and a thriving economy to east London, supported by access to transport, well designed housing and high quality design is a positive focus. In east London local transport connections will be essential to counter the under-investment of the past and to overcome the physical barriers in the area. This will be a priority where major new housing development is planned. Investment will be crucial in delivering the planned improvement and this will be challenging in the current economic climate. RICS would emphasise that the role of the development industry in delivery is a crucial one and that it is essential that the framework prioritises viability for developers to underpin actual achievement. It is essential therefore that costs to developers, whether those sought through s106 or via CIL contributions are set at a realistic level, bearing in mind the need for remediation in much of the post-industrial landscape and impact on values of changes in the property market and wider economy.	2.4	Overarching development principles	17		General comment - No change
RICS	When applying the statement set out under Convergence (Section F) the need for viability must be borne in mind to promote rather than inhibit development. The introduction of the London-wide CIL and potentially others in the pipeline should be borne in mind in terms of viability of development. Guidance on viability from RICS is currently in draft and due for publication shortly and takes into account the cumulative impact of various CIL charging and s106. The need for infrastructure should not render development non-viable.	2.4	Overarching development principles	17		General comment - No change
RICS	RICS is though committed to embed high design in urban form and recognises the role that this plays in overall sustainable development. Our recent member guidance on green infrastructure <a href="http://www.rics.org/site/scripts/news_article.aspx?newsID=2261">http://www.rics.org/site/scripts/news_article.aspx?newsID=2261</a> illustrates the significant role this plays in shaping urban communities and delivering across the range of social and economic priorities, making neighbourhoods and centres attractive places for residents and for business in delivering Convergence	2.4	Overarching development principles	17		General comment - No change
BioRegional	Systems Thinking: The OLSPG approach contrasts with the overarching focus on sustainability that has framed the development of the London 2012 games up to this point. We are concerned that by presenting sustainable development alongside other topics in silos it fails to encourage innovation for positive sustainable outcomes. For example, - As this OLSPG is considered to take precedence over local LDF for planning decisions within its area, we would expect to see a clear vision that links sustainable resource use and ecological limits (a wider scope for Principal E) to delivering truly sustainable communities (a wider scope for Principal A) that includes both references/relates to improving the existing built environment as well as setting high standards for new build; - With regard to A – the need for new homes should be balanced against overall ecological footprint and carbon footprint of London to ensure that the development minimises upfront 'embodied carbon' emissions; - With regard to B – mixed use developments are a focus to minimise the need for transport; - With regard to C – sustainability of transport should have targets; - With regard to D – the higher energy use for tall	2.4	Sustainable development	17		Partial change considered appropriate
OPLC	E. sustainable development – it is unrealistic to expect 'exemplar' standards from development without questioning the viability of achieving this.	2.4	Overarching development principles	18		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Lend lease	Stratford – We fully support further strengthening of connections to key commercial locations. The designation of Stratford as a zone2/3 station would have substantial benefits and attractions for businesses especially those looking to relocate from more central London office space.	3	The Sub-areas	33		Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
NHS East London and City	Sub-areas and health infrastructure requirements A more comprehensive assessment of health infrastructure requirements and costs is needed taking account of the phasing of new housing and population and opportunities for new healthcare facilities. A consistent approach should be taken to secure health contributions from borough s106/CILs, the LTGDC s106 Tariff and a future Mayoral Development Corporation CIL.	3	Sub-areas	51		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	We consider the split of the sub areas is sensible in setting out key themes for those areas. The basic residential figures seem fine over a 20 year period in terms of capacity. In relation to employment land the figures seem large and whilst we are supportive we are unclear where this level of investment will come from particularly in the peripheral areas	3.1	The Sub-areas	51		Supporting - No change
LBWF	Page 51, 3rd paragraph line 8 should be amended to ensure consistency between the NOF AAP and the OLSPG. Line 8 should read, "... located within Waltham Forest and contains an interesting mix of light industry, open spaces and Victorian residential properties. In many parts, there is an industrial legacy with a combination of historic features, a diverse range of light industrial and employment premises".	3.1	The Sub-areas	51		Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	3.1 The Sub-areas We are pleased that the waterways are encapsulated within the OLSPG and not used as boundaries (although the Lee Navigation does form the boundary to the north west of the area). The design of waterside development should start with the water at the centre, so that its environment becomes fully integrated and is not just seen as a setting or backdrop.	3.1	The Sub-areas	51		Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	The sub-area section is welcomed as an appropriate format for providing a spatial focus to the document. In some parts of this section, particularly in the 'Scale of Change' boxes for each area, there is a need for consistency in approach to the way in which the development capacity and social infrastructure figures are expressed, with the use of "around" and "up to". It is suggested that all should refer to "around", so that for example, the number of school entry forms or GP's are not seen as a maximum when more detailed infrastructure planning and delivery is carried out.	3.1	The Sub-areas	51		Accept - Review and amend
RICS	The proposals for each of the Sub-areas are clear and each is described distinctly, with housing numbers and related employment floorspace supporting the case for place-shaping in each case. Two possible weaknesses are the lack of local transport to the north as it connects both with in the OLSPG area and beyond and the need to integrate Fish Island/Hackney Wick through Tower Hamlets to meet the City (Figure 3.1.2 Sub-area visions)	3.1	The Sub-areas	51		Partial change considered appropriate
English Heritage	Sub-areas: It would be useful for the any locally identified views and sightlines to be shown within the sub-areas to promote their protection. Views have clear urban design benefits, for example, for local distinctiveness and orientation, while some, such as those created by the Lea Navigation Canal, are the product of historic design and should be protected for their historic significance.	3.1	The Sub-areas	51		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace supports the vision and housing and employment floorspace requirement for the Southern Olympic Fringe as cited in Figure 3.1.2. Workspace supports the vision and housing and employment floorspace requirement for the Stratford area as cited in Figure 3.1.2.	3.1	The Sub-areas	52	fig 3.1.2	Supporting - No change
OPLC	The current proposals and procurement situation for the stadium have changed. Add 'some of' to the beginning of the last paragraph.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	53	Context	Accept - Review and amend
LBN	We are generally supportive of the proposals relating to the Olympic Park. We are particularly interested in how the 102 hectares would be provided bearing in mind the recent changes proposed by the Legacy Communities Scheme. It is most unfortunate that the Legacy Communities Scheme as submitted leaves out key area of the Stadium and its surrounds. The economic future of the venues needs to be updated on page 53. It is important the question of total open space is fully addressed as part of the main application and that this SPG makes that a requirement.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	53		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Leyton Orient FC (URS)	In our opinion the Eton Manor venues must be supplemented by private sector investment that will have the potential to generate significant income in the long term. This should take the form of a new community stadium venue for Leyton. It can provide new high quality spectator accommodation not only for Leyton Orient Football Club, but potentially other users; rugby perhaps. The stadium can be designed to include space for associated retail and commercial activities, leisure and sports/medical. All of which will help to generate the necessary investment and income to ensure long term viability with minimal demands on public funds.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	53		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	This section indicates that development platforms are likely to be brought forward over a 20 year timeframe. It states, an Interim Use Strategy should be developed by the OPLC to avoid large areas of the park lying dormant over this period. We fully support this and think it should be stated more clearly in the Strategic Chapter (Section 2)	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	53		Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	The overall vision and context is welcomed and supported. The number of residential units identified, if assumed to include potential capacity for development immediately to the south of the Stadium, would appear to be broadly consistent with the numbers proposed for the Zones around the Aquatics Centre and southern part of the Games time concourse, within the OPLC Legacy Communities development proposals. However, the final form and uses of the Stadium will help to define the appropriateness of the development type and form on the area immediately to the south of it. Change the indication for the development platform to the south of the Aquatics Centre to 'Mixed Use' to reflect the appropriateness of a diverse development mix in this location which is dominated by the Aquatics Centre, utilities buildings, roads and rail infrastructure.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	53		Accept - Review and amend
LVRPA	New connections and bridges will make the Park accessible to those who live and work across the OLSPG area, linking new and rejuvenated communities, its waterways and open spaces will be a key element of the wider network of open spaces that form part of the Lee Valley Regional Park and follow the River Lea from the Thames in the south to Hertfordshire and Essex in the North.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	53		Accept - Review and amend
RICS	The future use of the Stadium and other facilities will be key to the success of this Sub-area as a focus for much of the activity in the wider area. The IAC in 2017 may delay the roll-out of transformation and future use, though this should become clear in the coming months. Both the Aquatic Centre and Velodrome will be part of the sporting legacy in the area and future use ought to be affordable to local people, as should the new sport complex at Eton Manor. The Park does seem to have good connectivity via the new bridges to the wider communities in the area and is well supported generally with strategic transport links. It is positive that new family housing at Old Ford and Hackney Wick/Fish Island will be close to the amenities in the Park. The potential new housing and mixed use development to the south and east of the IBC/MDC may be useful in meeting need, but should be well supported by employment land provision. The first phase of development between 2012 and 2014 may need to be extended to allow for the IAC 2017. The interim use strategy proposed should be helpful in avoiding large areas of the Park being dormant and may be helpful in rolling out the sporting	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	53		Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	3.2 Olympic Park While we accept that this sub-area includes only the River Lea, Old River Lea, Waterworks River and City Mill River, the valuable remediation work undertaken by the ODA in preparing this area for the Games and its long-term regeneration, has re-opened the Park's waterway connections with the River Lee Navigation and the Hertford Union Canal, towards the City and the Regent's Canal, and to west London beyond. The Vision describes only the linear north-south connections of the River Lea.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	53		Accept - Review and amend
LBTH	• [p53-54] The text refers to "four main development opportunities... within the Olympic Park sub-area", but their locations are not clear from the plan on p54.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	54	Fig 3.2.1	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	Gateways do not demonstrate any hierarchy and in some cases are arbitrary. It would useful to know what the plan is trying achieve.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	54	Fig 3.2.1	Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	As per the comments above made on Figure 2.2.1 OLSPG Areas of Change in relation to reflecting the OIA designation as per the Council's Core Strategy / including the small triangle of SIL.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	54	Fig 3.2.1	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
OPLC	The OPLC has of course now submitted a planning application for housing and mixed use to the south and east of the press and media centres.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	55		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Business and Employment This section is supported. It may also be worth highlighting that temporary uses should not compromise the overall environmental, social or economic impacts of the wider legacy scheme as a whole.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	55		Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	Business and employment The rejuvenated waterways are an asset and resource to the existing and future communities around the Olympic Park, as well as a draw for tourism, education and recreation. The document should therefore emphasise the potential for utilising the waterways for business and employment opportunities.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	55		Accept - Review and amend
LBTH	• [p55-56] Note also our comments above (under Homes and communities, p22) regarding OPLC's current proposals for the area to the south of the Olympic Stadium, and the implications for the delivery of new homes within the Olympic Park sub-area. Our understanding is that of the total 3,100 units anticipated for this sub-area, up to 1,000 units might be located in the area that is proposed to be occupied by the athletics warm-up track.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	56	Fig 3.2.2	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	It should also be noted that the proposed uses for the area to the south of the Aquatics Centre includes a mix of commercial, hotel and student accommodation floor space in addition to some residential and so should be indicated as 'mixed use' within Figure 3.2.2. This can perhaps be seen as more appropriate given the corridor of roads and utilities in close proximity to two side of this relatively small area.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	56	Fig 3.2.2	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Connectivity and Transport The approach is supported but the proposed new pedestrian and cycle links to the north-east and south-west will have high costs and be difficult to achieve satisfactorily with uncertain benefits and need careful analysis to establish feasibility.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	57		Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	Connectivity and transport Fig. 3.2.3 Olympic Park key local connections aerial view As mentioned above, the path on the western side of Stadium Island, and across bridge E35 (the green 'heritage' bridge) is not indicated, or that along Waterworks River (the Olympic Gardens). The connections between the towpath and bridges should be maintained/installed after the temporary bridges are removed, after the Games phase. Not all bridges have stepped connections to the towpaths, making access difficult.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	57	Fig 3.2.3	Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	Fig 3.2.4 Olympic Park key local connections A number of additional bridges are indicated on this plan, that we have not been made aware of previously, or consider are required. We would wish to discuss this further if these are proposed.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	58	Fig 3.2.4	Partial change considered appropriate
OPLC	Question the value of the identifying the temporary connections which only exist to support the Games. It is very clear what the immediate post games legacy will be through the Post Games Transformation planning permissions. The plan would then be less confusing. Also some of those connections shown as permanent are temporary for Games.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	58	Fig 3.2.4	Partial change considered appropriate
Land Use Consultants	Potential affects as a result of proposals for this sub-area would be addressed through the inclusion of the new Development Principle(s) and implementation of recommended changes to Development Principles C1 and D.	3.2	Olympic Park	59	Urban Form	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Development Principles – Homes and Communities (page 59). It is noted that this section includes reference to the residential terrace included within the OPLC LCS planning application that would encroach into the legacy parklands of the Olympic Park that currently have planning permission. Although the paragraphs here do reference the need for careful assessment of any such proposal, the inclusion of this wording does not appear to add anything to the guidance that the document provides and indeed is not identified in any adopted formal planning policy either in the London Plan or London Borough of Hackney Core Strategy. This cannot, therefore be seen as further guidance to the London Plan or reference to existing policy and so should be removed. The specific planning application proposal will require assessment of this element on the merits of the scheme, any specific effects or impacts on existing planning permissions and related planning conditions and planning obligations, and on current adopted planning policy. Amend the second paragraph to remove reference to the "terrace of housing" so that the sentence reads: "The Mayor and the OPLC are considering	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	59		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
ODA PDT	Urban Form Reference here to the existing requirement to achieve a minimum of 102ha of publicly accessible open space capable of designation as Metropolitan Open Land is welcomed and supported as a key commitment for the Olympic Park that should be carried forward within any future development scenario. As for the above comment, reference to the proposed terrace adjacent to the IBC that encroaches into the permitted main parkland is considered inappropriate and should be removed from the document. Development heights indicated in Figure 3.2.5 are seen as generally appropriate. However, this is not specifically the case for the area to the north West of Aquatics and between Stratford City and the Water Works River. The indication that development can rise above 11 storeys is not necessarily a form that would compliment development adjacent at Stratford City (the text refers to 'up to 10 storeys' while Figure 3.2.5 appears to indicate 11 storeys+). A form that indicates 4-6 storeys along waterworks River Frontage and 7-10 storeys away from	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	59		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Equally, caution should be exercised in identifying a band of very high development immediately to the south of the Stadium as the final form of any development (if any here) will need to specifically relate to the final form and use of the legacy stadium.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	59		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Sustainable Development This section is welcomed and supported.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	59		Supporting - No change
LVRPA	The OLSPG refers to the proposal to locate a terrace of housing adjacent to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park east of Waterden Road. The Authority shares the concern expressed (page 59, 4th paragraph) that the design and amenity implications of this proposal, "would require very careful assessment, as would its impact on the quantum and quality of open space within the new Park..." as required by the 2007 Olympic planning approval. The Authority will be raising a similar point as part of its response to the Legacy Communities Scheme outline application, given that the design of this northern part of the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park was always considered to have a character focused on biodiversity in contrast to the southern part of the Park. There needs to be consistency on this point.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	59		Partial change considered appropriate
OPLC	While the LCS and Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park will aim to achieve as high sustainability as possible over time to expect it to be 'exemplary' is unreasonable until full technical analysis, other convergence demands on the scheme and overall viability is considered.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	59		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Bywaters	Fig. 3.2.4 - Olympic Park key local connections acknowledges Ruckholt and Gateway Road as key missing local connections. "Bywaters" would suggest that the GLA consider the benefits of a fundamental reconfiguration of this junction and the allotment sites flanking Ruckholt Road, creating a far better use of these underutilised sites and over-engineered routes, enabling the design and delivery of urban streets threaded with considered landscape and populated with new homes and social, recreational, educational and commercial facilities. This approach will also enable "Bywaters" and other landowners to bring forward their sites for redevelopment in a more comprehensive manner ensuing that the resulting urban development is well connected into the immediate and wider context.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	59	Fig 3.2.4	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	Regarding Urban Form the document talks about the northern area being informally laid out and the southern areas less so. It then goes on to state Opportunities will exist for appropriately designed taller buildings to frame and overlook the park, though smaller and more intimate frontages and settings should also be created. We have some concerns about how effective this guidance is as it does not say in what circumstances the variations should occur. The Legacy Community Scheme is showing buildings on the edge of the park on the Northern Newham side (PDZ6) being 29-32 m high and with a clear formal edge. Its design code recommends that the height adjacent to the park ranges between 13m and 17m. OLSPG fig 3.2.5 indicates between 2 and 6 storeys. We feel that clear expectations are needed so that we do not end up with uncoordinated and poorly planned developments around the park.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	60	Fig 3.2.5	Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	Appendix A is a figure from the updated Hackney Wick Area Action Plan (AAP). This figure identifies the movement network of streets includes main streets, quiet secondary roads and shared surface areas. It is recommended that this detail is reflected on Figures 3.2.4 and 3.5.3 Hackney Wick / Fish Island key local connections.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	60	Fig 3.2.4	Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	For Figure 3.2.5, consider revising the guide to building heights for the development area to the north west of the Aquatics Centre to 7-10 storeys, while indicating the potential for higher elements.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	60		Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LVRPA	It would be helpful if the Regional Park was identified on Fig. 3.2.5. 'Olympic park urban form'.	3.2	Olympic Park Sub-area	60	Fig 3.2.5	Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Scale of Change The reference to "4,000 new homes from the converted Athletes' village" is incorrect. The Stratford capacity figures should be checked to ensure that they are consistent with these figures. The currently approved Stratford City Site Wide Housing Strategy proposes that within zones 3,4 and 5 there will be 4211 dwellings (including 2818 units resulting from conversion of the built Athletes Village accommodation). Elsewhere there will be an additional 1558 units (made up of 334 in Zone 2 and 1224 in Zone 1). N24 in Zone 3 also has approval for 248 units. The resultant overall total for Stratford City (including the Athletes Village is thus 6,007units).This figure does not include any additional units that would result from completion of the s73 application to change hotel floorspace into residential units – which would be an additional 685 units).	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	61		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	The housing area to the north of the Athlete's village has been identified as having an indicative capacity of 960 Units within the initial OPLC LCS Masterplan proposals. The Stratford capacity figures should be checked to ensure that they are consistent with these figures.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	61		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	The current Stratford City outline planning permission allows for a further 86,000 sq.m of hotel space (in addition to that already built in Zone 1). Additionally the full planning permission for plot N24 permits 12,689 sq.m of hotel development. The outstanding total is therefore 98,689 sq.m. However, the s73 application (when completed) will result in a reduction of hotel floorspace to 25,528sq.m. With N24 the total amount of outstanding hotel floorspace would thus be 38,217 sq.m. If the already built Zone 1 hotels (34,794 sq.m) are added back in the amount of hotel floorspace overall is 76,000sq.m. For commercial floorspace the SC outline pp permits 465,000 sq.m in total. Check and if necessary amend capacity figures to reflect that permitted.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	61	Scale of Change box	Accept - Review and amend
TFL	New wording: "... bus facilities at the new regional station".	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	61	Para 2	Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	Context Connections to the Park and its waterways are also important from the Stratford sub area.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	61		Partial change considered appropriate
RICS	The scale of change and the identity of Stratford as a Metropolitan Centre in the settlement hierarchy is thoroughly described in this section. Stratford's strategic transport links will support in-commuting to the substantial total of around 200 000 m sq employment floorspace. Improvements to the public realm should be a priority in place shaping to allow Stratford to fulfil its true potential. Newham Borough Council have well developed plans to deliver both housing and employment, with the emphasis on growing mixed communities to reduce churn and promote stability with a locally appropriate mix of housing types and tenures, with the aim of making this a successful and prosperous part of east London. There is scope to improve local transport access north of Stratford City. Stratford is the most appropriate location for tall buildings and seems ideal for the Cycle Superhighway proposed. See earlier comment on urban intensification in Transport Development Areas.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	61		Supporting - No change
Stratford Centre/CEPF Chariot SARL (Quod)	It is recognised that some retail development can assist with place making and support the very localised needs of new residents at the Olympic Park. The potential for ancillary retail development is recognised in national planning policy (Policy EC14.2 of PPS4). However, the OLSPG must be clear that any more than ancillary retail development can only be accommodated in designated town centres. As currently drafted the OLSPG is silent about the quantum of retail development that would be acceptable, with the 'Scale of Change' boxes for each sub area in Section 3 ignoring retail uses completely. Given the regeneration imperative for existing parts of Stratford Town Centre this is considered to be a significant oversight and potentially inconsistent with Policy EC5 of PPS4 which requires local planning authorities to define the scale of retail and town centre uses in plans with first priority given to designated town centres. In our view each box relating to areas beyond defined town centre should make it clear that only limited ancillary retail uses are acceptable.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	61	Scale of Change box	Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBN	We consider as indicated above that it should not be automatically accepted that Stratford will become a Metropolitan Centre although it of course must be a part of the vision and objective. A status change depends on a significant level of investment in the pre-existing Stratford Shopping mall and old town centre and what can be done physically to better link with the Westfield development. This should involve looking at crossing arrangements at the Great Eastern Road, the use of the concourse area and other linkages potential connections at bridge or subway level. In Stratford vision, it should be noted that Maryland is not a new local centre, but an improved one.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	61		Accept - Review and amend
Stratford Centre/CEPF Chariot SARL (Quod)	The Owners welcome the identification of Stratford Town Centre where a development should be encouraged, and in particular the Stratford Island Site as: · an Area of Change in terms of housing (Figure 2A.1); · an Area particularly suitable for mixed use (Figure 2B.2); and · the inclusion of the existing parts of the Stratford Centre in a wider Metropolitan Town Centre (Figure 2.2.3);	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	61		Supporting - No change
TFL	Maryland – change label to “Committed Crossrail station”.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	62	Fig 3.3.1	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Development Principles – Homes and Communities/Business and employment Welcomed and supported	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	63		Supporting - No change
National Federation of Artists Studio Providers	Stratford Development Principles: NFASP notes that Bow Arts is a member of Stratford Rising, the partnership/network body which is leading the development and improvement of the Stratford Cultural Quarter (mapped also e.g. P64 Fig 3.3.2).	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	63		General comment - No change
Stratford Centre/CEPF Chariot SARL (Quod)	The requirement for new retail developments to have direct street access and which is well integrated into the surroundings (P63). Retail development on the Island site is likely to be part of a large scheme where new routes and places are created as an extension to the existing covered shopping centre; it is unrealistic to believe that every new or reconfigured shop unit will have direct street access.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	63		Accept - Review and amend
Stratford Centre/CEPF Chariot SARL (Quod)	It should be made clear that the requirement for a Shop mobility scheme that links the Town Centre with the Queen Elizabeth Park, should be an obligation on any proposals for the Queen Elizabeth Park or neighbouring development. Imposing such a requirement on new development in Stratford Town Centre would be inappropriate and would fail to recognise the Island site already has excellent pedestrian and public transport accessibility.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	63		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace supports the scale of change and vision for the Stratford sub-area. Workspace considers the area of change should be extended to include the Stratford Office Village. As noted above, the Stratford Office Village provides a medium to long-term opportunity in which to promote mixed-use development that could incorporate business, education, cultural and arts, retail and residential uses.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	63	Fig 3.3.2	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	It should be noted that the Chobham Farm/Leyton Road area has been identified as having a housing capacity of 1200 units within the LB Newham Stratford Masterplan. The Masterplan also indicates a potential to expand the town centre and include educational uses in the area to the south of the ‘CTRL Box’. Given this and the environmental constraints here, it may be more appropriate to denote the area between the CTRL Box and the Stratford Island site as having potential for mixed use development in Figure 3.3.2. Consider denoting the area between the CTRL Box and the Stratford Island site as suitable for ‘mixed use’ development.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	64	Fig 3.3.2	Accept - Review and amend



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
London Cycling Campaign	PLEASE CHANGE TEXT - Changes and improvements should be made to the road network, where Stratford High Street and the town centre gyratory are particularly problematic, acting as significant barriers to pedestrian movements within the area. <i>In order to improve the centre's pedestrian and cycle environment the gyratory system needs to be changed to two way; traffic speeds reduced, new crossing points provided, and improved cycle access implemented (including remedial work on recently built unsatisfactory cycle lanes). Cycle Superhighway 2 should be completed as soon as possible in accordance with the London Plan and to standards of international best practise.</i>	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	65		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Connectivity and transport Welcomed and supported. Given the high costs of options to improve access to the north these need careful and early consideration so that development does not compromise the preferred option and so that funding can be considered.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	65		Supporting - No change
TFL	Alter wording: "... particularly around the new committed Crossrail stations..."	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	65	Para 3	Accept - Review and amend
London Cycling Campaign	Stratford Gyratory is a barrier to cyclists. This is not alleviated in any way by new and nonsensical "cycle lanes" in Great Eastern Street and the removal of the cycle slip road to enable cyclists to cross at the junction of Stratford High St, Station Road and the Broadway.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	65		Partial change considered appropriate
London Cycling Campaign	CS2 on Stratford High Street is on the A11.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	65		Accept - Review and amend
Stratford Centre/CEPF Chariot SARL (Quod)	Great Eastern Road The Owners are concerned, however, that there remains a lack of clarity as to whether the Great Eastern Ring Road around Stratford Town Centre will revert to one way running. We note that this is a key aspiration of London Borough of Newham in their Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan, February 2011 (Page 51) and would be consistent with OLSPG Development Principle C2 which seeks to reduce physical severance and improve connectivity . Currently it is only acknowledged that there is need to " improve the highway network in Stratford Town Centre to improve its environment making it attractive for all users and to reduce congestion." (p35). A consistent and clear policy position would help to provide important clarity for those promoting development within and close to Stratford Town Centre and the SPG should make clear the preferred approach.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	65		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	We welcome the further information on sustainable development set out for each of the OLSPG's sub areas. Reference to the ambition for new development surrounding the Stratford sub area (Section 3.3) to connect to the Olympic Park Decentralised Energy Network in line with the Core Strategy is welcomed; it is considered that the other sub areas should also similarly emphasise local heat and power network connections to surrounding areas.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	65		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	Page 65 Connectivity and Transport should indicate the aspiration for an access to the Stratford Stations from the south Carpenters Estate. 2nd Para relating to Cycle Super Highway 2 should relate to Stratford High Street A118 (formerly A11) and not A13.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	65		Accept - Review and amend
Land Use Consultants	Potential affects as a result of proposals for this sub-area would be addressed through the inclusion of the new Development Principle(s) and implementation of recommended changes to Development Principles C1, C3 and D.	3.3	Stratford	67	Urban form	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Sustainable Development Welcomed and supported, particularly the emphasis on the potential to extend the Olympic Park and Stratford City heat network to serve new development in the vicinity.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	67		Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
ODA PDT	Urban Form The approach in the text and in Figure 3.3.5 is supported. However, it is considered that the indicative heights shown for the southern half of the Chobham area are inappropriate for the location and should provide a transition from the height and form of development at Stratford City to the much lower scale and form of existing development east of Leyton Road. It should also be noted that the Stratford Masterplan indicates the potential and need for a new open space within this area. It is suggested that the indicative heights of between 4-6 storeys would be more appropriate with a potential for allowing taller elements where this can be justified from a design and residential amenity perspective. Revise the indicative height for the southern element of the Chobham area to between 4-6 storeys and indicate a principle of height transition from Stratford City eastward to the existing developed areas east of Leyton Road. Include indication of local open space requirement.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	67		Partial change considered appropriate
London Cycling Campaign	Stratford PLEASE CHANGE TEXT - Stratford High Street has undergone significant redevelopment over the last ten years with a number of tall and dense developments either having been completed or granted planning permission. " <i>The High Street itself has been re-landscaped at great expense, but nevertheless remains a minimum of 4 lanes giving too much priority to motor traffic at the expense of pedestrians and cyclists (for whom specific provision has deteriorated) and which remains an unpleasant environment for vulnerable road users</i> The building pattern established here is intended to be managed to make the most of the opportunities to create additional routes and connections through the area and to ensure that the various proposals are coherently connected at ground floor level.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	67		Accept - Review and amend
Stratford Centre/CEPF Chariot SARL (Quod)	The Owners support the main thrust of Section 3.3 (Stratford) which seeks to ensure that Stratford will become a thriving Metropolitan Centre that acts as a hub for new and rejuvenated communities. The Owners also welcome the acknowledgement of the flexibility in the design of buildings, with figure 3.5.5. recognising the potential for generally 8 storey buildings with the potential for landmark buildings of 16-24 storeys.	3.3	Stratford Sub-area	68	fig 3.5.5	Supporting - No change
LBTH	As we stated in our comments on the May 2011 draft of the OLSPG, the consented scheme at the Bromley-by-Bow Tesco site provides significantly more than 3,100m2 of commercial development. The detailed application includes 12,331m2 of commercial space, including a 11,377m2 superstore. The outline application includes a further 2,633m2 of commercial floorspace.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Accept - Review and amend
Thames Water	Abbey Mills Sewage Pumping Station We welcome the reference to Abbey Mills Pumping Station in this section of the SPG. Abbey Mills Pumping Station is an important heritage asset, but it is also a site that is an operational sewage pumping station and we would therefore welcome reference to its continued operational function.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Vision The vision is welcomed. In particular, the emphasis on 'managed change' is important given the need to provide for those locations that currently have viable and functioning businesses who's interests should be taken into account in any long-term transition process. Where such large scale change is envisaged the emphasis should also be on achieving a comprehensive approach to that change.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Supporting - No change
LTGDC	Page 69 – a short paragraph should be provided on Bromley by Bow. It is the only area not described at present. LTGDC suggest the following wording: "Bromley by Bow is bounded by the A12 to the west, River Lea Navigation to the north and east and London Underground and National Rail corridor to the south. Bromley by Bow station is located at the south west corner of the area. The area currently accommodates a Tesco foodstore, low grade industrial uses and sites cleared in anticipation of redevelopment. The site's adjacency to strategic road and public transport infrastructure and waterside and heritage setting provides opportunities and constraints to new development. The site has the potential to provide an important point of access to the recreational and heritage opportunities of the Lower Lea Valley from the west, through the creation of a new district centre and its associated access and townscape improvements."	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	The Three Mills Wall River is being referred to as the Waterworks River, this should be corrected.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69	3rd Para	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LVRPA	"Three Mills, the Greenway and the towpaths along the Prescott Channel, Waterworks River, City Mill River and River Lea form part of the Lee Valley Regional Park."	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69	3rd Para context	Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	3.4 Southern Olympic fringe Context Severance issues for pedestrians and cyclists have now been improved at the Bow flyover by the recent completion of the 'fly-under' walkway, which connects the River Lea towpath beneath the A11 crossing.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Proposed connections reconfigured
Landprop Services	Support vision	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Supporting - No change
Landprop Services	Should include a mention of retail and visitor accommodation.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Partial change considered appropriate
Riverine Centre	Whilst we agree that the objectives for the Riverine Centre should include a mix of residential, employment and community uses, we consider that given the existing faith use on the site and the agreed PPPA, the OLSPG should be more explicit in confirming that "an element of community uses (including faith based)" is appropriate in line with the PPPA.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Partial change considered appropriate
RICS	This Sub-area has significant opportunities for regeneration and the mix of uses proposed should give this region a distinct character when considered with the opportunities for waterside development and the need to overcome the severance that local waterways and strategic road and railways present. This area has a high flood risk and so development should seek to manage this risk. There is considerable potential to release industrial land in this Sub-area and there is generally good access to public transport within and beyond the OLSPG area, making this a sensible location for family housing. In place-shaping the local heritage assets and variety of waterways create a distinct character that should help develop the area as a mixed and stable community.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Supporting - No change
Workspace Group (GVA)	Broadly, we support the 'Vision' and 'Scale of Change' for the Southern Olympic Fringe which is set out in the OLSPG. Notwithstanding this, please be advised that our representations set out above as they relate to each of the Development Principles also apply to the discussion of these principles between p.71 and p.76 of the OLSPG as they refer specifically to the Southern Olympic Fringe area. We appreciate that emerging guidance for OLSPG area is still in the process of formulation and we therefore welcome the opportunity to work with the Mayor of London to ensure that the drafting of the guidance as it applies to our client's site helps to facilitate rather than frustrate the delivery of a potential better outcome at this location by providing an appropriate policy basis against which the site's redevelopment potential can be 'optimised' in accordance with the London Plan.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Supporting - No change
Lancaster PLC	We support the stance the SPG takes on the Southern Olympic Fringe, that many of the heritage and water assets will be restored and used to create a network of new mixed use neighbourhoods and the 9,600 new homes and 206,000 sq.m. of new and improved employment floorspace proposed in this area.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Supporting - No change
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	ET and SHG support in general terms, the vision, scale of proposed changes and guidance set out in Section 3.4.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	69		Supporting - No change
Riverine Centre	As part of the emerging Masterplan for the site, the Trustees recently commissioned a Development Options and Feasibility Appraisal, the Appraisal concludes that with respect to family accommodation, which could include the provision of 3 bed flats, it will normally require the provision of typical housing units to a low density and the provision of green spaces and gardens, which are likely to increase remediation costs. The financial analysis undertaken shows that such a scheme of family dwellings will not produce sufficient land values for such development to be viable.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	70	Fig 3.4.1	Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBN	Vision supported. Figure 3.4.1 in the sub-area commentary needs to be clear that high street does not imply extending retail down Stratford High Street, which is mainly outside the town centre. Rather an enhanced corridor experience is what we seek, addressing problems of voids, the harsh environment etc. Local Connectivity 4th Para confuses matters in relation to 3 potential improvements 1) Improvement of Abbey Road bridge (adjacent to Abbey Road DLR Station) for better pedestrian and cyclist facilities 2) Improvement of redundant Crows Road bridge onto Abbey Road next to West Ham Station 3) An aspiration to provide bus links from Bromley By Bow to West Ham which may include river and rail crossings to the west and north of West Ham gas holders. These should be indicated on Fig 3.4.4. The existing road link and proposed bridge on Pudding Mill Lane are shown in the wrong place on Fig 3.4.4.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	70	Fig 3.4.1	Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p70 & 72] Figures 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 omit the proposed primary school at Bromley-by-Bow – this should be included. As we suggest above, it may also be useful to indicate the proposed location for the new nine form entry secondary school, just to the south of the OLSPG boundary west of the Lea Navigation.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	70	Fig 3.4.1	Partial change considered appropriate
Riverine Centre	We assume that there is a graphical error on Figure 3.4.1 and that the whole of the Riverine Centre should be shown as an 'Area of Change'. It is assumed that the slither of land in the middle of the site shown excluded from the 'Area of Change' is an error.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	70	Fig 3.4.1	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	Page 71, Business and Employment: Despite reference to Sugar House Lane/Three Mills there is no mention of the opportunity to provide highly accessible and visible commercial uses along the edge of the A12 at Bromley by Bow.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Development Principles – Homes and Communities Pudding Mill Lane area is within the ODA's planning authority area. The reference to change from SIL to a greater mix of uses here is consistent with the draft Newham Core Strategy approach. The reference to treating specific areas within Pudding Mill as more appropriate for non-residential uses is welcomed as recognising that these have potentially difficult conditions that may make residential uses less appropriate. In addition to the area adjacent to the A12, the DLR station and Bow Substation, the significant parts of the area running alongside the Great Eastern Railway lines are also required permanently for Crossrail purposes, potentially increasing the area less suitable for residential use. It may therefore be more appropriate in Figure 3.4.2. to show the area bounded by the Bow Back Rivers, River Lea and railway lines as 'Mixed Use' rather than 'Residential', given that the residential opportunities here are probably quite constrained. Consider changing area bounded by Bow Back Rivers, River Lea and railway lines to indicate 'mixed	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Development Principles – Business and employment The emphasis on the importance of the areas identified for mixed use/employment use for providing business and employment opportunity is welcomed. There should be an emphasis on the provision of business floor space that helps to meet the demands of those sectors of the economy that are expanding or are projected to grow while avoiding the replication of the type of ground floor/lower floor commercial spaces and 'live/work' spaces that have proved generally less successful in recent development schemes in the OLSPG area. Add sentence emphasising the need to provide business/commercial floorspace in a form and type suitable for those elements of the East London economy which are projected to grow during the Legacy period.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71		Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	Page 71, Homes and Communities: Despite references to the type of housing promoted at West Ham and Sugar House Lane/Three Mills, there is no mention of the aim to provide a mix of housing typologies within the District Centre and adjacent sites at Bromley by Bow;	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71		Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	The section on Homes and Communities talks about needing a high proportion of low density housing for families at Sugar House Lane, but it would be more appropriate to refer to medium density high family housing. Newham accepted this at the EIP into their Core Strategy, and amended the policy text accordingly. The OLSPG should use the same wording. There should be a reference to the adopted Sugar House Lane Land Use and Design Brief.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Riverine Centre	It is recommended that given the site's sustainable location with good transport links, the best use of this brownfield site would be for a mix of uses including higher density housing rather than a larger quantum of low density family housing.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71		Partial change considered appropriate
Riverine Centre	We consider it premature for the OLSPG to prescribe the location of uses on the site. Page 71 acknowledges that remediation works and new connections are required to deliver development and without firm conclusions on these issues we consider the OLSPG is premature and restrictive in suggesting where uses should be located.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71		Partial change considered appropriate
Riverine Centre	The location of these mix of uses should be considered comprehensively as part of the master planning exercise being undertaken by the Trustees which is considering access options in detail together with the most viable location for uses.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71		Partial change considered appropriate
Riverine Centre	It is therefore recommended that page 71 should be less prescriptive in relation to the location of uses and allow greater flexibility within which the emerging Masterplan can respond. Furthermore, given the PPPA agreed between all parties it is considered that the description within Page 71 should make specific reference to community uses (including faith based) being suitable.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71		Partial change considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	It is inappropriate that Marshgate Business Centre be included as a site that focuses on the delivery of family housing. In this instance, there should not be a focus on family housing as this requirement may undermine the delivery and regeneration of this existing four-storey redundant and underused employment site. The dwelling mix should be considered on a site by site basis taking into consideration the risks to delivery and site constraints.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71	Fig 3.4.2	Partial change considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace supports the release of industrial land to the south of Pudding Mill Lane for new housing that incorporates employment floorspace.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71	fig 3.4.2	Supporting - No change
OPLC	Pudding Mill Lane Sugar House Lane and Three Mills Should be shown as mixed use across the whole area rather than specifying specific areas of residential. This allows proposals to be more site specific.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	71	Fig 3.4.2	Partial change considered appropriate
LTGDC	Bromley By Bow North i.e. the site north of Three Mills Lane should be identified as a site with the potential to accommodate a mix of residential and employment generating uses in accordance with the Bromley by Bow Land Use and Design Brief. While the predominant use may be residential we will still require and encourage employment uses. It is suggested that on the map the site is split in the middle, with mixed use (red) shown alongside the A12 and on the northern tip, and residential (yellow) by the canal.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	72	Fig 3.4.2	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	Fig 3.4.2 The southern two thirds of Three Mills Island should be coloured blue/purple as it will/should remain creative employment as set out in the Sugar House Lane Land Use and Design Brief. Uses on this site will also be influenced by the proximity of the Twelvetreets Crescent Gas Holder consultation/blast zones.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	72	Fig 3.4.2	Partial change considered appropriate
LTGDC	Fig 3.4.2 Add a "possible new primary school" within Bromley by Bow south (so that it is consistent with amended Fig 2.A.3);	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	72	Fig 3.4.2	Partial change considered appropriate
LVRPA	The extent of proposals for new development on Three Mills Island is unclear given text and maps in the OLSPG. This needs to be clarified. There is concern about the various proposals in the OLSPG for residential development on this site, for example as currently suggested in the document (page 71), and shown on Fig.3.4.2 Southern Olympic Fringe Land use and Fig 3.4.5 urban form where building heights of 4-6 storeys are proposed.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	72	Fig 3.4.2	Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LTGDC	Fig 3.4.2 In West Ham, showing residential south of the railway line is too simplistic. The bus depot is to the south, gas holders to the west, railway to the north and the area is separated from the station by an employment led zone. The Newham Core Strategy proposes employment led mixed use for the site, with criteria that need to be met for residential to be acceptable.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	72	Fig 3.4.2	Partial change considered appropriate
OPLC	There should be a predominant assumption of red, i.e. mixed use across this site which include Pudding Mill Lane Sugar house Lane, Three Mills and Bromley by bow north. All areas are similar in Character and approach. If there is a specific housing target being this should be stated in the spread of the mix and not targeted in this document, yet. In areas such as Bromley by Bow North it does not make sense to have residential in the restricted northern environment and is counter to the UDC Land Use and Design Brief and LBTH's emerging SPD.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	72	Fig 3.4.2	Partial change considered appropriate
Riverine Centre	As per our comments above, we consider it premature and restrictive for the OLSPG to delineate where residential and mixed use development should be located on the site. The OLSPG should provide flexibility for the location of these uses and Figure 3.4.2 should be amended accordingly.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	72	Fig 3.4.2	Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p73] The reference to the bus link over the Limehouse Cut should be at St Andrews Way rather than Andrews Way.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	73		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Connectivity and transport Welcomed. The area provides very significant challenges to providing good connectivity. Addressing these connectivity barriers should not be under-estimated. Achieving this or at least agreeing schemes needs to be an early priority since failure to provide good connectivity would jeopardise the proposed developments.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	73		General comment - No change
British Waterways	Connectivity and transport We would object to the description of waterways being barriers to movement – they provide safe and direct pedestrian and cycle connections between several key destinations, as well as routes for freight and leisure waterborne transport. As Sir Terry Farrell also described, they connect rather than divide communities, being focus points for events and amenity opportunities. Regeneration is encouraged on both sides of the area's waterways, and should also positively address the waterways. With regard to a bus link over the Limehouse Cut at Andrews Way, British Waterways would need to give consent for this. We do not generally support bridges unless appropriate need can be demonstrated, as these create additional maintenance requirements, can shadow waterspace and the towpath and reduce amenity for waterway users and ecological habitats, and encourage anti-social behaviour.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	73		General comment - No change
London Cycling Campaign	Stratford High Street is in no way an acceptable cycle route. Significant improvements are needed for cyclists and pedestrians including the early completion of Cycle Superhighway 2 to standards of international best practice and retention of the bridge at the Greenway with the addition of ramps for cyclists."	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	73		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p74] Our comments under Connectivity and transport, p36 (above), with regard to the new continuous riverside pedestrian/cycle connection along the Lea Navigation under the A11/A12, the additional pedestrian/cycle connection, the all-movement A12 junction, and the difficulty of delivering the connection numbered 2, all also apply to the map on p74.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	Cycle/Pedestrian (blue): delete the route that runs south through Bromley by Bow south and east parallel to the railway to West Ham as this has not been promoted to date;	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Partial change considered appropriate
LTGDC	Cycle /Pedestrian: the route across the River Lea Navigation between Bromley by Bow north and Sugar House Lane should be added;	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LTGDC	Cycle/Pedestrian: routes across the A12, created by the All Movements Junction (AMJ), should be specifically identified, perhaps by use of a "7a" annotation, which is also referenced on page 35. The introduction of the AMJ helps realise the development potential of Bromley by Bow and Sugar House Lane and planning for it is well advanced.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Partial change considered appropriate
LTGDC	Cycle/Pedestrian riverside (green): the existing connection should be extended along the edge of Bromley by Bow North, under the A11 then over the River Lea Navigation AND south within the existing Tesco site.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Partial change considered appropriate
LTGDC	Cycle/Pedestrian riverside: the missing connection is south beyond the existing Tesco site, under the railway and along the edge of the Maltings residential development;	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Proposed connections reconfigured
LTGDC	Cycle/Pedestrian/Vehicle (red): Hunts Lane should be added as an existing route that provides access to large parts of Sugar House Lane;	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Proposed connections reconfigured
LTGDC	Cycle/Pedestrian/Vehicle: The route linking Sugar House Lane to Pudding Mill Lane is a missing connection, not an existing connection;	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	Bridges (navy blue): the existing bridge linking Sugar House Lane to Three Mills should be added;	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	The key includes "mode to be determined". This should be deleted.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Accept - Review and amend
Riverine Centre	It is considered premature to show a new route through the middle of the site. Although it is agreed that a route from Crows Road is a 'missing connection' the complex and costly deliverability of this needs to be acknowledged further within the OLSPG. Furthermore, the location of any new route through the site from Crows Road is still being reviewed and it is considered premature and restrictive to show this through the middle of the site which may impact on development options. Again, although it is agreed that a route through the site, over the river and linking to Bromley by Bow is a desirable 'missing connection' the costs associated with this and its deliverability need to be acknowledged within the OLSPG in order to ensure that development is not fettered by even greater onerous costs.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	Fig.3.4.4 Southern Olympic fringe key local connections Three Mill Lane bridge is shown as a missing connection on this plan. As mentioned above, there are also new bridge connections shown that we are not aware of.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	FIG 3.4.4	Proposed connections reconfigured
OPLC	Required key link should be shown (dotted) up Sugar House Lane, and north up to the park past pudding mill. This is currently not accessible.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	74	Fig 3.4.4	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Sustainable Development The opportunity could be taken here to emphasise the opportunities to develop, extend and connect to the local heat network from the Olympic Park as a direct opportunity for meeting sustainable development targets set in wider planning policy. It is suggest that the following text is added at the end of this section: "Opportunities to extend the Olympic Park heat network along and across Stratford High Street should be exploited. The development of new and linked heat networks to the south will also be encouraged".	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	75		Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
British Waterways	Sustainable development In improving the quality and access to open space, including the waterways, this should also promote the active use of the waterways. Moorings provide passive surveillance of the waterway environment, and water-based uses provide activity and animation that help support the canals and rivers as a destination.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	75		General comment - No change
LBTH	• [p76] The map should show the proposed open space as part of the Tesco scheme to the south of Three Mills Lane Bromley-by-Bow, which is also promoted in the draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	76	Fig 3.4.5	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	Fig 3.4.5 The promotion of 7-10 storey development along the A12 edge within Bromley by Bow north should be avoided and amended to up to 8 in accordance with the Bromley by Bow Land Use and Design Brief. The map also suggests Bromley by Bow south is redeveloped with development at 4-6 storeys when permission already exists for a development of courtyard blocks ranging in height from 7-10 storeys with a 19 storey tower (this permission reflects the district centre classification and adjacency to BBB station). The OLSPG should be amended to reflect this.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	76	Fig 3.4.5	Partial change considered appropriate
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	ET and SHG support, in particular, Figure 3.4.5, which provides indicative guidance on appropriate heights within the Southern Fringe area. For the same reasons as outlined above, it is considered that the site at Bromley-by-Bow North is a major development opportunity that can support a high density development and the indicative heights set out on Figure 3.4.5 should be treated as a minimum.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	76	Fig 3.4.5	Supporting - No change
Riverine Centre	It is assumed therefore that the proposed 2 – 3 storeys within the western section reflects the OLSPG’s proposed family housing in this location. For the reasons outlined above, we consider such a delineation to be premature and restrictive.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	76	Fig 3.4.5	Accept - Review and amend
Riverine Centre	The OLSPG should also encapsulate sufficient flexibility to increase heights and densities in appropriate locations on the site which may assist with the deliverability and viability of comprehensive development on the site. It should also be noted that within the emerging Core Strategy, the site is shown as a Strategic Site within the Arc of Opportunity where heights of 8 – 12 storeys (13 – 19 in exceptional circumstances) are appropriate adjacent to high volume transport nodes and 5 – 8 storeys are appropriate on parts adjacent to high volume transport nodes. Based on the emerging detailed master planning work which the Trustees have commissioned and the emerging Core Strategy, we would recommend an indicative height of 5 – 12 storeys across the site.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	76	Fig 3.4.5	Partial change considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace objects the proposed building height guide for the Marshgate Business Centre as noted in Figure 3.4.5. The Marshgate Business Centre should be included as tall building location for the following reasons: The site is close to an excellent public transport network; There are no physical constraints that restrain building heights; The Marshgate Business Centre exceeds the heights given in Figure 2.D.2; Tall buildings offer excellent regeneration opportunities and make regeneration schemes viable; The proposed low-density would sit uncomfortably against the adjoining high density areas and would create a disjointed urban form; and Increased density will provided a more appropriate urban form to front the adjoining canal.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	76	Fig 3.4.5	Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	Fig.3.5.3 Hackney Wick/Fish Island key local connections As mentioned above, there are new bridge connections shown that we are not aware of.	3.4	Southern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	82	FIG 3.5.3	Proposed connections reconfigured
LBH	The mixed used area identified on Figure 3.5.2 should be extended further west to reflect the OIA boundary as per the Council’s Core Strategy and include the small triangle of SIL. The primary school and nursery locations should be moved further west toward the southern end of the playing fields to with the area of search identified in the Hackney Wick AAP and also to align with the discussions LBH and the Learning Trust have been having with the OPLC regarding their location in the LCS.	3.5	Olympic Park Sub-area	56	Fig 3.5.2	Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Vision The vision is welcomed and supported.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	77		Supporting - No change



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
ODA PDT	Scale of change Tower Hamlets Core Strategy identifies capacity for 2400 new homes across Fish Island while Hackney Wick Core Strategy Policy 5 identifies a potential for 620 new homes at Hackney Wick. The Hackney Wick Phase 1 AAP suggests that this figure can be “achieved and exceeded” within the plan period. Given the emerging Legacy proposals for the Olympic Park element of Hackney Wick, the figure of 620 can probably be seen an underestimate of capacity here. However, this section of the OLSPG suggests the sub area has capacity for 5,900 new homes, almost double that identified in the Core Strategies. Given the scale of this variance it would be helpful for this figure either to be qualified or a foot note provided that references how this new figure reflects the current LDF evidence base of the respective boroughs in order to make clear that the OLSPG is not proposing new policy in this section. Provide clarification or explanation to the variance in capacity for new homes indicated as against that in adopted borough policy, given the significant variance.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	77		Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	3.5 Hackney Wick and Fish Island Context Flood waters can be managed by control of the water structures, such as Three Mills Lock. As above, we would object to the description of the waterways as ‘significant barriers to movement’. The waterways provide safe, direct links for pedestrians and cyclists to other green spaces, such as Victoria Park and Hackney Marshes, and key destinations such as Canary Wharf and the Thames. We were keen for a connection to be made between the Energy Centre at Kings Yard and the Lee Navigation, in order that the waterway be utilised for transport of waste materials etc.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	77		Partial change considered appropriate
Neptune Group	It would be helpful to be able to view and comment upon the capacity modelling that has led to these targets,	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	77		General comment - No change
Neptune Group	Generic targets should not be seen as maximum ceilings that might otherwise reduce the capacity and potential of a site, particularly where such a site is capable of delivering benefits of a ‘strategic’ scale.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	77		General comment - No change
Neptune Group	Reference is made to the need for new development to have regard to existing character. Where appropriate, this is understandable, but much of Mid-Fish Island is of a poor character and is capable of accommodating change without detriment to, for example, the conservation area. Indeed, new development that would be capable of enhancing land use function and the setting of the waterways should not be constrained in terms of an existing low grade quality or say low building heights.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	77	context	General comment - No change
RICS	This Sub-area of the OLSPG area has the potential to grow into a well-connected and vibrant community with strong links west to wider Tower Hamlets. The diversity of business activity proposed mean that higher-value activities should have the scope to develop, bringing new employment opportunities. The Green Enterprise District should bring additional strengths. The historic severance that local waterways have caused Fish Island are well addressed by the proposals for new bridges and connections. In terms of road transport the A12 presents a considerable challenge and it is here that very recently two cyclists have died. Road safety is therefore a priority in the area since several strategic roads criss-cross the area, transporting freight and impacting on air quality. In terms of urban form and place shaping this presents challenges when planning for places where people want to live and work and these present significant barriers to connectivity. The potential for land use change and the managed release of industrial land to support higher density residential and employment use is considerable and in particular the plans to develop a family focused residential neighbourhood	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	77		Supporting - No change
OPLC	Makes reference to both the IBC and MPC buildings coming down if no use if found by 2017. This only applies to the IBC. It is critical that flexibility exists for the future use and operation of media and press centres.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	77		Accept - Review and amend
LBTH	• [p77-78] As we commented in relation to the May 2011 draft, the name of the sub-area is somewhat confusing given that it covers a much wider area than Hackney Wick and Fish Island. It would therefore be useful for the map on page 78 to show the full extent of the sub-area, and for the “Context” wording to include a clear statement to the effect that it also includes parts of Clapton, Homerton and Bow.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	77		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBTH	• [p77-78] We understand that the figures given for new housing and business floorspace, and the consequent projections for child yield and jobs, relate to the entire sub-area. However, from the current draft it would be easy to construe these as applying only to the areas of change shown on the map on page 78. We would suggest amending the text in the 'Scale of change' box to make clear that these represent growth across the whole area, and specifying what proportion of these are in the areas of change shown on the map. The latter figures should be consistent with the Fish Island AAP, the Hackney Wick Masterplan, and the numbers anticipated in the OPLC LCS area.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	77		Accept - Review and amend
LBH	The cycle circuit should be removed as the course is subject to change. Alternatively the new circuit should be reflected on this graphic. The IBC text box should include reference to... high quality 'business' and creative industry cluster. Lea Navigation reference is incorrect – should be Lee Navigation.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	78	Fig 3.5.1	Accept - Review and amend
LBH	The area around the MUA should be mapped as an Area of Change.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	78	Fig 3.5.1	Accept - Review and amend
LBTH	• [p79] We concur that "care must be taken to protect the amenity of existing and new residents" and would argue that this applies across the area, not just in Hackney Wick. We would also welcome any further clarification of how the use of the northern section of SIL in Fish Island South as a "buffer and transition zone to the more mixed use and residential areas to its north" could be achieved.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	"... This could face onto and help frame the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, though any such proposal would need careful assessment in terms of design, amenity, impact on the retained SIL within Hackney Wick, and the overall quantum and quality of new public open space as required by the 2007 Olympic planning approval. This sentence should be amended to read "... impact on SIL and OIA within Hackney Wick..." Amend relevant sentence to include reference to OIA.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	This section should also highlight the broadband opportunities created by the Games and Legacy and associated infrastructure requirements or if not here, then elsewhere in Section 2 – The Development Principles.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Accept - Review and amend
Pendleton	The mixed use boundary should be extended further south to include the area between Wick Lane and the A12 because: vacant for over 10 years planning applications which have been approved in the immediate area have been predominantly for mixed use developments Any heavy industrial use (B2) would be considered a 'bad neighbour' any use within Class B2 would also be opposed and considered unacceptable proposals to develop the site for mixed use employment, GP practice, housing, community and leisure would help to create a strong distinctive neighbourhood hub around highly accessible public transport infrastructure mixed uses will be in accordance with the strategic aims of the Hackney Wick Master Plan The existing B1 units, which are accessed from Maverton Road, are in the main now retail in character.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Business and Employment This section is welcomed and supported.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Supporting - No change
London Concrete	Reference to the retention of the majority of the southern section of Fish Island as SIL to safeguard industrial uses is fully supported. This area contains a key group of industrial uses at Bow Midland West Rail Yard. Reference should be made to the response provided above to Page 29, Land Use Change.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79	Industrial Land	Partial change considered appropriate
National Federation of Artists Studio Providers	Hackney Wick and Fish Island Development Principles: NFASP notes that artists' studios and studio providers like SPACE already play an important role in regenerating the area and in bringing to HW&FI a range of professional skills and practices which (a) contribute to the employment and cognitive diversity of the area and (b) have helped and will help planners and developers make imaginative interim, medium AND long-term use of difficult buildings and areas.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		General comment - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Neptune Group	We welcome the identification of the waterfronts as residential areas, although as before we feel that a cautious approach must be taken to the approach of family housing, particularly 'house' typology in the waterfront areas that are suited to higher developments. Areas that may be better suited to such a typology are more central areas of mid FI, where the original housing block and street pattern still exist.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Partial change considered appropriate
Pendleton	To conclude; we ask that the mixed use boundary shown on the SPG and the Fish Island Strategy be extended as shown on Map 1. This would enable an effective transition from residential to the north and east to employment uses in the south. THEY HAVE ATTACHED MAP TO SUBMISSION.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Partial change considered appropriate
Pendleton	To prevent long term vacancy of employment buildings (as currently exists) within the Fish Island area, an exception clause should be included to allow for mixed use development on sites where long term vacancy can be demonstrated. This would accord with the current plan which states; "A number of development sites will become available in Hackney Wick and Fish Island after the Games, and the Mayor of London and Hackney and Tower Hamlets Councils envisage the managed transition of industrial land for mixed use development". The site at 616 Wick, the vacant yard at the rear, and vacant B1 space are examples, where high level of vacancy has blighted the area. Part of the reason is that new residential users are now objecting to any heavy industrial uses. Accordingly unless policy is revised as proposed to be more flexible, the overall aims for this "area of change" will not be achieved in the plan period.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		General comment - No change
ODA PDT	Homes and Communities While the majority of this text is welcomed, this section refers to the proposal for additional residential development encroaching on the permitted Legacy Parklands of this part of the Olympic Park, which is currently subject of a planning application. This would also sit outside of this sub area as currently indicated in Figure 3.5.2. As for earlier comments in this respect, this reference is seen as inappropriate and should be removed. Remove reference to "additional housing" to the east of the International Broadcast Centre.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Partial change considered appropriate
LTGDC	If Fig 2.A.3 is amended as suggested above, Fig 3.5.2 will also need to be updated. LTGDC support the predominant land uses shown on this plan, but also recognise that the Borough LDFs may provide more precise boundaries for appropriate areas for mixed use and residential development.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Partial change considered appropriate
Pendleton	The southern area within Fish Island which is designated as strategic industrial use, could accommodate greater flexibility in the range of employment uses to include; hotels, GP practices, community and leisure, due to the close proximity of residential accommodation on the opposite side of the road. (A view supported by the 2007 EDAW Study). Whilst it is agreed that the SILs protect Tower Hamlets sub-regional economic role, it is considered that because there are now residential uses (nearly 200) on one/two sides of the boundary, and uses which are retail in character adjoining, the allocation as employment only would be highly restrictive. This would clearly be detriment to the nearby residential uses as the likelihood of conflict would be greater e.g. more trucks and large lorries.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Partial change considered appropriate
LTGDC	The text on page 79 refers to north and mid Fish Island. However, it is not clear which areas this description covers Perhaps they should be indicated on the maps or references to street names should be given. The areas as set out in the draft Fish Island AAP could be used, in which case the OLSPG should explicitly say this.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	79		Partial change considered appropriate
Neptune Group	On this basis, consideration should be given to the 'blanket' designation of much of Mid- FI as a 'mixed-use'. It may be that the indicative boundaries shown on, for example, fig 3.5.2 need softening a little.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	80	Fig 3.5.2	Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p80] The land use diagram, figure 3.5.2, currently differs in some areas from the guidance for Fish Island shown in the current draft of the AAP and should be revised to ensure consistency between the two documents. We would also recommend that the edges of the areas shown for the various land uses should be blurred, and that reference should be made in the text to the more detailed guidance that the AAP will provide on managing the shift from SIL to mixed use or residential in Fish Island.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	80	Fig 3.5.2	Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	Figure 3.5.2 identifies predominant proposed land uses and the proposed 'residential' land use in relation to Bromley-by-Bow North is fully supported.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	80	Fig 3.5.2	Supporting - No change
H Forman & Son	The site falls within the Hackney Wick and Fish Island (HW&FI) area, and generally, we support the policies set out in section 3.5, including the residential land use designation for this site shown at Figure 3.5.2. We support the stance the SPG takes on the HW&FI area, that 5,900 new homes and 173,000 sq.m. of new and improved employment floorspace are proposed. However, we do feel that this figure should be reviewed and increased if possible. The possibilities this area has generally, and Fish Island in particular has, are only just starting to be recognised in a wider sense and this could allow for more new homes to be delivered.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	80	Fig 3.5.2	Partial change considered appropriate
OPLC	Mixed use should be designated across the whole of HW&FI where residential is currently shown. Canal uses should be mixed so as to preserve the creative mix across HW&FI. There is no rationale for the designation as shown here. There are also already examples of successful new mixed area.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	80	Fig 3.5.2	Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p81] We welcome the reference the potential for an alignment of the Chelsea-Hackney line that would improve accessibility to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. We would suggest that the specific mention of a potential station at Hackney Wick, which was included in the May 2011 draft and the delivery of which would have a significant impact on public transport in Hackney Wick and Fish Island, should be reinstated. As per our comments on the May draft, further clarification should be added in relation to the reference to new bus infrastructure around the A12. We would also welcome emphasis of the strategic importance of the Monier Road bridge and this need for this to be multi-modal. It is helpful that the text now acknowledges the potential for "alternative SIL uses such as waste or energy infrastructure" to be accommodated on the existing railheads should all or part of the site no longer be required for rail use. However, as we comment above (p37), we still consider that the document's reinforcement of the existing safeguarding is unhelpful.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	81		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Connectivity and transport Approach welcomed. High priority should be given to transforming the convenience, attractiveness and access from the wider area of Hackney Wick station given its key location in relation to providing wider connectivity. Highlight importance of Hackney Wick improvements	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	81		Supporting - No change
London Cycling Campaign	PLEASE CHANGE TEXT...". In addition the White Post Lane Bridge that is currently closed will reopen <i>for walkers and cyclists (with controlled access for local businesses)</i> , and a new land bridge will link from the East Marsh over the Eastway and <i>A12 connecting Hackney Marshes directly to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. Provision should be made for a cycle ramp on the western side of Bridge HO10.</i> "	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	81	Para 6	Partial change considered appropriate
LTGDC	The second paragraph on page 81 should be reworded (from the second sentence) to say: "The LTGDC have acquired land around the station and are working with landowners and planning authorities to radically transform the station and its surroundings to create a new focus or "hub" for the area. This would include a redesigned and more accessible station entrance and greatly improved public realm. The possibility of creating a new north-south pedestrian link under the station should be explored by developers landowners and planning authorities. If practical, a new north south pedestrian link under the station should also be provided to open up the area immediately around the station and improve connectivity.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	81		Accept - Review and amend
TFL	Alter first sentence: "Recent improvements now allow for a train every eight minutes in peak times at Hackney Wick and Homerton stations."	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	81	Para 3	Accept - Review and amend
London Cycling Campaign	A hub for the area should include high quality provision for cycling.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	81		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
London Cycling Campaign	PLEASE CHANGE TEXT - The LTGDC have acquired land around the station and working with land owners and planning authorities to radically transform the station and its surroundings to create a new focus or "hub" for the area. This should include a redesigned station entrance and greatly improved public realm. <i>The possibility of creating a new north-south pedestrian and cycling link under the station should be explored by developers, land owners and planning authorities.</i> " We note that a link underneath the track would make the Olympic Park accessible by cycle to the many people who live east of the development and also the users of the new cycle hire facility due to be located next to Stratford Regional Station.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	81	Para 2	Partial change considered appropriate
London Concrete	The final paragraph on this page makes reference to two important "strategic transport sites". This includes Bow West. As per the response made to Page 37, Land Use, Freight and Servicing, reference to the Bow Midland West site as a "Transport Site" is not sufficiently precise and does not afford the appropriate level of protection for the existing or future use of the site. It also fails to comply with National and London Plan policy which requires the safeguarding of railheads. As per the response made to Page 37, to comply with National and London Plan policy the SPG should refer to the site as a "Strategic Rail Freight Site" for uses which make effective use of the railhead. This should include existing, planned or potential use of the site for concrete batching, the manufacture of coated materials, other concrete products and the handling, processing and distribution of minerals/aggregate.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	81		Accept - Review and amend
Neptune Group	In terms of local connectivity, we welcome the identification of the Monier Road bridge as a key element of the movement framework, allowing for longer-term public transport routes to develop. The SPG should emphasise the importance of such a link being delivered and in parallel, lobby for such to be secured through the current Legacy applications. We support the enhancement of the existing N-S crossing point, but question whether a second to the west would be necessary or beneficial.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	81	Fig 3.5.3	Proposed connections reconfigured
LBTH	• [p82] Although the proposed connections are generally consistent with the Fish Island AAP, which we welcome, please note the comment above under Connectivity and transport, p36, regarding the missing pedestrian/cycle connection linking Roman Road to Fish Island – this should be removed. The link that is shown to the south on p36 is missing from the p82 map.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	82	Fig 3.5.3	Proposed connections reconfigured
LTGDC	Fig 3.5.3 – shows the Greenway terminating to the east of the A12, and the route under the A12 to Victoria Park as a key local connection. It would be useful for the OLSPG to highlight that an improved connection into Victoria Park is an aspiration that all stakeholders should work together to achieve.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	82	Fig 3.5.3	Proposed connections reconfigured
H Forman & Son	We note the various new bridge links shown over the River Lea to the east of Fish Island and would support these. However, it is not clear in the diagram at Figure 3.5.3, which are proposed and which are existing. We would also urge for as solid a commitment as possible, to deliver these items of infrastructure.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	82	Fig 3.5.3	Partial change considered appropriate
Land Use Consultants	Potential affects as a result of proposals for this sub-area would be addressed through the inclusion of the new Development Principle(s) and implementation of recommended changes to Development Principles C1 and D.	3.5	Hackney Wick/Fish Island – Urban form	83	Open Space	Accept - Review and amend
LBH	Hackney Cut should only be referred to as the Lee Navigation (advice received from British Waterways during consultation on the HW AAP).	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83		Accept - Review and amend
LBH	This section should stress the need for further investigation of / and co-ordinated approach to providing 'Strategic Flood Mitigation' infrastructure. As parts of Hackney Wick are at risk of flooding a project to investigate strategic flood mitigation options has been included in the AAP Implementation Plan.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Urban Form The text is welcomed and supported, particularly with reference to the need to provide localised open space in addition to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park and Victoria Park, which have/will have a different role and character.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83		Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	Sustainable development Text is welcomed and supported	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83		Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
London Concrete	The allocation of the Bow Midland West Rail Yard for anything other than rail related uses would be contrary to both National and London Plan Policies. Moreover, as required by National and London Plan policies, Bow Midland West should in fact be specifically safeguarded as a "Strategic Rail Freight Site" for uses which make effective use of the rail head and for minerals related activities.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83		Accept - Review and amend
TFL	New wording: "... should be explored by developers, land owners and planning authorities, subject to other requirements of the land for continuing rail freight use."	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83	Para 5	Partial change considered appropriate
Environment Agency	We welcome the consideration given to flood risk for the Sub-Areas at Hackney Wick & Fish Island and on the Northern Olympic Fringe. We feel that these considerations and future close working on flood risk should apply to all of the sub-areas across the site. We would welcome the opportunity to work with you further on these sub area strategies.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83		General comment - No change
British Waterways	Urban form Use of the waterways The Hackney Cut is part of, and also known as, the Lee Navigation, so should be identified as "...Hackney Cut (Lee Navigation)...". We support the statement regarding opening up the canals to new activity, and would suggest some examples to promote this, such as floating cafés, canoe hire, gallery boats, trip boats, angling...etc.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83		Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	Sustainable development Waste The waterways should be utilised for transporting waste by waterborne freight.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83		General comment - No change
LBTH	[p83] The text refers to the need for "a new local park...south of the rail line within the Fish Island and Hackney Wick area". We support this but suggest amending the text for clarity to refer to Fish Island North, and adding a reference to Fish Island East as a further potential location for local open space – as the map on p84 shows.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83		Accept - Review and amend
LBH	This figure is missing cycle connection from Victoria Park to Hackney Wick – as key existing local cycle connection (solid blue route). This should continue along Wallis Road through to Wallis Road Bridge.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83	Fig 3.5.3	Accept - Review and amend
LBH	The Council's Streetscene department has aspirations to improve pedestrian and cycle links over/under the A12 from Homerton to Hackney Wick and Olympic Park. This plan shows the route along Wick Road however this route is not a pleasant route for cyclists and pedestrian due to the dominance of motorised traffic resulting from the A12 and slip roads. This plan should be amended to reflect this and our aspiration to provide more high quality links for pedestrians and cyclists.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	83	Fig 3.5.3	Proposed connections reconfigured
LBTH	• [p84] The SPG's guidance on building heights in Fish Island should reflect the Council's own position as set out in the current draft of the Fish Island AAP. Although this does appear to be the case, the colours used to indicate different ranges of building heights on the map on p84 are not sufficiently distinct from each other for this to be clear. We would also suggest removing any unused categories of building heights from the key to the map, in particular that for "11 plus" storeys. For the avoidance of doubt, the guidance provided on prevailing building heights in the current draft of the Fish Island AAP is as follows: • Fish Island North: 4-8 storeys • Mid Fish Island: 4-6 storeys • Fish Island East: 3-6 storeys.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	84		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	As per the comments above made on Figure 2.2.1 OLSPG Areas of Change in relation to reflecting the OIA designation as per the Council's Core Strategy / including the small triangle of SIL. Amend Figure 2.D.2 to reflect the OIA boundary as per Hackney's Core Strategy Proposals Map. Also map the small triangle of SIL as permitted building heights of 4-6 storeys.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	84	Fig 3.5.4	Accept - Review and amend
LBH	The height designation around the MUA should be 4-6 storeys to align with the Hackney Wick AAP.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	84	Fig 3.5.4	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LTGDC	LTGDC are unclear as to the rationale for the guide to building heights on fig 3.5.4 Hackney Wick / Fish Island urban form, in particular the area identified for 11 storey plus buildings to the south of Hackney Wick Station. There is no discussion of heights in the text on urban form on page 83. It would be useful to know how the GLA reached the conclusions on heights set out on Fig 3.5.4. The map itself seems to be internally contradictory, with the label "Typical height 4-6 storeys with scope for taller elements" being referenced to the Hackney Wick AAP, which only covers the north of the railway line, and extending into areas with 2-3 storey building heights identified.	3.5	HW & FI Sub-area	84	Fig 3.5.4	Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	Page 85, 3.6 Scale of Change - indicates that the Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area has the potential to accommodate around 3,200 new homes and .... 800 new jobs. The GLA strategic modelling using the GLA typology should support justification of these figures. For your reference, it should be noted that the LBWF NOF AAP area represents a smaller area and the AAP indicates 2,500 new homes.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	85		Accept - Review and amend
Bywaters	The North Olympic Fringe Sub area is expected to deliver 3,200 new homes. This number could potentially be improved upon were the indicative reconfiguration of under-utilised lands be acted upon in that it demonstrates a far greater quantum of development and scale of change is achievable than that currently being indicated.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	85		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Vision Noted and welcomed. However, reference to the Lea Bridge area as one specific area of change should be considered given the references to this in the emerging LB Waltham Forest Core Strategy and Northern Olympic Fringe Area Action Plan. The detail of any reference should be agreed with LB Waltham Forest. This will help to emphasise that the OLSPG addresses areas of change away from the core locations surrounding the Olympic Park. Consider including reference to the Lea Bridge area as one of proposed change.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	85		Partial change considered appropriate
Avivia	Support retail centre at Leyton Mills, suggest flexible approach land use quantum's to avoid constraints.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	85		Supporting - No change
LVRPA	change text to "The Sub-area includes a substantial part of the Lee Valley Regional Park including Walthamstow Marshes SSSI Nature Reserve to the north, Low Hall Sports ground to the east, a range of important regional sporting, leisure and visitor facilities along Lea Bridge including an Ice Centre, Riding Centre and the Waterworks Centre and Nature Reserve. Other important open spaces include The Sub-area includes large areas of marsh and open space, including Walthamstow Marshes to the north; Marsh Lane fields; Ive Farm; the Lammas Land Park; Seymour Playing Fields, allotments and Drapers Field, with more formal recreation uses at exist such as Leyton Orient Football Club. Eton Manor and a golf course. The Lee Valley Park Authority's Ice Rink and Riding Centres provide additional important regional facilities and valuable resource for sporting, recreational, culture, nature conservation spaces and activities. The River Lea and the Dagenham Brook run north to south through the Sub-area.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	85	3rd Para	Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	3.6 Northern Olympic fringe The River Lea has a more natural, Riverine character that the more urban, hard edged, southern waterways and Lee Navigation/Hertford Union Canal, and is therefore well suited for the use of small paddle boats, etc.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	85		General comment - No change
Leyton Orient FC (URS)	Improving strategic and local connectivity between the park and the Northern Olympic Fringe is essential to achieve wider regeneration objectives and these plans are welcomed.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	85		Supporting - No change
RICS	The more modest scale of change proposed in the Northern Fringe is consistent with the scale of existing and planned housing, including family housing, though some areas are less well served by public transport. The proximity of substantial areas of open green space in the upper Lee Valley and at Epping Forest are value assets the area., as well as sports facilities at Eton Manor are valuable assets. Retail development at Leyton Mills and a range of employment opportunities support development in the area. There is potential too at Leyton Mills improve the public realm and upgrade connections north to the Lee Valley Regional Park and Walthamstow wetlands, while Crossrail at Maryland Station will substantially improve connectivity well beyond the OLSPG area. Flood risk is an issue for this Sub-area so this risk needs to be managed with care.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	85		Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBWF	Page 86, Fig 3.6.1 Northern Olympic Fringe Context – the Map should be shifted northward to show the NOF area rather than showing the Athletes Village. Figure 3.6.1 – ‘Area of Change’ should include ‘Opportunity Sites 11, 19, 23, 17, 13,14,15, 7,4’ as shown on pages 26,27, 28 of the NOF AAP. These Opportunity Sites are identified as ‘Area of Change’ in the NOF AAP. Indeed LBWF has received various planning applications for mixed use development at those sites. It is important to ensure consistency between the proposals in NOF AAP and the proposals and guidance in OLSPG.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	86	Fig 3.6.1	Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	Page 87, 1st paragraph, line 4 after ‘... to overcome existing severance’ add ‘ Waltham Forest would expect financial contributions towards the cost of a new footbridge into Eton Manor from Leyton Mills. This would provide direct access into the Olympic Park from Leyton and greatly improve the connections between the new and existing communities; and upgrade Leyton Underground station to cater for increased footfall as a consequence of the Legacy Communities Scheme (LCS) new housing proposals.’	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	87		Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	Page 87, at the end of the 4th paragraph, suggest add, ‘The Legacy Communities Scheme (LCS) application would include almost 4,000 new homes, a large proportion of which would potentially be coming on stream in a 2-3 year period. The proposed housing development suggests a major strain on social infrastructure, both within the application boundary and on its immediate periphery. Specifically Waltham Forest has concerns that the Chobham Academy would not be able to meet the pressure of an existing acute shortfall of school places; that access to health and leisure facilities would be insufficient as a result of the proposed developments; and that highways and public transport infrastructure would be insufficient to cater for the combined housing provision. It is important that new developments should contribute to the provision of sufficient social infrastructure and highway infrastructure to cater for the needs of the local community.’	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	87		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Development Principles – Homes and communities This section is welcomed and supported. Reference to the provision of a new green link between Leyton Mills and Eton Manor. It is assumed that this proposed connection will be addressed in the proposed Delivery Study. Depending on the form of such a link, there are significant physical barriers that would need to be overcome and so any such proposal should be caveated by the carrying out of a feasibility study. There should also be a principle that any such link would not negatively impact on the provision of the planned Legacy uses or development form at Eton Manor. Add reference to the need for feasibility work to establish the nature of the proposed link between Leyton Mills and Eton Manor.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	87		Partial change considered appropriate
Bywaters	This would support a more interventionist strategy to site assembly and spatial restructuring, ensuring that better use of the under-utilised sites in the area is realized. This not only enables a more appropriate morphology to be delivered, strengthening connections, but a full range of uses and associated densities of use can be delivered to accompany and support it. The reliance on so few sites within the North Olympic Fringe sub area to deliver the suggested 20,000 sq m of new and improved business floorspace, some 800 jobs, jeopardizes delivery in this respect. All under-utilised sites must be examined and considered comprehensively as part of the overall strategy.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	87		Partial change considered appropriate
Bywaters	An extraordinary new sporting facility is being developed on the western ‘doorstep’ of Leyton. The need to create far stronger connections between the park and Leyton is required if the people of Leyton are to fully benefit from the arising sports and recreation opportunities the park will undoubtedly offer. This too supports the need for a more radical and bold approach to the Ruckholt Road area and adjacent sites and infrastructure in order to better deliver a more seamless and urban connection. Without improving interconnectivity between the areas, the risk is that some neighbourhoods remain isolated and depressed and the ability to capitalise on this potential to improve health and well being through access to the new park and sports facilities will be hampered for a generation or more.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	87		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	Nothing has been included on the Marshes in sporting Legacy i.e. home of grassroots football, benefiting from £16m investment plan etc.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	87		Accept - Review and amend



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBWF	Suggest that Pages 86, 88, 90, 92 - Figures 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3 and 3.6.4 should be "Shifted Northwards" to show the Main Opportunity Areas identified in the LBWF NOF AAP and include Hall Farm Curve in the North and Eton Manor, Drapers Fields and Velo Park in the south. The NOF Sub-area maps currently show the Media Centre and Athletes Village which are areas outside the NOF Sub-area.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	87		Accept - Review and amend
LBWF	We have some concern the Maps for the Northern Olympic Sub-Area in section 3.6 currently are not showing the main Opportunity Areas identified in the LBWF NOF AAP.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	87		Accept - Review and amend
LBWF	Errors on Page 88 Fig 3.6.2 Northern Olympic Fringe land use - Amendments should be made to correct some land use errors. Those 3 sites at (i) Bywaters site at Auckland Road (i.e. Site 7: Redeveloped Waste Facility at NOF AAP); (ii) Church Road Estate Road (Site 14: existing employment site at NOF AAP); and (iii) Church Road Etloe Road (Site 15: existing employment site at NOF AAP should be amended from 'Residential' to 'Mixed Use'. This is to ensure consistency between the LBWF Northern Olympic Fringe Area Action Plan (NOF AAP) and the OLSPG. The NOF AAP identified those 3 opportunity sites for mixed use, employment, social infrastructure and residential development and should not be shown just as 'Residential' use.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	88	Fig 3.6.2	Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	Errors on Page 88 Fig 3.6.2 Northern Olympic Fringe land use - Amendments should be made to the correct spelling of 'Ruckholt Road', not 'Ruckholt Road'.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	88	Fig 3.6.2	Accept - Review and amend
LBWF	Error on Page 88 Fig 3.6.2 Northern Olympic Fringe land use - 'Ruckholt Road site' should not have the symbol of 'Primary School', 'Primary School' symbol should be deleted.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	88	Fig 3.6.2	Accept - Review and amend
LBWF	Page 88 Fig 3.6.2 Northern Olympic Fringe land use - the Map should be shifted northward to include the proposed Mixed Use sites Nos 11,19, 23, 17, 13,14,15, 7,5 4 as shown on pages 26,27, 28 of the NOF AAP.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	88	Fig 3.6.2	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Business and employment This section is welcomed and supported. It is noted that in Figure 3.6.2. the employment area denoted for Temple Mills overlaps the sub-area boundary and crosses into Eton Manor. As this is not denoted within the Olympic Park sub area section, it is assumed that this is in error and should be corrected to show green space. Correct the employment area denoted for Temple Mills to exclude Eton Manor.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	88	Fig 3.6.2	Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	Page 89, 2nd paragraph, line 4 should read, '...and re-opening of Lea Bridge Station are key infrastructure schemes. These schemes could stimulate and facilitate growth in the wider Sub-area...'	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	89		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Connectivity and Transport The broad approach is welcomed. As in other areas early decisions on which schemes to pursue are needed. Given the cost and complexity of providing a link from Leyton Mills to Eton Manor this will need careful assessment and comparison with further improvements to other routes into the Olympic Park.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	89		Supporting - No change
British Waterways	Connectivity and transport In terms of new pedestrian accesses along the Lee Valley tributaries, consideration should be given to preventing fly tipping that can often occur at public accesses to waterside areas, causing significant maintenance issues.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	89		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBWF	Page 90 Fig 3.6.3 Northern Olympic key local connections - the Map should be shifted northward to include the proposed Hall Farm Curve and re-opening of Lea Bridge station route linking the Chingford to Liverpool Street route to the Coppermill Junction to Stratford line. The Hall Farm Curve and re-opening of Lea Bridge station are key transport connectivity schemes which will facilitate growth in the sub-region and also representing significant local infrastructure improvement.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	90	Fig 3.6.3	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBWF	Page 90 Fig 3.6.3 Northern Olympic key local connections – should show the improved No 97 bus upgrades and extended linkage from Chingford to Stratford City.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	90	Fig 3.6.3	Proposed connections reconfigured
Land Use Consultants	Potential affects as a result of proposals for this sub-area would be addressed through the inclusion of the new Development Principle(s) and implementation of recommended changes to Development Principles C1, C3 and D.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe - Urban Form	91	Open space & biodiversity	Accept - Review and amend
LBWF	Page 91 Sustainable Development – if necessary, reference to any details of flooding can refer to the NOF Flood Risk Zones which is on page 91 of the NOF AAP.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	91		Accept - Review and amend
LVRPA	The sub section entitled 'Lea Valley' should be renamed as 'Lee Valley Regional Park'	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	91	Lea Valley Para	Partial change considered appropriate
LVRPA	The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority has adopted Area Proposals that relate to a significant part of the sub-area. The 'Area 2 Proposals The Three Marshes: Walthamstow, Leyton and Hackney' seek to establish the Lea Bridge Road area as a major visitor node, enhancing existing sport and leisure facilities, developing options for visitor accommodation and improving open spaces and associated visitor infrastructure. Nature reserves and important ecological resources will be protected and enhanced and measures to improve public access for nature conservation, educational and heritage interests developed further.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	91	Lea Valley Para	Accept - Review and amend
Bywaters	"Bywaters" welcomes the acknowledgment that taller buildings could appropriately be located on its site, up to 10 storeys. While the draft SPG states that "significant landuse changes are to be focused on a relatively small number of areas" we would suggest that the ability to improve connectively and create a more coherent urban form would appear to require a more radical approach particularly in relation to Waltham Forest Council's landholdings of the Score Centre, the allotment sites that straddle Ruckholt Road, and the Ruckholt/Orient Way junction and adjacent lands.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	91		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Environment Agency	In the section on the 5 sub-areas, only 3.6, the Northern Olympic fringe (page 91) mentions enhancement to biodiversity directly. Whilst we recognise that this sub-area contains the wetlands, which are of such high importance to biodiversity, we would also similarly welcome further consideration to biodiversity enhancement in the other four sub-areas.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	91		Partial change considered appropriate
Bywaters	Fig. 3.6.4 Northern Olympic Fringe urban form identifies a 'gateway site' straddling Ruckholt Road. It suggests this gateway could be suitable for taller buildings and appears to include some of the open space adjacent to the road. This is welcomed. But the connection of the Gateway to its fringes and to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park needs reinforcing and the need to reconfigure open space and underutilized sites needs boldly addressing.	3.6	Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area	92	Fig 3.6.4	Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	The commissioning of a viability study to assess the delivery and investment plans of the area infrastructure providers would be material consideration.	4.1	Delivery - Introduction	95		General comment - No change
LBWF	An issue would be what happens to the document if it fails to be supported by deliverability work.	4.1	Delivery - Introduction	95		General comment - No change
LBH	It is useful to identify the key stakeholders to bring forward ideas and discussions on the table regarding provision of major infrastructure for the Olympic site. However, the section does not provide further discussion/ clear indication in relation to who will make the final decisions on infrastructure, which can be taken by a wide range of stakeholders. Is GLA going to lead the whole production process and set up a project board to review the Infrastructure study and associated evidence on an annual basis?	4.1	Delivery - Introduction	95		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LTGDC	LTGDC support the Delivery chapter and consider that it provides a useful summary of the delivery issues. The LTGDC is likely to comment further on the Delivery and Infrastructure Study when it is released for public consultation.	4.1	Delivery - Introduction	95		Supporting - No change
English Heritage	Delivery: 4.2 Collaboration and governance (page 96): we are pleased that English Heritage is identified as a delivery partner. For clarity, it would be useful for this section to outline the key planning powers of the Olympic Delivery Authority, London Thames Gateway Development Corporation and the Mayoral Development Corporation, in particular, the threshold at which these powers apply. This is important given the implications for strategic applications, for example those involving tall buildings	4.1	Delivery - Introduction	95		Partial change considered appropriate
NHS East London and City	The delivery section needs to be more robust with definitive targets. Section 4.6 states that the GLA will be producing a delivery study and section 4.8 refers briefly to monitoring and review. These currently marginal components of the SPG are critical to its success as they will specify what the Olympics legacy will actually deliver for local communities. We would welcome the opportunity to contribute to the forthcoming Delivery Study.	4.1	Delivery - Introduction	95		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p97] We welcome and strongly support the overarching development principle requiring developers to provide a statement explaining how schemes will help achieve the SRF convergence outcomes. This will be a very useful tool in ensuring that development in the legacy area helps support regeneration in the existing communities and neighbourhoods. The text refers to the production of further advice on how this principle could be met: this will be important in ensuring that developers have clarity on the Mayor's (and our) aspirations for their contribution to convergence, and we look forward to working with you to develop this advice. The recently submitted OPLC LCS planning application offers an early opportunity to provide a model of best practice for such convergence statements, and we will be lobbying OPLC to take up this opportunity.	4.1	Delivery - Introduction	97		Supporting - No change
LBTH	[p97] It will be critical to the success of the OLSPG that its associated Delivery Study provides a comprehensive and appropriately ambitious assessment of the social, community and transport infrastructure needs of development in the OLSPG area, along with a robust evidence base to support their delivery. This should of course be rooted in the infrastructure requirements arising directly from development, but should reflect the Mayor's intention, which we support, that development in the OLSPG area should support regeneration in the existing communities and neighbourhoods and contribute to the achievement of the convergence outcomes set out in the SRF. We look forward to continued involvement in the development of the Delivery Study over the coming months.	4.1	Delivery - Introduction	97		Supporting - No change
British Waterways	Delivery BW are already working with local communities and businesses in the area, and as part of our move into the third sector next year, we will shortly be appointing a waterway partnership for London, made up of a range of people representing different waterways interests - such as boaters, walkers, cyclists and anglers - and people with relevant expertise in areas like volunteering, fundraising, environment, heritage and community engagement.	4.1	Delivery - Introduction	97		General comment - No change
LBN	Paragraph 1 of 4.2 Introduction is useful in explaining the role of this SPG and should also appear under the Status section. This Guidance presents the Mayor of London's views on how his planning policies should be applied across the OLSPG area in order to maximise the regeneration benefits of the 2012 Games. We note that the MDC boundary is much smaller than the OLSPG area (see Fig 5.2 P106) and believe this is further reason to conclude that the latter extent is far too large.	4.2	Collaboration & governance	95		General comment - No change
LBN	This section is too long and detailed and simply needs to list the key stakeholders. It does not need the lengthy explanations provided. It would be helpful to mention where any of these bodies or agencies have funding schemes or programmes of development and change that are relevant to the area. It would also be beneficial to recognise that each of the boroughs has an Infrastructure Delivery Plan where many of these programmes will already be listed and their costs and funding sources indicated.	4.2	Collaboration & governance	95		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Cycling Campaign	We suggest the fine words on collaboration to be followed up by concrete proposals. In respect of cycling poor collaboration has already resulted in avoidable mistakes that have wasted public money. Monitoring and review should include a specific commitment to consult local stakeholders - for transport via a consultative group.	4.2	Collaboration & governance	95		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Inclusive London	We welcome the intention to ensure that transport connections are an integral part of the planning. Inclusion London recommends that consultation with disabled people and their organisations takes place at an early stage of design concerning transport services, vehicles and the pedestrian environment, particularly regarding any plans to provide shared surface streets, which are problematic for many groups of disabled people including blind and partially sighted people.	4.2	Collaboration & governance	95		General comment - No change
Inclusive London	Lastly, we cannot emphasize enough the importance of consulting with disabled people and their organisations at every stage of the planning process from identifying need, drawing up specifications to reviewing completed works. Practical design solutions which improve accessibility can best be found through on-going discussion with disabled people who are 'experts by experience'. We totally support Appendix 3 which mentions the importance of consulting with local Deaf and disabled people's organisations and voluntary groups as well as access groups and officers. We urge planners to follow this sound advice.	4.2	Collaboration & governance	95		Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	This section is welcomed and noted. The reference to the ODA as development control authority could include reference to the expectation that this role will pass to the MDC in October 2012. Include reference to ODA planning powers being planned to pass to the proposed MDC.	4.2	Collaboration & governance	96		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	Consideration should be given to how this relates to the Key Themes and Sub Areas. How will x number of homes and jobs be delivered? In what phases, by whom and what is needed to support this? How will community facilities be provided and who will bring this forward? These questions have not been addressed and cannot be left in the general form of this chapter. As noted above it is intrinsic to a quality legacy that infrastructure is provided in a timely manner. Stronger statements should be used in this section to firmly acknowledge that infrastructure delivery is a pre requisite of the development opportunities.	4.3	Delivery mechanisms	97		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Lend lease	Delivery Mechanisms – The delivery of office space in Stratford would benefit exponentially from the reduction of business rates and the aim of delivering both jobs and growth. Although this is not specifically mentioned we would urge for its inclusion as a catalyst for office development.	4.3	Delivery mechanisms	97		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace considers that an additional delivery mechanism relating to enabling development should be added within this section. In particular, further text should be added that includes measures that would enable the delivery of commercial floorspace. In order to provide good value and high quality commercial floorspace, some existing under-used and vacant sites will require regeneration and renewal over the next 10-years to meet the modern and future needs of London's businesses. Such regeneration requires funding and Workspace proposes that if this is to be privately funded, a high-value economic driver will be necessary to enable redevelopment and ensure the overall viability of regeneration. The benefits of this are: The creation of modern business units, which can continue to be provided as good value rental accommodation; The more efficient use of urban land; The retention of the same, if not higher levels, of employment on existing sites; The provision of sustainable mixed-use development; The development of land to assist in meeting the targets and needs of the sub-region; Avoidance of reliance on public funding; The continued support of small and medium enterprises th	4.3	Delivery mechanisms	97		General comment - No change
ODA PDT	This section is noted and supported. However, it could benefit from reference to how the Mayor will utilise his own mainstream budgets to support the delivery of the OLSPG objectives and make a link between the delivery of these and the London Plan Implementation and Delivery Programme. Consider adding reference to how the Mayor would utilise his own mainstream budgets in support of delivering OLSPG objectives. Consider providing text that links OLSPG with the London Plan Implementation and Delivery Programme.	4.3	Delivery mechanisms	97		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
OPLC	The ODA does not have CPO powers.	4.3	Delivery mechanisms	97		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	We feel this should indicate spatially how the convergence objectives would be realised. They need to be related to the themes and sub areas. Reproducing the list in the Appendix does not cover this adequately or provide any clarity for the boroughs or developers.	4.4	Convergence	97		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
ODA PDT	The text and Overarching Development Principle F is noted and supported.	4.4	Convergence	97		Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
London Sustainable Development Commission	In particular we recommend that the convergence criteria should include an assessment of air quality.	4.4	Convergence	97		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	In many ways this should be closely linked to convergence. It is far too general and there should be an appreciation of the key forms of infrastructure necessary to deliver the vision. What for example is needed to regenerate the area as a successful mixed use communities? How many school places, what key connections, what proportion of employment space should be left/re-provided. These are addressed to some degree in the sub areas, but an overview would be a sensible addition here.	4.5	Strategic infrastructure	97		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
British Waterways	4.5 Strategic Infrastructure The waterways form part of the area's key infrastructure - providing sustainable transport links, recreation and leisure opportunities that promote health and well-being, and should be included in infrastructure provision to support the existing future communities.	4.5	Strategic infrastructure	97		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	Boroughs have to prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to underpin CIL and thus be examined. The study should have formed part of the evidence base for this OLSPG and resulted in an integral IDP. It should not be a separate document. We understand that the Olympic delivery study is in production and suggest it must be agreed and referenced in this section by the host boroughs.	4.6	Delivery Study	98		No change - completed background document
LBTH	[p98] The text on potential sources of funding to secure regeneration in the OLSPG area states that "CIL is likely to become the principal means of funding infrastructure through the development process", and goes on to note that "as currently proposed, the MDC would be able to develop a further local CIL for its area." As we commented in our response to the Mayor's consultation on the proposed MDC in April 2011, it will be essential to recognise that the infrastructural needs of the proposed MDC area cannot be separated from those of its hinterland. The infrastructural requirements arising across the proposed boundary need to be addressed jointly to support convergence: tackling A12 severance is an obvious example. This will require close working between the boroughs and the MDC, which would also need to be given the flexibility to invest outside its boundary. We also suggested that any CIL mechanisms established for the proposed MDC also need to acknowledge that that some of the infrastructure necessary to support development within its boundary may be delivered and/or managed by boroughs and would not necessarily be located within MDC area.	4.6	Delivery Study	98		No change - completed background document
LBH	It will be useful to have a key infrastructure schedule included in this OLSPG document to show what, when, where, whom, how and associated risks.	4.6	Deilvery	98		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	The delivery study is intended to assess, identify and quantify the social, community and transport infrastructure requirements of the development that the OLSPG envisions. It will also assess existing provision across the OLSPG area. The findings from this report may influence the level and amount of infrastructure that has been identified in the document. The Borough therefore reserves the right to further comment on the level type of provision identified following completion of the Delivery Study.	4.6	Delivery Study	98		No change - completed background document
ODA PDT	The proposed study is noted and welcomed, having the potential to provide a useful part of the overall delivery framework for the OLSPG area.	4.6	Delivery Study	98		No change - completed background document
Riverine Centre	It is important that the OLSPG acknowledges that contributions to any strategic infrastructure requirements sought through Section 106 agreements / Community Infrastructure Levies should be considered within the context of the viability of individual proposals in order to ensure development is not fettered.	4.6	Delivery Study	98		No change - completed background document
Land Use Consultants	Add to the second set of bullet points a statement requiring 'An assessment of specific proposals, particularly for transport infrastructure, for potential impacts on European sites, and the potential requirement for HRA'.	4.6	Delivery	98		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	Some commitment to the opportunity to spend CIL outside the OLSPG boundary within the 5 host borough areas would be useful here. Inevitably the picture around s106/Cil is more complex especially in the transition period and some diagrammatic explanation of the operation of these mechanisms may be beneficial here. It is crucial to the achievement of convergence to ensure that the impacts of such large quantum of development are sufficiently mitigated in the surrounding areas. A ready mechanism for this is the opportunity to use CIL monies beyond the boundaries of the development. In addition the Mayor's CIL has to be factored into viability presenting significant challenges to the investment available to tackle convergence. More analysis of how these issues will be dealt with should be provided in this section. Consideration of the position in relation to finance and how this is expected to influence investment over the coming years is vital.	4.7	Funding	98		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
ODA PDT	While many of the requirements are specifically related to the regeneration of the OLSPG area, many (particularly transport) have much wider beneficiaries and, indeed, are vitally needed regardless of the OLSPG regeneration. The funding sources assessment needs to address the wider funding sources and options reflecting these wider benefits. Identify how the Delivery Study or further work that could be carried out subsequent to it might address or identify the wider funding resources that would be needed to deliver the mitigation/infrastructure necessary to meet existing projected growth needs which OLSPG area schemes might be expected to contribute towards.	4.7	Funding	98		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
British Waterways	4.7 Funding In terms of infrastructure levies, BW have previously agreed the setting up of 'canal funds' by the developers of new sites - in London including King's Cross, Paddington Basin, Limehouse Basin - to help meet the raised expectations of communities and to mitigate the impact of new development on a particular area. This should also be implemented here, where there has been significant change, and increased pressure on local open spaces, in including the waterway environment.	4.7	Funding	98		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBH	Some reference and or commitment to the opportunity to spend CIL outside the OLSPG boundary within the 5 host borough areas would be useful here. Inevitably the picture around s106/CIL is more complex especially in the transition period and some diagrammatic explanation of the operation of these mechanisms may be beneficial here.	4.7	Funding	98		Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	Community Infrastructure Levy Waterways should be included as part of the area's essential infrastructure, as above.	4.7	Funding	98		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	In the same way as borough Core Strategies have produced Monitoring Frameworks this SPG should have an Appendix dedicated to the key measures (including convergence) and indicators to show how successfully the SPG is being implemented.	4.8	Monitoring and review	98		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Land Use Consultants	Inclusion of a Development Principle requiring protection, enhancement and management for biodiversity within the OLSPG. This should specifically require that development proposals consider, and if necessary, address potential impacts on European Sites referencing the potential requirement for HRA of specific proposals. This should reflect the supporting text to Development Principle E and the requirement for the provision of open space for biodiversity and access to nature, including reducing recreation pressure on European Sites. This may be similar to Development Principles D2 and D6 which were included in the 5th Draft OLSPG. · It may be considered appropriate that two separate Development Principles are required, one relating to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity as a result of development, and the second the creation of high quality open space for biodiversity and access to natural greenspace. In addition, this could cross reference the Northern Olympic Fringe sub-area and proposals for the creation of the Walthamstow Wetlands nature reserve, and that this must consider potential impacts on European Sites.	2.E	Sustainable development	43		Accept - Review and amend
LBWF	Page 19, 3rd paragraph indicates new homes figure to be 3,200 in the Northern Olympic Fringe Sub-area. The GLA modelling using the GLA typology needs to support this figure. For your reference it should be noted that the NOF AAP area represents a smaller area and the AAP includes 2,500 new homes.	2A	Homes and communities	19		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	The following information is from the Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan: The increase in population would include 2,750 preschool aged children, approximately 2,300 of primary school age and over 1,200 additional children of secondary school age, excluding sixth formers. The masterplan and other proposals in the area will meet new residents and help to combat poor access to services for existing residents, through provision of: 16 new nurseries Primary schools providing 11 forms of entry Three new secondary schools Chobham Academy in Stratford City, a new building for the Stratford School on the former Rokeby School site and a new seven form of entry school in the south of the ward Expansion of the higher and further education offer 23 new GPs and 21 new dentists 2 polyclinics (Chobham (under construction) and Vicarage Lane (opened)) Additional / improved community spaces at Carpenters and Pudding Mill/Sugar House Lane.	2A	Homes and communities	19		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	"This Guidance identifies a number of areas where new housing should be focused. Some of these are on the development platforms the OPLC will inherit after the Games and others on land currently in industrial use which can and should change to provide new housing." Disagree with the above use of the word 'should'. The identified Areas of Change in Hackney Wick still fall within the OIA designation as per the Council's Core Strategy and as such should be primarily used for Industrial employment uses. Whilst employment led mixed use is permitted can include housing, this may not be appropriate in all cases. Permit housing as part of employment led mixed use schemes or will be released from industrial land to permit a greater range of uses.	2A	Homes and communities	19		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
ODA PDT	The principle of seeking the delivery of 'Lifetime Neighbourhoods' is welcomed. The broad housing capacity stated for each could be qualified by highlighting that specific sites and development capacity figures will be established by detailed development plan work carried out by the local planning authorities. With respect to town and local centres within this supporting text it would be helpful to delineate between those that currently exist and those that are planned, for example the text currently gives the impression that Pudding Mill is currently a local centre but is currently not designated as such and does not physically exist as a local centre. Suggest that text in second paragraph of supporting text is changed to read "These in turn could in future be connected to more locally focused centres and transport nodes at Hackney Wick/Fish Island, West Ham, Pudding Mill Lane, Chobham, Three Mills and Maryland."	2A	Homes and communities	19	DP A1	Accept - Review and amend
BioRegional	Contemporaneous Planning of Homes and Other Buildings: There is a tendency for meeting housing targets to be planned separately to developing sustainable communities, which have the access and the supporting community facilities (including local shops, community centres, green spaces, sporting and other leisure, health and education) that are needed to turn an estate into a strong community. This guidance does not explicitly set out what is desired here. If a community-led rather than a housing-led approach is desired it is recommended that the OLSPG (or Mayor of London) consult local communities, together with statutory bodies to create a blueprint of community needs (as well as wider wants and desires) that can guide an enable a community-led approach to regeneration of these sites to be achieved. We support the stated aim to resist the loss of social infrastructure. We would like to see a spatial plan for future social infrastructure that extends beyond educational buildings, to include the full range of social infrastructure expected, including the other aspects mentioned above.. It is important that key facilities (e.g. nurseries, outdoor play areas, local shops) are not pr	2A	Homes and communities	19		Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	Development principle A1 – Building a network of well connected Lifetime Neighbourhoods We support the statement that the area's waterways are an important part of helping support healthy and active neighbourhoods.	2A	Homes and communities	19	DP A1	Supporting - No change
Thames Water	It is essential that the OLSPG recognises the essential role that the operational site at Abbey Mills provides for London. The guidance should ensure that new residential and mixed use development opportunities identified within the southern Olympic fringe that are in proximity to the site do not affect operation, maintenance or opportunities for future additional infrastructure provision which may be required on the site.	2A	Homes and communities	19	DP A1	Accept - Review and amend
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	The development potential of the OLSPG area and the contribution that it can make towards the delivery of 29,000 new homes is fully supported as are the anticipated housing figures for each of the sub-areas. The Southern Olympic Fringe Sub area with an indicative provision figure of 9,600 homes is fully supported together with the recognition that this will primarily be from the <i>"re-use and redevelopment of industrial areas which currently provide few community facilities or homes and which have few physical or social links to the surrounding communities"</i> .	2a	Homes and communities	19	DP A1	Supporting - No change
Inclusive London	Inclusion London recommends that the Mayor's commitment to Lifetime homes standards and dwelling space standards is emphasised and the commitment that 10% of new homes and hotel rooms will be wheelchair accessible is stated more clearly, particularly under 'Home and communities', Section Two.	2A	Homes and communities	19		Partial change considered appropriate
Leyton Orient FC (URS)	We support this development principle and emphasise the importance of retaining and supporting local communities and integrating local communities needs to provide a cohesive sustainable framework for growth.	2a	Homes and communities	19	DP A1	Supporting - No change
NHS East London and City	Given the importance of the concept of Lifetime Neighbourhoods within the guidance, we recommend that the principles of Lifetime Neighbourhoods are spelled out in more detail, including specific guidance on how development can support healthy and active lifestyles for people of all ages and abilities. Alternatively, or additionally, a development principle should be added that specifically addresses the promotion of healthy and active lifestyles. This would ensure that this crucial outcome does not become a marginal issue within development proposals.	2A	Homes and communities	19	OA DP	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
RICS	The delivery of new homes to meet both need and some demand in the broad locations identified should contribute to a more coherent spatial structure for east London, with Stratford and the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park at the centre, successfully co-locating development close to this strategic transport hub. This has long been a message that RICS has been keen to promote to pursue sustainability by reducing the need to travel. This is a particularly useful approach in east London where the disconnect created by many waterways, strategic roads and railways create a disconnect that has been exacerbated by decades of under-investment. The resulting deprivation and neglect in this post-industrial landscape means that much needs to be done to integrate development, provide local transport links and to improve the urban fabric and public realm.	2A	Homes and communities	19		General comment - No change
RICS	We would though, highlight the potential impact of the new 'Affordable Rent' model and changes to the benefit system in developing the stable and balanced communities planned. The issues are well publicised and widely understood, though the impact is not easy to quantify. The issue lies with the available income once accommodation costs have been met and applies to both those in relatively low-paid employment as well as those on benefits. This change at national level impacts on those in London where land values and a vibrant rental market have led to higher rents in many areas. This could be a significant issue for residents in receipt of benefits in east London, particularly as regeneration achievements are likely to lead to uplift in private sector rental values as improvements to the area grows. Eighty per cent of local market rental values could be unaffordable to many of those seeking to make their home in east London given that wage increases are currently fairly low. As Affordable Rent will be the main grant-funded affordable provision in the next few years this could have an impact on resident choice of housing location and its proximity to employment in east London. The exp	2A	Homes and communities	19		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Shelter	New homes and neighbourhoods rightly form a central part of the vision for the Olympic Legacy area, and Shelter welcomes the identification in the draft SPG of the potential for 29,000 homes in a "network of Lifetime Neighbourhoods that will meet the needs of new and existing communities." As the draft SPG also states, Lifetime Neighbourhoods require homes of different sizes and tenures, and we welcome the emphasis on the need for a high proportion of family sized housing in the Olympic Legacy area.	2A	Homes and communities	19	DP A1	Supporting - No change
H Forman & Son	We support the broad principles of the OLSPG, and that it has the potential to provide around 29,000 new homes and 1.35 million square metres of new and improved commercial floorspace and confirms Stratford as a focus for regeneration and change. The site falls within an Area of Change (Figures 2.A.1 and 3.5.1) which we would support, in particular given the aspirations referenced above.	2A	Homes and communities	19		Supporting - No change
OPLC	Release of surplus industrial land particularly around AND WITHIN the Olympic Park	2A	Homes and communities	19		Accept - Review and amend
BioRegional	High Density Sustainable Living: We are concerned that the wider aspects of developing a socially sustainable community are built in at the master-planning stage, including for the conversion of the Olympics Village site. This should address issues such as how to ensure that high density (e.g. tower block) living can still achieve high level of wellbeing and ecologically sustainable living and develop high levels of social cohesion. We envisage that monitoring activities, potentially involving academic inputs (e.g. UEL) and the social landlord (Triathlon) could help ensure a sustainable community is achieved.	2A	Homes and communities	19		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	It should be noted that applying London wide averages of child yield to Newham will not be appropriate where there is a high proportion of young adults in the borough and birth rates are the highest in London. We consider our needs are higher than average and heavily skewed to primary school provision. This is not reflected at all in the OLSPG . More direct reference to up to date borough identified education needs should be the principle by which education infrastructure is determined.	2A	Homes and communities	19		Accept - Review and amend
BioRegional	Allowable Solutions: We note that this SPG overlaps with the LDF of the London boroughs and expect that retrofit and improvement of existing buildings (e.g. housing in Clapton Park) is reflected in the LDF so not covered in this document. This is important as creating a sustainable legacy of this area will require improvement of much of the quality and sustainability performance of existing infrastructure and buildings as well as new developments. We would expect an indicative statement in the SPG that future 'allowable solutions' are achieved in the area and reflected in area action/master plans that are developed to deliver the plan.	2A	Homes and communities	19		Partial change considered appropriate



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBWF	Figure 2.A.1 Sub-area housing outputs, Area of change should include 'Opportunity Sites 11,19, 23, 17, 13' shown on pages 26,27 & 28 of the NOF AAP. These Opportunity Sites proposed changes to mixed use such as residential, social infrastructure and employment uses. Recent LBWF planning applications have been received for proposed mixed use development at those sites.	2A	Homes and communities	20	Fig 2.A.1	Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	Figure 2.A.1 Sub-area housing output We would suggest that the indicated 'areas of change' should include the directly adjacent waterways so that they are integral to the design and not just seen as a backdrop or setting for development.	2A	Homes and communities	20	Fig 2.A.1	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	Figure 2.A.1 Sub-area housing outputs Leyton Orient Football Club's Brisbane Road stadium should be shown as and 'Area of change' on Figure 2.A.1. Potential exists for future development at the stadium and this potential should be recognised as a generator of change within the Olympic Legacy area. In addition, Leyton Orient Football Club's Brisbane Road Stadium is shown on Figure 2.A.1 with a green wash. This suggests that the Stadium is an area of open space. The stadium is not an area of open space and this green wash should therefore be removed. The stadium is a developed mixed use site.	2A	Homes and communities	20	Fig 2.A.1	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
RICS	The rationale for identifying the location of potential housing takes into account the settlement hierarchy described, with most housing being located in the Southern Olympic Fringe, Stratford and Hackney Wick-Fish Island Sub-areas to correspond with District and local centres and transport nodes. This is consistent with the relative scarcity of public transport in the Northern Fringe Sub-area and with the available capacity in the Olympic Park. Figure 2.A.1 illustrates this well.	2A	Homes and communities	20	fig 2.A.1	Supporting - No change
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace supports 'Figure 2.A.1 Sub-area housing outputs' in respect to the Southern Olympic Fringe. Specifically, Workspace supports the identified areas of change and the requirement to provide 9,600 homes within this area. Workspace considers that the areas of change within the Stratford area should be amended to include 'Stratford Office Village'.	2A	Homes and communities	20	fig 2.A.1	Accept - Review and amend
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Stratford Office Village currently provides self-contained office accommodation between Romford Road and Broadway on the edge of Stratford town centre. This accommodation is characterised by high vacancy rates. It is the medium to long-term intention of Workspace to modernise and redevelop this site to continue to provide good value small business units. In order to do this, Stratford Office Village will require regeneration and renewal to meet the modern and future needs of London's businesses. Such regeneration requires funding and Workspace proposes that if this is to be privately funded, a high-value economic driver will be necessary to enable redevelopment and ensure the overall viability of regeneration. Without a mixed-use development that incorporates higher value uses, the redevelopment and modernisation would be unviable and there is a risk that the office accommodation at Stratford Office Village will deteriorate and in so doing could undermine the vision for this area. Furthermore a mixed-use development at this site could deliver education, cultural and arts, retail and residential uses in this part of Stratford Town Centre.	2A	Homes and communities	20	Fig 2.A.1	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	The area south of the Olympic Stadium was designated as a development platform in the 2007 Olympic and Legacy Transformation planning permissions. The situation has moved on significantly since then and while the land will still be available for development, the current stadium procurement process includes this land to support the operation of the future Stadium. Athletics is anticipated to be at the core of any future use (reinforced by London's successful bid to host the 2017 Athletics World Cup) and this will require a warm up track which will occupy a significant portion of the development platform. To promote housing, at this stage before the strategic operation of the Stadium is finalised we believe unduly constrains the viability of the future operation of the Olympic Stadium. This development platform should not be designated as suitable for housing at this stage. More generally on the description of the stadium we recommend the following wording "The 2007 planning consent [ref] allows for the main Olympic Stadium to be reduced in size to 25,000 seats."	2A	Homes and communities	20	Fig 2.A.1	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	Southern Olympic Fringe boundary. Should this not go north to the railway line in the South West rather than being along the road. This would also bring it in line with the Bromley by bow Masterplan SPG that has just been consulted on.	2A	Homes and communities	20	Fig 2.A.1	Accept - Review and amend
BioRegional	We are concerned that sites for housing seem to have been identified first with community facilities secondary (e.g. Fig 3.4.1 notes housing sites and a possible school site).	2A	Homes and communities	20	Fig 3.4.1	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBH	'Sites currently identified for potential new schools are shown on Fig 2.B.3 and include the following: 'Cardinal Pole Catholic School in Hackney which will be a new secondary school for 1,050 pupils which is currently split across two campuses and is due to be completed in 2012. 'Cardinal Pole School is not a new school. It will move from its current two sites to one site in 2012 and we wish to stress that the school on its new location will not offer any additional places. Since it will not lead to any changes or increased/reduced number of places offered we are not clear why it gets a special mention. However, funding for a new 4FE Academy at one of the former Cardinal Pole school sites (Victoria Park Road) has recently been confirmed by the DfE. This is expected to open in 2014.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	Accept - Review and amend
LBN	This section of the document aligns with Newham's stated aims of prioritising family housing and building quality neighbourhoods. However, at 30% it does not align with Newham's 39% target. And gives further weight to our concerns about the extent of the guidance area and level of detail. The Core Strategy is underpinned by bespoke evidence and needs to be accurately reflected here. There is otherwise a danger of this conflict being exploited to the detriment of the quality of place making. It is also confusing for potential investors when what is needed is clarity and consistency.	2A	Homes and communities	21		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	Page 21 refers to affordable rent as forming the bulk of new grant funded schemes. Whilst this may well be true the SPG should reflect the East London Housing Partnerships view on this new product, that is, we are concerned about its negative effect on affordability. We want to see a continuation of family housing at target rent and a gradual increase in rents, if necessary, as units get smaller to lessen the negative impact on families, while maintaining the required financial viability, to ensure continued delivery.	2A	Homes and communities	21		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p21-22] We welcome the emphasis on promoting family housing and endorse the requirement for all housing to meet Lifetime Homes standards. The areas shown as particularly suitable for higher levels of family housing in figure 2.A.2 (not 2.B.2 as it is referred to in the text) are aligned with the guidance presented in the draft Fish Island Area Action Plan, which identifies the following locations for family housing: • Fish Island North, outside the core Hub area; • Mid Fish Island, with the main opportunities on sites fronting the Hertford Union Canal and Lea Navigation and through the comprehensive redevelopment of large scale sites such as Neptune Wharf; • Fish Island East.	2A	Homes and communities	21		Supporting - No change
LBTH	• [p21] We also support the Mayor's commitment to maximising the provision of affordable housing in the OLSPG area. However, as we commented in response to the May 2011 draft, we are concerned that development principle A2 requires that "tenure mix should also reflect the relatively high levels of social rented housing that exists in parts of the OLSPG area". We are concerned that this wording could be used to justify the provision of lower levels of affordable housing than either we or the Mayor aspire to achieve in this area. The Tower Hamlets Core Strategy sets out the Council's requirement for 35-50% affordable homes on sites providing 10 or more units, reflecting the high levels of demand for affordable housing in the borough. We would expect that target to be maintained in development coming forward within the Tower Hamlets part of the OLSPG area. We would therefore suggest that the final sentence of the development principle, and any other references to this requirement, be replaced with wording to the effect that "tenure mix should also reflect local housing priorities and need". In Tower Hamlets, our priority remains the delivery of social rented accommodation	2A	Homes and communities	21		Accept - Review and amend
LBTH	• [p21] As you may be aware, the East London Housing Partnership recently supplied guidance to OPLC on Host Boroughs' positions in relation to Affordable Rent and Fixed Term Tenancies, along with draft guidance on tenure split and maximum rent levels for the Legacy Communities Scheme. The recommendations in relation to affordable rent levels reflect the consensus that rents at 80% of local market rents will be unaffordable to most people in need of affordable housing in many parts of the Host Boroughs. This is a particular issue in Tower Hamlets. Given the draft SPG's welcome commitment to maximising the provision of affordable housing in the OLSPG area, it would helpful if the document could acknowledge this issue in its discussion of Affordable Rent provision.	2A	Homes and communities	21		Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBH	Please amend the second sentence in the box, to convey the idea that the residential mix should reflect a sustainable balance between families with young children and teenagers and other household types: "New housing proposals should secure the maximum reasonable provision of affordable housing as well as communities that are mixed and balanced by tenure, bedroom-size and household composition, and household income." Please also amend the Development Principle to make it clear that family housing should not be concentrated in a single tenure, e.g. social housing - there should be an attractive family housing offer across all tenures and incomes.	2A	Homes and communities	21		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	The emphasis placed on delivery of family housing is supported, being underlined by the need identified for example in borough housing evidence base work. The text confirming the need to take account of sub-regional and borough housing needs and reflect these in the different OLSPG areas is welcomed.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	With regard to the reference to 'affordable rent' in this section, it may be worth highlighting the approach outlined in the Mayor's 'Revised Housing Strategy Proposals' (August 2011) which proposes to "deliver Affordable Rent homes at a range of rents, with a programme average of 65 per cent of median market rent and rents charged within the new welfare caps". It may also be worth including reference to the developing borough positions on percentage of median market rents that are seen as appropriate that are likely to be specific to the areas within the OLSPG. Consider including reference to the 'affordable rent' position stated in the Mayors 'Revised Housing Strategy Proposals' of August 2011	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	The text and Figure 2A.2 is helpful in identifying the areas particularly suitable for a higher level of family housing. However, caution is required in identifying sites or locations which are not in any other way currently designated for change or being considered for such a change, e.g. identification of Morrison supermarket site in Stratford, given that OLSPG should not be creating new policy proposals or designations. It is recommended that the sites/locations identified in the OLSPG should be reviewed to ensure that these are already identified within development plan documents of associated LDF guidance to ensure that no new specific designations are being made. Consider reviewing identified sites and locations against those identified in borough work related to LDF development plan documents to ensure that no specific new designations are being made by default within the document.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	Accept - Review and amend
BioRegional	Clarity on Affordable Homes: It is not clear what the 'maximum reasonable' provision of affordable housing means, and may differ depending on housing need, council or developer point of view. We propose that for clarity the OLSPG should have a target.	2A	Homes and communities	21		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
BioRegional	While this section defines a new type of affordable housing (Affordable Rent) it does not set out what the proposed breakdown of affordable housing should be by type (e.g. social rented, shared ownership, shared equity) or what percentage of the overall housing target is required to be affordable.	2A	Homes and communities	21		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LVRPA	The OLSPG needs to support spaces that lie within the Park and the wider Olympic Legacy area to flourish as visitor and cultural hubs. This is particularly important in relation to Three Mills which is also identified under Development Principle A2 'Promoting family housing and increasing housing choice' as an 'Area of Change suitable for a higher level of family housing' (page 21 and Fig 2.A.2 Family Housing Locations).	2A	Homes and communities	21		Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
British Waterways	Development principle A2 – Promoting family housing and increasing housing choice We note the statements here “Parts of Pudding Mill Lane and Blackwater Road are considered suitable for higher levels of family housing because their size, geography, water frontages and connectivity...The waterside sites at Fish Island, Bromley by Bow and Three Mills also have the potential to provide attractive family housing as does Old Ford where the OPLC are proposing a new family focussed neighbourhood and new community facilities.” We are keen to see active water frontages that are animated by adjacent uses. We therefore favour mixed-use developments that can provide animation of the ground floor uses and passive surveillance to the waterside environment, rather than purely residential, which offers more limited activity.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	The general principle of promoting family housing and increasing housing choice within the OLSPG area, is supported and whilst a general requirement to seek ‘maximum levels’ of family housing is also supported in principle, appropriate levels of provision clearly need to reflect the constraints and opportunities afforded by the specific site; the wider identified need in the area and the to be ‘reasonable’ when considered in the context of competing planning requirements. This point needs to be emphasised more clearly.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Inclusive London	While we respect the Mayor’s intention to provide a mix of housing to reduce the likelihood of areas with a high percentage of social housing or high cost homes, we think there is an over emphasis on family sized houses at the expense of affordable housing, for which there is only a weak commitment. Inclusion London recommends that the Mayor’s commitment to Affordable Housing is stated throughout the document, but particularly under ‘Home and communities’, Section Two.	2A	Homes and communities	21		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Landprop Services	ERROR - Page 21 should be Fig 2.A.2.	2A	Homes and communities	21	1st Para	Accept - Review and amend
Landprop Services	Support flexibility in affordable housing	2A	Homes and communities	21		Supporting - No change
Lend lease	Homes and Communities – A sensible and affordable strategy to allow families to settle in the area is important for a community to grow. This should be an inclusive policy to allow for low and middle earners to gain access to suitable housing provision. Commercial terms should be negotiated with private developers so as to allow for a universally affordable provision.	2a	Homes and communities	21		General comment - No change
Neptune Group	Whilst we acknowledge the need for balanced tenure and housing mix, we question whether the areas identified for higher levels of family housing (40% plus) on the waterside fringes of mid FI are appropriate, both in terms of location and scale of designation. We consider that the capacity and suitability of the area for ‘house’ typologies should be investigated through future master planning exercises and the SPG should avoid designating large areas for such in advance of that exercise.	2A	Homes and communities	21		Partial change considered appropriate
Shelter	However, Shelter has serious concerns about the draft SPG's approach to achieving an appropriate tenure mix. The draft says little about the need for affordable housing, beyond the statement in policy 2.A.2 that “new housing proposals should secure the maximum reasonable provision of affordable housing as well as communities that are mixed and balanced by tenure and household income.”	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Shelter	We are concerned that the phrase „the maximum reasonable “ will be insufficiently strong to ensure that forthcoming local plans prioritise the provision of an adequate supply of affordable homes. We note that the London Plan 2011 sets a strategic London-wide target of 13,200 affordable homes per annum – and requires boroughs to set overall targets for affordable housing supply “reflecting the borough's contribution towards meeting strategic affordable housing targets in light of the framework set by the Plan and guidance in SPG”. Yet the SPG itself sets no overall target for affordable housing provision, nor any requirement that local plans should do so. This is a worrying omission.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Shelter	We are equally concerned that the policy 2.A.2 goes on to say that the tenure mix delivered should “reflect the relatively high levels of social rented housing that exists in parts of the OLSPG area.” This statement may be interpreted to mean that detailed plans for the Olympic Legacy area should provide for fewer affordable homes than would be the case if the surrounding area currently had a lower proportion of social rented homes.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Shelter	This would be a thoroughly unsatisfactory result, for several reasons: Firstly, the implied logic is that the tenure mix of new developments should be designed to adjust the overall tenure mix of an unspecified wider area towards an undefined „balance “. The lack of clarity in this policy is itself troubling, and increases the risk of lengthy and costly disputes over the content of detailed local plans – which the publication of SPGs is meant to reduce. Secondly, such an approach ignores the fact that the Olympic Legacy is a uniquely large scale development project that will create entire new neighbourhoods. The current tenure mix of the surrounding areas is therefore far less relevant than would be the case for other, far smaller developments. Thirdly, this line of reasoning fails to take account of the fact that, as the SPG itself notes, the only form of affordable housing that will be grant funded by the HCA will be Affordable Rent, offered at up to 80% of market rents. As social rents in east London are typically around 35% of market, few households that currently access social housing will be able to afford the new tenure – especially if the project achieves its stated aim of	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Shelter	Most importantly, the wider Olympic Legacy area has exceptionally high levels of housing need that demand a substantial affordable housing contribution from the Legacy. The four surrounding boroughs have over 82,000 households on their housing registers – including almost 32,000 in Newham alone. Average house price to income ratios range from 7.04 to 8.68, making homeownership far beyond the reach of most local households. And the private rented sector is equally unaffordable: all four of the surrounding boroughs are in the 30 most unaffordable local authorities in the country. Average private rents for a two bed home are between 70% (Hackney) and 50% (Waltham Forest) of average take home pay – and for families requiring larger homes the situation is even worse.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Shelter	Finally, if the implicit aim of policy 2.A.2 is indeed to avoid increasing the proportion of affordable housing (a position Shelter does not support), this could be achieved while still delivering a significant number of affordable homes in the Olympic Legacy area. The housing stock of the four surrounding boroughs currently contains 35% affordable housing.2 If half of the 29,000 homes planned in the SPG were affordable, this proportion would only rise to 36%.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Shelter	Shelter believes that the SPG should include clear and strong statements about the amount and type of affordable housing that should be provided in the Olympic Legacy, and planned for in local plans. This should include an overall target for affordable homes: at a minimum this should reflect a proportional share of the London Plan target of 13,200 affordable homes per annum, although we believe that the level of need in east London and the scale of public investment in the Olympic Legacy area merits a higher target.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace objects to the requirement for at least 30% of all housing to have three or more bedrooms. Workspace also objects to the requirement for at least 40% of all housing to have three or more bedrooms in the areas identified in Figure 2.B.2.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Whilst the requirement to increase the provision of family housing in this area is laudable, it has the potential to undermine the delivery of important regeneration schemes within this area. Furthermore this policy contradicts the requirements of Paragraph 23 of PPS3 which states that developers should bring forward proposals for market housing which reflect demand and the profile of households requiring market housing in order to sustain mixed communities. Workspace considers that the housing mix should be determined on a site-by-site basis. It is important that the market housing mix is determined by the private sector so that residential schemes can respond to the market demands and site specifics at any given time, taking into account market signals. Failure to do so could result in a regeneration scheme being unviable.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Furthermore a number of the sites identified in Figure 2.B.2 have complicated site conditions and would not necessarily be suitable for this type of housing. Workspace considers that this requirement should be amended to encourage family housing with the actual mix being considered on a site-by-site basis that takes into the local context and site conditions.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Workspace Group (GVA)	In terms of the delivery of affordable housing, we consider that this should be sought in the context of viability in the first instance, and we would recommend that guidance should encourage innovative approaches to its delivery, including the provision of offsite affordable accommodation and commuted sums, where it would not be viable or appropriate for affordable accommodation to be delivered on-site and where better outcomes can be achieved to the benefit of the community. Therefore, whilst the importance of viability is recognised in the supporting text to Development Principle A2, this key factor in the delivery of housing should be more explicitly referenced within any final wording of Development Principle A2.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
OPLC	Not each individual family home can be expected to have access to a private garden. Where typologies allow this should be encouraged but where it is not feasible shared or communal gardens and open space will be a more appropriate provision.	2A	Homes and communities	21		Partial change considered appropriate
OPLC	The OPLC considers that reference to the capacity of 6,600 homes on land under its control north of Stratford High Street is not consistent with the detailed analysis within the LCS. The submitted LCS proposes up to 6,800 homes across all the legacy development platforms excluding the one to the south of the Olympic Stadium which is referred to above. Capacities should be referred to on a sub area basis rather than a 'land owner' basis.	2A	Homes and communities	21		Partial change considered appropriate
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	Development Principle A2 – Promoting Family Housing and Increasing Housing Choice Leyton Orient Football Club should be identified as an 'Area of change particularly suitable for a higher level of family housing'. Recent developments at Leyton Orient Football Club's stadium at Brisbane Road have provided over 200 new residential units of various sizes and tenures. Significant potential remains to provide further residential units which could include family housing.	2A	Homes and communities	21	DP A2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Design Council	Family housing - restriction should be put in place for flatted developments and incentivise family housing if 40% is to be achieved.	2A		21		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p22] Figure 2.A.2 shows the area to the south of the Olympic Stadium as a location "particularly suitable for a higher level of family housing". As you may be aware, an athletics warm-up track is currently proposed for this location, which the OPLC in its Legacy Communities Scheme planning application proposes would also provide playing field facilities for the nearby primary school in Fish Island East. Our strong preference, which we have expressed to OPLC, would be for playing fields to be delivered closer to the school, within Fish Island East. Should this not prove possible, however, then the athletics track would need to be retained in order to support the operation of the primary school, which is itself required to support population growth in the area. The retention of the warm-up track would in turn preclude residential development across a significant portion of the area location to the south of the stadium. The document should therefore reflect this uncertainty, both in plans and in its assumptions about housing numbers in the Olympic Park	2A	Homes and communities	22	Fig 2.A.2	Accept - Review and amend
LBWF	Figure 2.A.2 Family housing locations, predominately family housing should include 'Opportunity Sites 19, 17 shown on page 28 of the NOF AAP. These Opportunity Sites proposed changes to mixed use such as residential, social infrastructure and employment uses.	2A	Homes and communities	22	Fig 2.A.2	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	LTGDC generally support Figure 2.A.2 Family housing locations, but question whether in practice Pudding Mill Lane can accommodate family housing across the whole of the site – the impact on residential amenity of the portal for Crossrail and existing rail lines does not seem to have been taken account of enough. Newham accepted this at the EIP into their Core Strategy, and amended the policy text accordingly. The OLSPG should use the same wording.	2A	Homes and communities	22	Fig 2.A.2	Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	Figure 2.A.2 Family housing location This diagram indicates family housing along several water frontages, and we would request that consideration be given to our statement above.	2A	Homes and communities	22	Fig 2.A.2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBH	The updated Hackney Wick AAP identifies this area as a suitable for some amount of family housing east of the Lee Navigation because of its access to open space and the opportunity to build new family accommodation in a range of typologies as part of a mixed use scheme. Amend Figure 2.A.2 to include higher level of family housing between the IBC and MPC and the MUA or as a statement in the text.	2A	Homes and communities	22		Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Riverine Centre	Likewise, Figures 2.A.2: Family Housing Locations and Figure 2.B.2: Mixed Use, Cultural and Creative Clusters should also be amended in line with recommendations for Figure 3.4.2.	2A	Homes and communities	22	Fig 2.A.2	Partial change considered appropriate
RICS	The approach in prioritising family housing in the locations shown in Figure 2.A.2 is consistent with achieving Convergence objectives within Lifetime Neighbourhoods goals in creating balanced and stable communities through tenure mix and choice. The levels of 30 to 40 percent (family housing locations) family housing should help provide the stability needed. Family housing locations are appropriate, though these will need local transport provision where this is lacking to avoid social isolation and lack of access to the wider OLSPG. The use of waterside locations for family housing should help make these neighbourhoods attractive and reduce churn.	2A	Homes and communities	22	Fig 2.A.2	Supporting - No change
OPLC	While the OPLC supports the provision of family housing at Pudding Mill Lane, it does not consider the location of this area being served by the DLR station, containing significant infrastructure, necessarily will achieve "at least 40%" its suitability for mixed use and its proximity to A11 all points toward a more flatted development.	2A	Homes and communities	22	Fig 2.A.2	Partial change considered appropriate
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	Figure 2.A.2 Family Housing Locations Leyton Orient Football Club's Brisbane Road stadium should be shown as an 'Area of change, particularly suitable for a higher level of family housing' on Figure 2.A.2. Potential exists for future development at the stadium to provide family housing and this potential should be recognised within the Olympic Legacy area. In addition, Leyton Orient Football Club's Brisbane Road Stadium is shown on Figure 2.A.2 with a green wash. This suggests that the Stadium is an area of open space. The stadium is not an area of open space and this green wash should therefore be removed. The stadium is a developed mixed use site.	2A	Homes and communities	22	Fig 2.A.2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p23-24] The current draft of the Fish Island AAP Proposed Submission Document identifies a need for a further one or two primary schools and one secondary school in Fish Island, in line with the areas of search identified in the Core Strategy. Following the assessment of a number of sites on Fish Island North and Mid Fish Island, the Council's view is that there is no single site west of the Lea Navigation large enough to deliver a secondary school. However, the anticipated comprehensive redevelopment of Fish Island East does provides an opportunity to deliver a secondary school as part of a wider residential led development, particularly as this area is under the single ownership of the OPLC. A primary school site alongside other forms of development potentially as part of a mixed use development in mid Fish Island, is considered deliverable. The relevant text and plans in the final draft of the OLSPG should be updated to reflect this position.	2A	Homes and communities	23		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	Development Principle A3 seeks that new development is supported by infrastructure and that this should be secured by planning obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy. This is supported, but should be extended to consider other methods of accommodating and securing needed infrastructure. Clearly the plans of key organisations such as colleges, universities and health services are important. For example, we acknowledge in the Newham Core Strategy and Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan that both Newham College and New Vic both wish to relocate so that they have a presence in Stratford. This is also acknowledged in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	Resources (Schools Organisation) advise that it appears that while the right requirements for nurseries, primary and secondary schools are identified , provision of sites for primary schools in the right locations remains an issue. Moreover, given our current experience of provision of school places not keeping pace with growth we are concerned that it is demonstrated in this document that an adequate amount of school provision will be delivered in time for new homes.	2A	Homes and communities	23		General comment - No change
LBH	Under Development Principle A3, the proposed future provision of schools is rightly identified. Given the high proportion of family homes in the areas identified on map 2.A.2 (40% +), it is recommended that the OLSPG should also identify the provision of youth and other out-of-school services as an important priority.	2A	Homes and communities	23		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	This is very much school focussed. What about other social infrastructure e.g. health etc? There is a need for this document to provide clearer guidance on the potential for social infrastructure provided to support new housing to contribute to the achievement of convergence by improving provision for existing/adjoining communities. It is hoped that the work that URS are undertaking will help address and inform this section. Amend and update the section 2.A Homes and communities, as necessary based on the findings from the Delivery Study. Clearer guidance should be provided on all forms social infrastructure.	2A	Homes and communities	23		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
ODA PDT	The principle of securing necessary social infrastructure as identified here is supported. A reference to planning obligations being sought in line with Regulations 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 may be helpful in qualifying the extent to which planning obligations can secure such contributions.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
ODA PDT	This development principle is welcomed given the ODA aims in creating sporting venues designed with a focus on their legacy use and also the recognition in the text of the ODA integration of inclusive access to the venues and parkland.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A4	Supporting - No change
BioRegional	Prioritizing Visitors over Locals: A4. It is as of yet unclear what the principle A4, on creating a lasting sporting legacy, means in practice. This should be supported by a community consultation process to maximise the tangible benefits that can return to local people as the priority over (as well continuing to attract) visitors from further afield.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A4	General comment - No change
LVRPA	The Authority supports the Development Principle A4 'Creating a lasting sporting legacy' and the reference made to the role of the regional sporting facilities and leisure opportunities provided by the Park Authority as well as the retained venues that the Park Authority will manage.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A4	Supporting - No change
London Cycling Campaign	Venues will need good provision for everyday use and enough space for good cycle parking to be included as a realistic part of the travel plans for major events. Italicised text should read "This will mean: · providing high quality facilities for walking and cycling for everyday purposes that will allow 20% of journeys under 5 miles to be made by bike · ensuring that there is sufficient reserved space so that transport plans for major events can be required to provide secure temporary cycle parking facilities sufficient to attract demand in addition to the permanent provision · improved signage and access to public transport, · provision for coaches and taxis.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A4	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Shelter	The whole document is light on the need to provide good quality cycle parking. This should be to a standard that matches that in Hillingdon and significantly exceeds the current London Plan minimum (which is currently under review). The London Plan in fact encourages higher standards and the local conditions are more than suitable - there being lots of new 'sustainable' development, and a high cycling potential.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A3	Partial change considered appropriate
Landprop Services	Social Infrastructure is too prescriptive.	2A	Homes and communities	23		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Leyton Orient FC (URS)	Eton Manor recommended 15,000 capacity stadium, while we are not convinced that this is an especially suitable location for the comparatively elite sport of tennis, our plans do acknowledge the existing Legacy proposal. However we believe the greater need of the surrounding communities including Leyton are facilities for team activities and spectators.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A4	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Cycling Campaign	PLEASE ADD ADDITION TEXT The OLSPG area includes a number of significant sporting and leisure venues, and provision will have to be made for the transport needs these uses and events will generate. <i>This will mean encouraging walking and cycling, improved signage and access to public transport, and provision for coaches and taxis.</i>	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A4	Accept - Review and amend
London Sustainable Development Commission	The SPG does refer to the London Plan policy 3.7, which suggests that such analysis and consultation should take place as part of the development of proposals for larger sites (page 23). However unless some overview is provided in the OLSPG, it will be very difficult to assess whether proposals are assisting the existing communities.	2A	Homes and communities	23		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
MPA/MPS (CgMs)	MN summary - MPA support DP A3	2A	Homes and communities	23		Supporting - No change



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
National Federation of Artists Studio Providers	Development Principle A3: NFASP welcomes the references to Social Infrastructure, and the inclusion of cultural facilities within that. It asks the Mayor to note that cultural facilities would include places where people can actively engage in making and practising visual and other kinds of art (as well as places where people might enjoy art presented to them) and that visual artists living and working in and near the locality can make a substantial contribution to this. Visual artists have also, in many places across the UK, been commissioned, placed, located or offered studio space in community facilities (community centres, schools etc). This kind of studio provision often works best where there is a close and symbiotic relationship with neighbouring (professionally managed) artists' studios.	2A	Homes and communities	23		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Neptune Group	In respect of social infrastructure (development principle A3) we would welcome an open assessment / testing of provision required and how this is anticipated to be delivered in terms of phasing. Such a process will allow individual landowners the ability to assess capacity and address, where necessary, in a manner that does not inhibit the scale or programme of development of key sites in key sub-areas.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A3	Partial change considered appropriate
RICS	Policy 3.17 of the London Plan highlights the need for social infrastructure to support London's growing population and the need to resist the loss of social infrastructure through development. This applies particularly to planned development in east London and the likely growth in population resulting from regeneration and new housing. The likely increase in population of 60 000 and there will be a significant role for the development industry in major developments in working in partnership to secure the best outcomes for east London in providing the new social infrastructure needed. The cross-sector collaboration involved will relate to the role of Neighbourhoods and the Neighbourhood Plans set out in the Localism Act and should, with in the National Planning Policy Framework, include the goal of promoting business and growth, so a balanced approach will be needed in prioritising deliverables.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
RICS	RICS property professionals have a long history of involvement in all the stages of developing social infrastructure, including schools and sporting and leisure facilities and are likely to take a leading role in east London. There is an opportunity however to promote skills in the construction and property management industries in the schools and colleges proposed. This would help redress the loss of skills in the construction industry in particular and help provide the expertise needed to build new communities in east London, as well as delivering job opportunities. RICS offers accreditation with chartered status for property professionals but has recently developed accreditation at a technical level with its new Associate grade of membership that is open to those working in the property sector without a degree. We would actively seek to promote this as a useful competency based accreditation across a range of specialisms should appropriate learning opportunities be offered in schools and Further and Higher Education in the area and would welcome the	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Sustainable Development Commission	The OLSPG, in relation to social infrastructure, indicates that the Delivery Study 'will assess existing provision across the OLSPG area' (page 23). The current draft of the SPG gives little indication that any such assessment has influenced the development of guidance. Only education is given any consideration (page 23 and figure 2.A.3), and even here there is currently no indication that there is any co-ordination with the needs of the existing communities and existing provision. This lack of consideration is particularly clear in the section covering retail provision where there is no mention of local shops (page 25 and figure 2.B.1). There is no mention of other local facilities such as leisure or health, or of local open space and allotments, all of which will be of major significance to the adjacent local communities. LSDC expects these issues have been given consideration in the Delivery Study assessment, and taken through into the next draft of the OLSPG.	2A	Homes and communities	23		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace considers that a balanced approach should be taken when considering the value of the overall planning obligations package, thereby ensuring the viability and deliverability of the proposed development to meet strategic objectives. As such, Workspace considers that any S106 contributions should be applied on a site - by - site basis and adheres to the requirements of Circular 05/2005. Planning obligations must only be imposed when it can be demonstrated that they are needed to mitigate against the impact of the development.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (GVA)	We recognise the need for new development to be supported by necessary social infrastructure, and that planning contributions are a means of ensuring that the needs of existing and new communities are met. To ensure consistency with the approach taken by the London Plan, however, the Development Principle should have regard to the economic viability of individual developments when seeking to secure planning contributions. This should be explicitly recognised in the final wording of the Development Principle.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
OPLC	The LCS is proposing NINE nurseries estimated at 50 FTE places although only floor space is applied for. The suggested locations for the nurseries are arbitrary and do not seem considered. Please refer to the LCS proposals.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A3	Accept - Review and amend
RICS	The Sporting Legacy of the 2012 Games has very recently been boosted by the news that London is to host the International Athletics Championship in 2012, reinforcing the capital's reputation as a leader in hosting world class sporting events. This will have a number of consequences for regeneration in east London. Firstly, consideration will need to be given to the facilities and services needed to support the IAC including the potential requirement for all or part of the Media Centre. This could mean that future disposal may need to be delayed or scaled back until 2018. It is not yet apparent whether other venues will need to be retained. This may impact on the programme for the transformation of the Olympic Park post-2012 as visitor access will be needed to part of the site including the Stadium itself. Nor is it clear if the planned reduction in seating should be delayed until 2019. The IAC will however enhance the sporting legacy of 2012 and east London's expertise in hosting such events. It would be positive if a distinct Athletics Legacy could evolve to augment the 2012 Legacy but and to go beyond this in promoting sporting achievement and activity based health outcomes for	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A4	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	The OLSPG could usefully promote a viable mixed use stadium with necessary supporting infrastructure as appropriate.	2A	Homes and communities	23	DP A3	Accept - Review and amend
LBTH	It may also be helpful to refer in the text and map to the nine form entry secondary school at Bow Locks: although it will lie just outside the OLSPG boundary, it is nonetheless relevant in supporting the population growth that the document envisages. This school will accommodate the four forms of entry from Bow Boys School and provide a further five forms of additional capacity.	2A	Homes and communities	24		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	[p24] The map on page 24 omits the proposed primary school in Bromley-by-Bow, although this is referred to in the text on page 23. The school should be added to the map.	2A	Homes and communities	24	Fig 2.A.3	Accept - Review and amend
LBH	As per the comments above made on Figure 2.2.1 OLSPG Areas of Change in relation to reflecting the OIA designation as per the Council's Core Strategy / including the small triangle of SIL. Amend Figure 2.A.1 to reflect the OIA boundary as per Hackney's Core Strategy Proposals Map. Also map the small triangle of SIL as an 'Area of Change'.	2A	Homes and communities	24	Fig 2.A.3	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	LTGDC have a number of comments on Figure 2.A.3 Map of New Schools and Chobham College. The new primary school at Bromley by Bow (granted planning permission in 2010 as part of the Tesco's application) is not shown on the map. The text on page 79 for Hackney Wick Fish Island refers to a need for a new secondary school. This isn't shown on the map. LTGDC understand that the London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Hackney support provision of the secondary school on Fish Island East. Provided evidence is produced that shows that this level of facility is required and will serve the existing and new communities in the area, LTGDC would support a requirement for a secondary school to be provided in Fish Island East in the next version of the SPG. However, it is recognised that this has implications for Social and Community facilities in mid Fish Island, where the primary school that was to be provided in Fish Island East would need to come forward. Further comment on this issue may be provided in LTGDC's response to the Delivery Study when it is published for public consultation in late November.	2A	Homes and communities	24	Fig 2.A.3	Partial change considered appropriate
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	Figure 2.A.3 Map of New School and Chobham College On Figure 2.A.3 Leyton Orient Football Club's Brisbane Road Stadium is shown with a green wash. This suggests that the Stadium is an area of open space. The stadium is not an area of open space and this green wash should therefore be removed. The stadium is a developed mixed use site.	2A	Homes and communities	24	Fig 2.A.3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBWF	Page 25, Development Principle 2B, 6th paragraph line 10, should amend 'Figure 2.A.1 to 2.B.1 (Town Centre hierarchy).	2B	Business and employment	25		Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBN	With regard to Town Centres/Stratford while we are broadly happy with this section, more could be said about how town centres can be broader employment hubs for a range of employment, not just retail and services. We welcome the aspiration for Stratford to become a Metropolitan Centre which is set out in Policy INF5 of the emerging Newham Core Strategy. However, the priority for change is within the existing Town Centre boundary. Newham will maintain this until the impacts of Westfield at Stratford City are assessed. Acceptance as a Metropolitan Centre is contingent on improved investment momentum within the existing town centre, and improved physical and functional integration such that the existing and new parts of Stratford can be characterised as a Metropolitan Centre.	2B	Business and employment	25		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	Forest Gate is a local centre where the draft Core Strategy states at Policy INF5: The need for Forest Gate to maintain and develop its District Centre role and function through the growth and renewal of floorspace to better meet a wide range of local community needs, targeting a medium-sized food store and comparison retailers but retaining its independent offer; IT is essential that as significant parts of the OLSPG overlap with the Newham Core Strategy, there must be consistency in key policy areas.	2B	Business and employment	25		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	The established creative and cultural clusters at Hackney Wick, Fish Island, Sugar House Lane, Three Mills and Stratford should be protected and expanded. Support should be given to these locations as well as other locations where business use is to be maintained or incorporated into mixed use redevelopment (e.g. Pudding Mill Lane) for business and activities with growth potential, notably the creative, technological, and cultural sectors, media businesses, waste infrastructure, green technology enterprises, and higher education facilities with research and development needs.	2B	Business and employment	25		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	We accept that the function of the OLSPG is principally to set out a long term vision for the Olympic Legacy area and surrounding neighbourhoods. However, the development through which that vision will be realised will come forward over an extended period, and it is therefore helpful for the document also to address interim uses and temporary opportunities which will arise over that time – as indeed it does on a number of subjects. It is therefore disappointing that the business and employment section is silent on this issue, since there are particular opportunities in relation to business and employment arising from interim uses and from construction of the permanent developments – opportunities which with the appropriate support could generate local benefit which would help contribute to the SRF convergence outcomes. This should be acknowledged in the introduction to this section. In the commentary below we also suggest some other sections where additions to the text could help to support these opportunities.	2B	Business and employment	25		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	The overarching development principle, with its focus on Stratford as a new Metropolitan Centre and a general focus on increasing business, employment and training opportunities is welcomed. The reference in the supporting text to the retail space at Stratford City will require updating as this is now mostly up and running. It may be worth re-phrasing this section to imply that the Stratford City Scheme as a whole will have a significant effect on this part of East London rather than implying that this will be the result of the retail space alone. Suggest that first part of second paragraph in the 'Context' section is changed to read: "The development of Stratford City is fundamentally changing this part of east London. 160,000 sq.m of retail space is now completed and mostly open, while planning permission also exists for "	2B	Business and employment	25		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	This development principle is supported and appears to reflect both the London Plan and adopted and emerging local development plans. It may help to include a reference to local plans identifying new centres where the scale and location of new development and growth justify this. Some commentary on what is required for Stratford to reach the point at which it becomes viewed as a Metropolitan Centre would also be helpful, e.g. what criteria need to be met or what mixes of uses, amounts of floor space need to be achieved? Consider including indicators that can be used to help define the point at which Stratford can be considered to be a Metropolitan Centre. Add at the end of the paragraph of supporting text: "Where any town centre boundaries are extended or new local centres identified, this will be achieved through the local development plan process".	2B	Business and employment	25	DP B1	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	Table needs updating as Bromley By Bow is now classified as a district centre in the London Plan, whereas the table says it isn't.	2B	Business and employment	25	Table 2.B.1	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
BioRegional	Local Shops: B1. We note that the Westfield Shopping Centre is already constructed in the OLSPG area and is the largest shopping centre in Europe. Therefore, in establishing the OLSPG we feel it important that the balance towards smaller local high street shopping is redressed, to ensure that the overall retail provision in the OLSPG area provides a full mix of shopping opportunity. We are concerned that an over-reliance of large stores may tend to attract in shoppers from the surrounding areas, before ensuring that local needs are met and a local distinctive character and sense of place is created. Therefore we are concerned that there is no explicit focus on supporting local shops at locations below 'district centre' in the Town Centre Hierarchy (Table 2B1) and target for number of stores as well as total retail provision – so that the size of store units, as well as the total trading sqm is considered.	2B	Business and employment	25	DP B1	Accept - Review and amend
Landprop Services	SHL should be mentioned as specific area for large office development.	2B	Business and employment	25		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
National Federation of Artists Studio Providers	Business and employment: NFASP would refer the Mayor to the well-evidenced case for the economic and enterprise contribution which the creative and cultural industries make to local and city-region economies, and in particular to the importance of increasing the amount of affordable workspace for sole practitioners and micro-enterprises. In this context we note again the important contributions of which East London's network of professionally managed and highly expert artists' studio providers make to the proposed OLSPG area.	2B	Business and employment	25		General comment - No change
RICS	The rationale for a planned approach to deliver both new housing and employment opportunities to promote economic development in east London is well expressed in this section, as is the settlement hierarchy in Table 2.B.1. There will however need to be provision for skills training across the community in order to enable local people to access a wider range of local employment opportunities, particularly in the new industries. It is useful to have provision to support small and independent retailers in order to meet the market demand in the diverse communities of this part of London and to promote entrepreneurship and business start-ups. In settlements outside Stratford it will be important to have a range of retail outlets to meet the needs of families and provide choice, so markets such as that at Roman Road are an important local facility and one that is likely to draw in customers from wider areas.	2B	Business and employment	25		Partial change considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace supports the overarching development principle which seeks to promote Stratford as a new Metropolitan Centre and promote economic development in this area.	2B	Business and employment	25	OA DP	Supporting - No change
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	Table 2.B.1 – Town Centre Hierarchy Leyton Orient Football Club should be included within Table 2.B.1 as facility close to Leyton Town Centre with potential for redevelopment as part of the regeneration of the Town Centre. Leyton Orient Football Club's future development aspirations and their benefit to the regeneration of Leyton Town Centre should be recognised within the Olympic Legacy SPG. In addition, Leyton Orient Football Club's Brisbane Road Stadium is shown on Figure 2.B.1 with a green wash. This suggests that the Stadium is an area of open space. The stadium is not an area of open space and this green wash should therefore be removed. The stadium is a developed mixed use site.	2B	Business and employment	25		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	We are unclear as to why it is only in town centres that mixed use is promoted on an area basis as opposed to a site basis. As our Core Strategy points out, it is slavish following of a vertical mixed use typology which has led to numerous inactive ground floor commercial units, and a weakening of our town centre network, as boundaries become less distinct, and investment spreads out. Moreover, residential and employment-generating uses do not necessarily always sit comfortably together side by side, or one above the other.	2B	Business and employment	25		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBN	Sequential tests - the text on mixed use as a typology does not accord with the PPS4 approach and that taken forward in our Core Strategy, which is to consolidate town centre uses (including hotels) into our town centres, and where appropriate, local centres, (in relation to community facilities plus retail). This may require, in major areas of change, planning for new local centres in accessible locations to ensure such uses benefit from a critical mass of attraction, and passing footfall. In referring to mixed use areas, and the strategy for hotels, there is no reference to the sequential test being applicable, and factors other than accessibility and old buildings which might affect location of employment-generating, and in some cases town centre, uses. This is also the case in the sub-area commentary.	2B	Business and employment	25		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	Consider/reference how the offer from the OLSPG area should complement other initiatives outside the boundary and current and future existing offer in this area. Particular attention should be given to the relationship with key existing and emerging economic centres in particular: Canary Wharf, the City, Greenwich Peninsula and Kings Cross Royal Docks (particularly Excel, UEL and City Airport) Canning Town.	2B	Business and employment	25		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	Insert reference to interim uses given the long development cycle envisaged, as referenced in Newham s Core Strategy (SP1, SP5, SP6 and INF6).	2B	Business and employment	25		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	Ensure there is reference to all the boroughs employment land studies?	2B	Business and employment	25		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LVRPA	The Authority's recently adopted Park Development Framework proposals for 'Area 2 Three Marshes: Walthamstow, Leyton and Hackney' relate to part of OLSPG area. These identify the Lea Bridge Road area as a major visitor node, building on the existing facilities and leisure offer and include proposals for the provision of visitor accommodation as part of the enhanced visitor offer at the Waterworks Centre (proposal A 2 6.)	2b	Business and employment	25		Accept - Review and amend
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	The business and employment development principles are supported, particularly the hierarchy of well connected town centres with Stratford having the potential to become a metropolitan centre and the proposed District Centre at Bromley-by-Bow.	2B	Business and employment	25		Supporting - No change
Neptune Group	The SPG should make clear that in areas identified for, for example, new housing and even mixed uses, that early investment will not be deterred.	2B	Business and employment	25		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
H Forman & Son	We note that Fish Island is shown as a creative and cultural industry cluster in Figure 2.B.2. We support this in general terms, but feel the text on page 27 should be stronger. For example, there should be specific support for affordable artists' studios. We support the efforts to retain the artistic hub and suggest ways be looked at to encourage developers to provide affordable studios, perhaps via an option to choose between lower levels of affordable housing or provision of affordable artists space.	2B	Business and employment	27	Fig 2.B.2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	Development Principle B2 (pg 27)is generally welcome but too narrow. For example Pudding Mill Lane is a major area of regeneration and change but is not mentioned. We would wish to ensure that other areas of business (whether retained existing or mixed use) growth sectors are supported. Suggest reword.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B2	Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p27] We support development principle B2, planning for new and emerging sectors, which is in line with our own adopted and emerging policy for this part of the borough. The text refers to the London Plan's encouragement of "the temporary use of vacant buildings for such uses", and we would suggest that there may also be opportunities for interim uses of development sites within the OLSPG area, and particularly within the boundaries of the OPLC Legacy Communities Scheme, to support the development and reinforcement of these clusters. The OLSPG should recognise and support these opportunities.	2B	Business and employment	27		Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBN	We would not wish to see any significant levels of office space (with the potential for sub market rent suggested) at the IBC/MPC. This would cause a significant threat to the viability of Stratford's new International Business Quarter and the small business space in Building M6 at Westfield. It could also impact on the Council's own asset management strategy if for any lettings in the Stratford area. We would also not wish this to undermine Newham's emerging Core Strategy Policy J1 which indicates that major office development should be directed to Stratford and Canning Town.	2B	Business and employment	27		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBH	It recommended that this section distinguishes between employment led mixed use areas and mixed use areas in the supporting text under Development Principle B3 and/or on Figure 2.B.2.	2B	Business and employment	27		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p27] We also endorse development principle B3, promoting mixed use development, and share your view of the social and regeneration benefits of such development. In particular we strongly support the requirement for mixed use developments to "incorporate training initiatives to ensure that the existing local workforce has the ability to access the new job opportunities". We would suggest that the OLSPG should also support initiatives to maximise local benefits during the construction phase of all significant development within its boundary – and that this should include local supply chain activity as well as training and employment schemes.	2B	Business and employment	27		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Support is expressed for the development principle and the promotion of and provision for development of emerging sectors within the economy. The approach of identifying broad locations for potential creative and cultural industry clusters in Figure 2.B.2 is welcomed as appropriate.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B2	Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	Development principle supported and recognition that there will be a need for detailed guidance within local development plans is welcomed.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B3	Supporting - No change
BioRegional	Mixed Use: B3. We would like to see this principle made more specific with examples of the kind of live-work units and developments that the Mayor would welcome, clearly set out. We note that BEDZed (a sustainable mixed-use development with work places and 99 homes, community facilities and work places in Sutton, South London) where Bio Regional's offices are based was supported by an active partnership of council and housing association. It may benefit the OLSPG to also set out the likely mechanisms it is expected to be coming forward with proposals for sustainable, mixed-use developments.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP1 B3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Lend lease	Business and Employment - GLA/MDC need to define what further support can be implemented e.g. business rates relief to support and attract occupiers organizations to Stratford. We see business rates relief as key to attracting occupiers to Stratford and with them, jobs. A further area that could be reviewed would be the potential to partner with local education bodies and existing local businesses to pool ideas and support growth in the region.	2B	Business and employment	27		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Leyton Orient FC (URS)	The vital 'anchor' in any new consideration of the plan for Eton Manor should be a community stadium venue for Leyton, supported by a modest amount of complementary commercial uses. This will then have the potential to create jobs, provide sporting and leisure opportunities for participants and spectators, and create a destination through a recognisable northern entrance. This can work in the same way as the southern main Olympic stadium is expected to.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Leyton Orient FC (URS)	We recognise that there are town planning issues to address. Not least that Eton Manor is presently designated as Metropolitan Open Land. However Eton Manor is a discrete area, visibly self-contained. From a strategic planning point of view, to use the site more effectively would be of immense regeneration benefit to East London, and its removal from MOL would not diminish the strategic function of other open land in the area.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
National Federation of Artists Studio Providers	Sustaining existing workspace is essential, and the OLSPG should ensure that it includes visual artists as an eligible employment activity where it is seeking to protect (let alone increase) employment floor space available for this sector.	2B	Business and employment	27		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Neptune Group	We note on pg 27, under B3, there is a suggestion that any mixed-use scheme should provide a similar or greater number of jobs than it displaces. We agree that jobs is a more appropriate benchmark than say floorspace, but equally, in an area where change will be of a significant scale, individual sites should be considered against the wider 'vision' and thus a strict before / after test may not be appropriate for each and every site.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B3	Partial change considered appropriate
RICS	The development of the media and creative cluster at Hackney Wick has the potential to develop a distinct neighbourhood in this part of London and provide a positive image of the area more widely. Its location close to the IBC/MPC is an additional element in this. This has the potential to offer a very different range of employment opportunities to residents and potential residents of east London and therefore has a role in community development. The Green Enterprise District is also of real value in the transition to a Low Carbon Capital and the sector offers significant employment opportunities in the construction and energy sectors from craft level upwards, providing significant employment opportunities in renewables and sustainable construction. RICS recognises the need for new skills in growing the green economy, whether in newbuild or retrofitting London's existing stock and offers accreditation as chartered surveyors of property professionals and Associate Membership for those working at technical level in the industry.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B2	General comment - No change
RICS	The focus on mixed-use in this part of London should help create the range of employment type needed by the diverse workforce in the area and help to provide the positive opportunities that will help combat worklessness through opportunity. The aim of providing some units at sub-market rates to stimulate business start-up should also help achieve the balance between new housing and employment provision to stimulate economic growth. Areas identified in Figure 2.B.2 as suitable for mixed use or for the creative/cultural industries are in the central Stratford, Fish Island/Hackney Wick and Southern Fringe areas and this highlights the need to ensure that local transport connections are in place to support access by those in elsewhere in the OLSPG area and beyond.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B3	General comment - No change
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace considers that additional text should be added that supports the promotion of business accommodation space and encourages small and medium sized enterprises. Small and medium sized enterprises provide an important and significant contribution to the London-wide economy, including East London. The potential economic and social benefits of promoting the development of small and medium enterprises include: The creation of jobs at low cost of capital; Contribution to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP); Expansion of the entrepreneurial base; Flexibility to adapt to market changes; Provision of support for large scale enterprises. All the above may never be fully realised without an adequate and encouraging environment and suitable available property.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace supports the promotion of the mixed-use neighbourhoods identified.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B3	Supporting - No change
OPLC	The expectation of subsidised workspace and employment and training initiatives is supported but subject to viability and negotiation on planning gain with the LPA.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B3	Supporting - no change
Leyton Orient FC (URS)	Uses which provide services or facilities for tourist and visitors on a regular basis should be encouraged. This would also assist in diversifying the areas economy. The construction of a community stadium and associated commercial development will achieve that purpose. We would not expect the existing Legacy Plan to result in activities that will engage significant numbers of local people. The delivery of a more commercial, viable scheme for Eton Manor can be expected to stimulate proposals to redevelop other sites within the Leyton area and achieve wider regeneration and community benefits.	2B	Business and employment	27	DP B3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBWF	Page 20 Figure 2.B.2, Area particularly suitable for mixed use – should include 'Opportunity Sites 11, 19, 23, 17, 13,14,15' shown on pages 26,27, 28 of the NOF AAP. Those three Church Road sites are proposed for de-designation from Locally Significant Industrial Sites to Mixed Use sites in NOF AAP.	2B	Business and employment	28	Fig 2.B.2	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBH	As per the comments above made on Figure 2.2.1 OLSPG Areas of Change in relation to reflecting the OIA designation as per the Council's Core Strategy / including the small triangle of SIL. Amend Figure 2.B.2 to reflect the OIA boundary as per Hackney's Core Strategy Proposals Map. Also map the small triangle of SIL as an 'area particularly suitable for mixed use'.	2B	Business and employment	28	Fig 2.B.2	Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	Figure 2.B.2 Mixed Use, cultural and creative cluster With regard to the area's identified as particularly suitable for mixed use, this includes some waterside space but could also include the water spaces alongside mixed use development sites, as these would be complemented by active uses on water, such as café boats, gallery boats, puppet barges, library boats, etc. At Hackney Wick, we are pleased that the 'creative and cultural industry cluster' encompasses the waterspace, which complements these uses and provides an attractive, alternative event space for community events (such as the Coracle Regatta at Hackney WickED festival).	2B	Business and employment	28	Fig 2.B.2	General comment - No change
Riverine Centre	Likewise, Figures 2.A.2: Family Housing Locations and Figure 2.B.2: Mixed Use, Cultural and Creative Clusters should also be amended in line with recommendations for Figure 3.4.2.	2B	Business and employment	28	Fig 2.B.2	Partial change considered appropriate
Workspace Group (GVA)	Figure 2.B.2 seeks to identify specific locations where mixed use development should be promoted within the OLSPG area. Notwithstanding this, the Development Principle should also recognise that sites other than those within the identified locations may also be capable of delivering mixed use development. In this regard, in outlining strategic policy 3 to develop and implement the legacy from the 2012 Games, the London Plan recognises that where the managed release of appropriate industrial sites is promoted, this should be for mixed use development. It is often the case that the most successful residential neighbourhoods are those which generate activity at ground floor level. As such in seeking to define residential and mixed use areas, the OLSPG should make it clear that where areas are 'predominantly' for residential use, there should be scope for flexibility in relation to ground floor uses to enable better place making outcomes to be achieved.	2B	Business and employment	28	Fig 2.B.2	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	The OPLC does not consider the entire length of the development platform to the east of Waterden Road as suitable for mixed use. There may be opportunity to the northern end of this platform at the Lea Interchange but the LCS proposes mainly residential for the remainder which is crucial in establishing a critical mass for a neighbourhood or community. Pudding Mill Lane is suitable for mixed use for reasons outlined above. If this area is not considered as appropriate for mixed use by the OLSPG then it will prove impossible to provide for the number of jobs and employment floorspace being sought by development plans.	2B	Business and employment	28	Fig 2.B.2	Accept - Review and amend
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	Figure 2.B.2 Mixed Use, Cultural and Creative Clusters Leyton Orient Football Club should be identified in Figure 2.B.2 as an 'Area particularly suitable for mixed use'. As indicated, Leyton Orient Football Club's Brisbane Road stadium is already a successful mixed use development, and potential exists to expand this mixed use function, both should the Club remain on the site, and should the Club relocate to an alternative site. The site is therefore an ideal mixed use location and should be identified as such in the Olympic Legacy SPG. In addition, Leyton Orient Football Club's Brisbane Road Stadium is shown on Figure 2.B.2 with a green wash. This suggests that the Stadium is an area of open space. The stadium is not an area of open space and this green wash should therefore be removed. The stadium is a developed mixed use site.	2B	Business and employment	28	Fig 2.B.2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBH	Figure 2.B.3 proposes the realignment of the SIL boundary around the IBC/MPC to remove the strip east of Waterden Road. It is preferred that this boundary remains unchanged to accord with the Council's Core Strategy Proposals Map. The Hackney Wick AAP has recently been updated and provides more detailed policy guidance for land within the Olympic Park, in particular how proposals should be dealt with on this portion of SIL, identified as Opportunity Site 7. (see section 7.2 of the AAP – <a href="http://mginternet.hackney.gov.uk/documents/s19537/Final%20Hackney%20Wick%20AAP%20Version%20for%20November%20Cabinet%202011.pdf">http://mginternet.hackney.gov.uk/documents/s19537/Final%20Hackney%20Wick%20AAP%20Version%20for%20November%20Cabinet%202011.pdf</a> ) The AAP recognises that this area is constrained by limited plot depth but has the potential to provide a new frontage to the Olympic Park. Therefore to encourage overlooking of the Olympic Park and acknowledging its physical separation from the employment designations west of Waterden Road, the updated AAP states that residential development (which could include family housing) as part of a employment led mixed use scheme would be considered if it can be demonstrated that it meets exemplar sustainability and urban design standards, that high levels of residential amenity can be achieved, and that employment uses can be prov	2B	Business and employment	29	Fig 2.B.3	Partial change considered appropriate



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Workspace Group (GVA)	We welcome the requirement outlined within the Development Principle for proposals and plans in the OLSPG area to promote the managed release of surplus industrial land. We also support the identification of our client's site in Figure 2.B.3 within an area where there is potential for a managed transition from the existing Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) designation and the recognition that the area has significant potential for regeneration. The OLSPG also considers that this area has significant potential for family housing. However, as outlined above in relation to Development Principle A2, it is considered that the need to prioritise the delivery of family homes as part of any new residential development should be subject to viability considerations, the need to encourage rather than restrain overall residential development, and the need to deliver sustainable neighbourhoods through the provision of a mix of housing types.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	Accept - Review and amend
LBN	Development principle B4 is sensible. We welcome the reference to avoiding unmanaged change in the 1st supporting paragraph. The final bullet point Pg 29 relating to Pudding Mill Lane is not helpful in that it is unclear as to objectives for retained employment and new employment generating activities. It should be recognised this is a very large site that does have a value in employment terms as evidenced by the Newham Employment Land Review. In line with the managed release approach GLA should be clear that they support Newham's position as set out in Policy J2 of the emerging Core Strategy that sites identified for release must meet certain tests in order that an alternative use can be justified.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	General comment - No change
LBN	Development Principle B5. This is far too vague and therefore lacks clear direction. The supporting text which reads as follows New visitor accommodation should be focused in the area's town centre and where there is good public transport access to central London and international and national transport termini. Major hotel development should be concentrated at Stratford and the area's town centres. Should be elevated to the main part of the Development Principle.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	Accept - Review and amend
LBH	Figure 2.B.3 identifies locations where the managed transition of industrial land however Development Principle B4 and associated text refers to the managed release of surplus industrial land. Whilst Council acknowledges the GLA's proposal to release of the small triangle of SIL west of the station to permit employment led mixed use as per the Council's OIA designation, this still is an industrial designation and therefore it is considered more appropriate that this Development Principle refer to the managed transition of industrial land as industrial uses are permitted and encouraged within OIAs. Development Principle B4 and supporting text refers to the managed transition of industrial land as opposed to the managed release.	2B	Business and employment	29		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Development principle welcomed and supported.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	Development principle welcomed and supported.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B5	Supporting - No change
LVRPA	Reference to the role of the Regional Park as a visitor destination is however missing and should be included within supporting text (page 29). This would ensure greater consistency with 'The London Plan', which under Policy 4.5 'London's Visitor Infrastructure' identifies the Regional Park as one of London's 'Strategic Cultural Areas' to be promoted, enhanced and protected (Policy 4.5 A f.).	2B	Business and employment	29		Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	Development principle B4 - Land use change We would support the managed release of surplus industrial land along the waterways, where the waterside location is not being utilised, so that its potential can be better realised for achieving environmental, social and economic aims. We agree that "Pudding Mill Lane should no longer be designated as SIL given the overall need for employment land across the OLSPG area and its significant potential for regeneration and family housing as well as its waterside frontages." We would support the proposal for interim uses to complement this change, and suggest moorings along these frontages would provide an element of passive surveillance and security.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	Supporting - No change
British Waterways	Development principle B5 - Promoting tourism and developing the visitor economy We would support the statement that the area's historic waterways, amongst its other assets, provide tremendous opportunities for tourism, and hope that the waterway's legacy plan we are drawing up with the OPLC will help to promote these.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B5	Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	ET and SHG support Development Principle B4, which encourages development proposals and plans in the OLSPG area to promote the managed release of surplus industrial land. The managed release of industrial land is essential if overall housing needs are to be met; if the regeneration sought is to be achieved and the overall long term vision for the OL SPG area are to be realised. Accordingly, Figure 2.B.3, which sets out the proposed new Industrial Geography of the area is fully supported.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	Supporting - No change
London Concrete	The document should ensure that any land in the vicinity of the Bow Midland West Site identified to be released from its SIL designation does not give rise to new forms of development (i.e. residential development) in close proximity to the retained SIL which could prejudice existing and future development for industrial and rail related purposes.	2B	Business and employment	29		Accept - Review and amend
MPA/MPS (CgMs)	MN summary - MPA support DP B4	2B	Business and employment	29		Supporting - No change
Neptune Group	We note the reference to 'managed' release of 'current strategic industrial land in Fish Island. The inevitability of change promoted by the SPG and AAP is such that 'managed release' implies that the authorities might condition / ransom the scale or location of change, even in areas outside those where SIL is proposed to be retained. In those areas of mid FI which it is not proposed to retain as SIL or LIL, then we feel that the documents should acknowledge that SIL is no longer a designation in those parts and not refer to their potential for future release – it is time to throw away that tatty old coat once and for all.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	Partial change considered appropriate
RICS	RICS supports the approach in this section to the planned release of industrial land to meet housing need and create sustainable mixed-use neighbourhoods as essential in achieving Convergence. The identification of broad strategic locations for industrial land release is helpful and it is useful that the need to retain sufficient industrial land for business and employment is recognised. These locations listed are aligned with the overall spatial strategy and reflect the availability of industrial land in these areas. The timing of some projects in the vicinity of the Olympic Park may need to be reviewed to take account of the recent announcement that London is to host the International Athletics Championship in 2017. This is explored earlier in this response in the section 'Development principle A4 – Creating a lasting sporting legacy'.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	General comment - No change
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace supports the approach for land use change within the OLSPG area. Workspace specifically supports the release of land to the south of the Olympic Park.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	Supporting - No change
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace supports the expansion visitor accommodation within the OLSPG area. Workspace agrees that such accommodation should be located in areas with good public transport links and as part of mixed-use developments.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B5	Supporting - No change
Aggregate Industries UK	Overall, AIUK welcomes the policies and ideas contained within the consultation document. With specific reference to Development principle B4, Development principle C3 and section 3.5 (Hackney Wick and Fish Island), AIUK welcomes the recognition that Bow Midland Yard West be retained as part of a Strategic Industrial Location.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	Supporting - no change
Aggregate Industries UK	The SPG, however, needs to make reference to existing rail transhipment policy contained within national Minerals Policy Statement 1 (Para. 13) and London Plan Policies 4A.31 and 3C.25. These overarching policies encourage local authorities and other plan making bodies to safeguard existing and future potential railheads from other forms of development. During formulation of plans for the redevelopment of Fish Island, it will be important to ensure proposed residential development is designed to a standard compatible with the ongoing use of BMVW as an aggregates railhead and associated added value aggregates processes.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	Partial change considered appropriate
OPLC	The expectation of subsidised workspace and employment and training initiatives is supported but subject to viability and negotiation on planning gain with the LPA.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B4	General comment - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
RICS	The very recent announcement that London will host the International Athletics Championship in 2017 has prompted comment in Sections A4 and B4 above. This is likely to stimulate tourism further in the five years following the 2012 Games and to enhance the reputation of London's sporting legacy still further. The delivery of planned post-2012 transformation and the closure of the Olympic Park during this period may need to be revised in light of this announcement, though there may be additional tourism benefits that arise. The location of hotel accommodation is relevant in this section, as is the provision of services for the visitor economy. While these ought to be sited close to or in Stratford and within easy reach of the Olympic Park, there may also be scope to consider their location elsewhere, including possibly at waterfront locations and the consultation document is helpful in providing scope for hotels to be sited in a limited way outside the immediate Stratford area. A recent criticism of hotel accommodation in the area is that there is insufficient disabled capacity and this may be a priority in the years following 2012 in the approach to the IAC in 2017.	2B	Business and employment	29	DP B5	General comment - No change
Thames Water	Section to the east of three mills needs to be safeguarded for Thames Tunnel they have supplied map.	2B	Business and employment	30		Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	The areas showing 'Potential managed transition' should also include 'Opportunity Sites 14 and 15' shown on pages 26,27 and 28 of the NOF AAP. These two Church Road sites are proposed for de-designation from Locally Significant Industrial Sites to Mixed Use sites in NOF AAP.	2B	Business and employment	30		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	Figure 2.B.3 This identifies the extent of land for change (e.g. SIL de-designation and Potential for Managed Transition) in more detail than Newham's Core Strategy. Again this is a subject where the OLSPG adds unnecessary detail. There are 4 locally significant sites identified with boundary specific detail to the east of Stratford High Street: Rick Roberts Way (excluding the Olympic coach park area) Jubilee Line Depot Abbey Mills Pumping Station Bridge Road Depot We consider that it is not in the remit of GLA to determine the extent of these sites nor to identify these for managed transition. These are not Legacy matters and for the borough to determine through a proper development plan process that is subject to Examination in Public. These should either be removed or shown collectively as an area occupied as an employment/utility/transport cluster. Policy 4.4 of the London Plan indicates that Local Development Frameworks should demonstrate how the borough's stock of Locally Significant Industrial Site will be planned and managed.	2B	Business and employment	30	Fig 2.B.3	Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	Details of the Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) Sites - should be the same as indicated in LBWF NOF AAP on pages 26, 27 & 28 of NOF. The areas showing 'Potential for managed transition' should include 'Opportunity Site 23' (i.e. 97 Lea Bridge Road) on p.28 of NOF AAP which is proposed for de-designation from SIL to mixed use site.	2B	Business and employment	30	Fig 2.B.2	Accept - Review and amend
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace supports Figure 2.B.3 and the identification of Pudding Mill Lane as a managed transitional area and its release as a Strategic Industrial Location.	2B	Business and employment	30	Fig 2.B.3	Supporting - No change
H Forman & Son	We see that Figure 2B.3 shows this part of Fish Island as a SIL undergoing a managed transition. We would ask this be kept under review and in-line with the other policy documents coming forward and the general desire to remove the SIL designation for this part of Fish Island.	2B	Business and employment	30	fig 2.B.3	General comment - No change
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	Figure 2.B.3 New Industrial Geography The built form of Leyton Orient Football Club is not shown on the figure and the site is shown with a green wash. The built form on the site should be shown on all figures and plans. The omission of the existing built form on the site and the green wash gives an incorrect impression that the site is a Greenfield area of open space. This is not the case. The site is a developed mixed use site.	2B	Business and employment	30	Fig 2.B.3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
BioRegional	Waste and Reuse: The mention of the ODA Transformation stage in section 3.2 (p55) should apply the waste hierarchy and consider structures and infrastructure for legacy reuse and dismantling for reuse offsite before demolition. For example, we note that nine new bridges are needed - that pedestrian walkways are being removed between the IBC and media briefing auditorium and car park during the transformation stage.	2B	Business and employment	55		Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBN	We welcome the overarching general principle which seeks to link communities and take advantage of transport improvements to support a shift towards more sustainable modes of transport. In particular we note and support Strategic links to Stratford and the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park; promoting local connectivity across the area and high levels of permeability to new developments. However we have strong reservations that no strategic interventions are proposed. The accessibility assets of Stratford that have enabled its transformation to date, need to be enhanced to ensure it maintains its accessibility in the face of increased demand from new residents, businesses and visitors. The comments below refer to detailed issues in the document but the lack of strategic transport intervention.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		General comment - No change
LBN	Page 31. More reference is needed to comment on conditions for walking and cycling in the locality, pointing out key assets (e.g. the Greenway) and problems (e.g. Stratford Gyratory and the barrier affect of major roads and railway infrastructure). Environmental conditions for walkers and cyclists on the A118 (formerly A11) Stratford High Street are very poor and alternatives are needed to ensure that key destinations are easy to get to and streetscape is improved.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p31] We strongly support the fundamental principles contained in the overarching development principle: that existing and new communities should be well connected, and that development and supporting infrastructure should help to achieve a lasting shift to more sustainable forms of transport. It would helpful to add prominent reference within the overarching development principle to the need to overcome existing barriers to movement, which is a fundamental requirement for successful and sustainable development in the OLSPG area. In addition, parts of the revised wording of the principle are confused – in particular the implied relationship between public transport infrastructure and the promotion of walking and cycling. This should be revised for clarity.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	2.C Connectivity and transport We are pleased at the acknowledgement of the area's extensive network of rivers and canals and the opportunities these present for sustainable waterborne freight, for moving construction materials and waste, particularly with the level of development that will be taking place in the area from Transformation and the following years. As part of being an increasingly attractive walking and cycling environment, we need to carefully manage the needs of different users, such as protecting more vulnerable pedestrians from anti-social cycling along the towpaths.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		Supporting - No change
London Cycling Campaign	A step change to sustainable transport is not possible without impact on motor traffic. We suggest a policy that assesses motor traffic reduction potential by identifying short local trips currently made by car that can easily be made by other means. This would provide a clear target for reducing motor vehicle usage which would increase overall road capacity for sustainable modes.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
NHS East London and City	However there are so many transport issues to be addressed in the OLSPG area that the ambition for pedestrians and cyclists is at risk of being overwhelmed in the subsequent discussion which is principally concerned with road and rail transport. The second strategic commitment to 'improving local connectivity by creating a network of key walking and cycling routes across the OLSPG area' is welcome but we recommend that the potential conflict with other transport modes is acknowledged and the priority of pedestrian and cycle routes made clear. Such routes must be attractive, accessible, safe and minimally obstructed. If they are compromised they risk not being used – this is not an uncommon outcome of cycle routes that are introduced after transport planning for motor vehicles is complete. We recommend the inclusion of a statement about the quality as well as the range of pedestrian and cycle routes.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31	OA DP	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	The need to improve both strategic connections and local connectivity is welcomed, but the difficulties of highway congestion and public transport over-crowding must also be addressed. The forecasts set out in the accompanying Strategic Transport Study show that with the currently funded plans (including Crossrail) many of these problems are likely to worsen. To a substantial extent these result from current and wider transport pressures and unless addressed will be likely to constrain development.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		General comment - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
BioRegional	Walking Cycling Promotion: We are encouraged to see some mention of walking and cycling in this strategy. However, we note that the A12 passes through the OLSPG and are concerned that a real modal shift in terms of transport sustainability is delivered as a result of the OLSPG development – rather than increased walking and cycling just enabling continued car-use and congestion of road networks as the urban population rises. We are also concerned that the focus appears to be on infrastructure provision rather than softer measures that integrate technology and behaviour change. For example, the introduction of car-club and promotion of cycling across the London Borough Sutton resulted in a modal shift that reduced road transport by 6%. We propose the OLSPG also includes measures to disincentivise car-use which enable users to choose between using a car for some journeys and using alternative modes at different times. For example, residential and commuter parking restrictions combined with public transport incentives could be effective and built into the overall OLSPG plan for the development of the area.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		Partial change considered appropriate
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	The development principles relating to Connectivity and Transport set out in Section 2C are all broadly supported.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		Supporting - No change
Lend lease	Community and Transport – We support Stratford International providing an international service and the MDC should aim to support this, with the renewal of the Eurostar franchise imminent this presents an opportunity to lobby for Stratford International to be included as an international stop. We believe the cycling routes to central London will increase in importance in the future and we support the extension of Cycle Super Highway 2 through Stratford, however, further work is still needed to support and encourage the use of bicycles. The cycle routes to central London would also be supported by the extension of the ‘Boris Bike’ scheme.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		Supporting - No change
Neptune Group	By virtue of its scale and unencumbered platform in terms of existing use, the Legacy application should be encouraged to take responsibility for many of the connections and interfaces with the ‘fringe’ areas.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	Recommend that section 2.C includes some wording on traffic issues in the east of the Borough. This is a current priority for Members at the Council. It is also recommend that a project is included on Figure 2.C.2 Strategic Projects and Interventions to managed extraneous traffic travelling to and from the A12. Alternatively this could be included on 2.C.3 Key local connections if felt this is more appropriate.	2C	Connectivity and transport	31		Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	Figure 2.C.1 Existing road and rail network – should add ‘Harm Farm Curve’ – a short stretch of tracks linking the Chingford to Liverpool Street route to Coppermill Junction to Stratford Line.	2C	Connectivity and transport	32	Fig 2.C.1	Accept - Review and amend
LBN	Fig 2C1 on P32 shows rail connections but doesn't show any of the network rail lines running through Stratford on the key. The DLR extension (light blue line) also stops short of Stratford International on the plan and should show that this has been extended and is operational.	2C	Connectivity and transport	32	Fig 2.C.1	Partial change considered appropriate
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	On Figure 2.C.1 Leyton Orient Football Club's Brisbane Road Stadium is shown with a green wash. This suggests that the Stadium is an area of open space. The stadium is not an area of open space and this green wash should therefore be removed. The stadium is a developed mixed use site.	2C	Connectivity and transport	32	Fig 2.C.1	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	Final paragraph page 33 reference to the cable car does not seem to be of great significance or relevance to the Olympic Legacy. Its more the totality of growth and improvements in the Royal Docks and Greenwich Peninsula that are of background importance not the individual elements of it.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	We support services north of Stratford particularly to key centres Tottenham Hale. Walthamstow, Chingford and Stansted in terms of capacity and improved infrastructure. This is also picked up in the Sub Areas section.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33		Supporting - No change
LBTH	• [p33-34] We welcome the new text on bus improvements, which responds to our concerns that the May 2011 draft did not adequately consider the area's bus needs holistically in anticipation of increased demand from development. We would concur that bus service enhancements are required between the OLSPG area, Mile End and Bow. The map on page 34 currently only shows new bus connections at Sugar House Lane and should be amended to indicate the other proposed bus improvements.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBN	Parts of the strategic highway network in the area suffer from high levels of congestion, as it is already operating at or near its capacity due to high levels of traffic demand. Further traffic growth will result in severe congestion to the detriment of all road users, as well as noise, severance and poor air quality. (P.33)" This should be tied to the potential impact on buses and underpins why bus priority is so important in this area.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	Given the scale of development this Guidance identifies it is crucial that further cumulative impacts on the road network from the various development proposals are investigated, and that mitigation measures to maintain and safeguard the current and future performance of the road network are identified and fully funded. Failure to do this will affect reliability of the area s road network, which includes key corridors serving the whole of London.(P.33). Reference to the newly available East London Highway Assignment Model (ELoHAM) should be made here, which is now available to authorities to assess this cumulative highway impact.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Development principle welcomed and supported. The range of proposed potential interventions is extensive and in total likely to have very high costs and an extended implementation period. Indeed a number of the proposals appear critical for existing users to a greater extent than for the new developments. In any case, given the costs, there is likely to be a need to prioritise proposals and create joint funding streams, but the Guidance offers no priorities. It is noted that "it is crucial ... that mitigation measures to maintain and safeguard the current and future performance of the road network are identified and fully funded". This is a challenging target when the Transport Study suggests that average highway speeds will fall by some 25% with only background growth. Clearly achieving this objective will require action at least in east London – and the mitigation measures to achieve this are not obvious. Add recognition that resolving these issues is not solely an OLSPG issue.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	References to strategic schemes and options may need to also be related to regional or London wide measures also included in other emerging OAPFs / SPGs / SPDs, e.g. Upper Lee Valley, Royal Docks, London Riverside, such as for rail, highway and river crossing options.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33		Accept - Review and amend
TFL	New wording: "These include highway improvement schemes, bus priority, limiting car parking..."	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	Para 9	Accept - Review and amend
LVRPA	The Authority supports the strategic project presented under Development Principle C1 'Improving strategic connectivity and capacity' to reinstate the Hall Farm Curve and reopen Lea Bridge Station.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	Supporting - No change
Environment Agency	Page 33 – Development Principle C1 We are pleased to note that this development principle refers to the London Plan Air Quality Policy 7.14 which means that planners/developers will need to comply with the requirements of that policy. We would, however, suggest that the SPG could also recommend more imaginative areas for example - "...developers/planners should consider measures as recommended in the smarter choices guidance such as localised low emission zones (LEZs) and travel plans for larger developments." The smarter choices is guidance produced by the Department for Transport, which we promote, and it gives techniques for influencing people's behaviour to more sustainable options.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33		Accept - Review and amend
London Cycling Campaign	PLEASE ADD ADDITION TEXT it is crucial that further cumulative impacts on the road network from the various development proposals are investigated, <i>and that mitigation measures to maintain and safeguard the current and future performance of the road network are identified and fully funded. Failure to do this will affect reliability of the area's road network, which includes key corridors serving the whole of London.</i>	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	Para 7	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Cycling Campaign	Currently 50% of all car trips in Outer London are 2 miles or less and a quarter of all car journeys in the UK are below 2 miles in length. Improving the performance of the road network requires shifting these trips to more sustainable modes. This may include reducing motor vehicle capacity for the benefit of cycling and walking. The result would be a better network performance overall. It is not realistic to improve sustainable transport whilst seeking to "maintaining current and future performance of the road network" by providing for, and encouraging increased car use. Italicised words should be amended to " and that measures be taken to ensure that the development is designed to maximise cycling, walking and public transport use so that it has no impact on the area's road network and encourages wider use of sustainable transport."	2C	Connectivity and transport	33		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
RICS	The three bulleted approaches proposed are useful. A modal shift to walking and cycling is a low-carbon approach could be valuable in east London. The protection of green space and the green links, as well as the network of waterways, all support a healthier approach to travel. Improved local connectivity through walking and cycling across the OLSPG area is also helpful, as is safe access within neighbourhoods.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	Supporting - No change
RICS	However it is unclear whether local people will perceive major health benefits from walking or cycling alongside the strategic roads that criss-cross east London and there may instead be some apprehension about the high air pollution levels in the area, as well as a negative experience of walking and cycling in areas of high traffic volume or congestion. Walking and cycling are valuable pursuits and can reduce demand on public transport and reliance on cars in some circumstances, but it is unlikely that they will meet the wider needs of an increase in population size of 60 000 or those of the many in-commuters to be employed in retail or the new and green industries.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	Alter wording: "three car operation on both branches of DLR".	2C	Connectivity and transport	33		Accept - Review and amend
RICS	There is a gap, identified in this consultation document, in public transport provision to the north of Stratford in the Leyton and Leytonstone areas in the Northern Fringe where 3 200 homes are proposed. The solutions outlined in the East London Sub-Regional Transport Plan identifies the projected population growth's increased demand and the improvements listed may be useful. This is however a significant increase in population and additional measures may be needed. Despite the additional provision outlined this still leaves an area of significant housing development with little additional capacity or connectivity to support wider access. The consultation recognises that there will be problems connecting the areas to the North, in particular the IBC/MDC that are 20 minutes walk from Stratford. These areas will certainly need some new provision such as shuttle bus services if they are to be successfully let and this is a core objective for the post-Games transformation.. However there may be a case for better connecting the IBC/MDC through possibly a guided bus or light rail such as the DLR or a tram extension from Stratford International. The consequence is that these	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	Partial change considered appropriate
RICS	We support the safeguarding of the Chelsea/Hackney route (Crossrail 2). This is clearly a scheme for the future as it will not be completed until around 2030, but once in place it will improve access between the east of the OLSPG area and the rest of London,. The review of the route is an essential component in redressing the long term lack of investment that this area has endured and has the potential to significantly optimise Convergence objectives and reduce isolation	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	Supporting - No change
RICS	We would strongly support the connection between HS1 and HS2 as shown in this document to achieve enhanced connectivity along these routes	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	Supporting - No change
RICS	A re-routing of the North Eastern Line to Stansted, rather than Shenfield, would be a major change and outside the scope of this consultation, but it might be advantageous to consider this in due course as an additional future high speed branch. However this is a matter for future consideration by other bodies such as Transport for London, Network Rail and the Department for Transport. Such a branch would probably be high speed and non stop and thus of no use to the north west area of the OLSPG area. To the north and north west of the OLSPG area does need to be addressed as it is difficult to see how lack connectivity for family housing in these areas would support Convergence goals or reduce the isolation that lack of access brings.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
RICS	RICS has long championed Transport Development Areas as an approach to promote higher densities for employment and residential uses near transport nodes to achieve modal shift housing and employment near transport nodes to promote connectivity. This does not of course avoid all car journeys but is intended to reduce those involved primarily in travel to work.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	General comment - No change
RICS	It is essential that the HS1 international trains in future stop at Stratford International after the Olympics to further promote the area. This was the original intention of the original concept for the HS1 route. It is still not clear whether this is going to happen.	2C	Connectivity and transport	33	DP C1	Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	Page 34 Figure 2.C.2 Strategic projects and interventions – LBWF understands that No 97 Bus would be extended from Chingford to connect to Stratford in the near future. In addition LBWF understands that the frequency of No 97 Bus operation would be improved between Chingford and Stratford. Therefore at Fig 2.C.2 'Proposed new bus connection' – should include No. 97 Bus extension from Chingford to Stratford.	2C	Connectivity and transport	34	Fig 2.c.2	Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBN	Map on page 32 and 34: should show proposed Cycling Superhighway as strategic infrastructure. Under Development Principle C1 it should be recognised that: the DLR extension to Stratford International and increased carriage capacity to Beckton is complete. However, further improvements in terms of frequency and better peak services to Beckton and off peak services to Woolwich Arsenal are supported. Crossrail will bring important benefits to stops at Stratford Regional, Maryland and Forest Gate in the north of LBN.	2C	Connectivity and transport	34	Fig 2.c.2	Accept - Review and amend
Lancaster PLC	Connection 15 is still to be built would be useful to list under on Page 35 identified gaps.	2C	Connectivity and transport	35	Fig 2.C.3	Proposed connections reconfigured
LBN	In relation to Development Principle C2 (Local Connectivity and Permeability). We welcome in principle the 16 interventions recognised. However, some of these seem to be lacking in substance in terms of clarity of delivery. Item 2 relates to improved connections to the West Ham area particularly to the station to the west. This shows a line drawn through the Abbey Mills site (we are unclear as to the basis for this and what discussions the GLA have had with the landowner). Providing a link to West Ham station is supported, but there does not seem to be any recognition of the formidable problem of bridging over the DLR and Jubilee Lines (and potentially Manor Road) as well as how (and who) would deliver and fund this.	2C	Connectivity and transport	35		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	Whilst car clubs are recognised as beneficial emphasis should be on viable and attractive travel choices particularly making it easier to walk and cycle locally.	2C	Connectivity and transport	35		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p35] The draft acknowledges that “areas to the north and within Hackney will still have relatively low levels of public transport accessibility which will need to be improved to maximise access to the facilities and employment opportunities that will come forward in these areas after the Games”. This also applies to Fish Island, and the text should be amended to reflect this.	2C	Connectivity and transport	35	DP C2	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Development principle welcomed and supported. It is noted that “under current plans, the areas to the north and within Hackney will still have relatively low levels of public transport accessibility which will need to be improved ...”. This will be critical if high density development is to be encouraged in these locations but there are currently only limited initiatives to achieve this. Given funding constraints, addressing the range of “gaps” identified is likely to require prioritising. Although the Transport Study provides very high level ‘scoring’ for each initiative, early further analysis to refine these assessments would be helpful. Add the following text to second to last paragraph on page 35: “Development plan documents and supporting studies should further define these connections and safeguard the land they require, with development proposals helping to deliver them. Associated infrastructure delivery plans should also seek to prioritise projects and aid coordination of their delivery.	2C	Connectivity and transport	35	DP C2	General comment - No change
Avivia	Support improved links want consultation on any changes and outline possible source of funding	2C	Connectivity and transport	35	DP C2	Supporting - No change
BioRegional	Walking Routes: How to overcome major barriers should be considered in planning safe-routes-to-schools (and work) for new communities in the OLSPG plan area. Therefore, in addressing the second connectivity aim (see p31) we propose that key consideration be given to transport intersections, in addition to increasing access and capacity for public transport and cycle parking at destinations), including crossing of road and rail routes that intersect communities.	2C	Connectivity and transport	35		Proposed connections reconfigured
LBN	Item 4 again is welcome in terms of improving the highway network but is rather general in nature. It should for instance specifically refer to Newham s objective of two way working of traffic around the gyratory. Also no attention has been given to the pedestrian and cycle environment around the A118 Stratford High Street. Better east-west pedestrian and cycle links at grade level across A118 (formerly A11) Stratford High Street are needed particularly between: Carpenters and Rick Roberts Way E-W at Stratford High Street DLR Sugar House Lane to Pudding Mill Lane.	2C	Connectivity and transport	35		Accept - Review and amend



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
British Waterways	Development principle C2 - Improving local connectivity and Permeability The following identified gaps depicted on Fig 2.C.3 include several that appear to involve new or existing crossings over waterways. We are keen that any new crossings are considered in terms of their impact on the amenity of the towpath and the potential for anti-social behaviour, as well as ecology, and maintenance. 1. Improving links from Roman Road, Fish Island, to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park and Stratford, in particular over the A12 2. Improving connections in the West Ham area, in particular to the station from the west 3. Improve links over the River Lea south of Bromley by Bow 4. Improving the highway network in Stratford Town Centre to improve its environment making it attractive for all users and to reduce congestion, including new or improved pedestrian and cycle routes linking Carpenters Estate, Greenway and Pudding Mill Lane 7. Improving pedestrian and cycle links across the A12 especially from Bow Roundabout southwards, and improved pedestrian and cycle environment along the A12 9. Improved links north of Hertford Union Canal between Hackney Wick across the Lea	2C	Connectivity and transport	35	DP C2	Accept - Review and amend
London Cycling Campaign	Item 4: The network needs improving in Stratford town centre and its environs. The new cycle lanes appearing in Great Eastern St already need improvement. Item 10: Remedial; work on bridge H010 should be specified. Add early completion of Cycle Superhighway 2 to standards of international best practice. Add significantly improved cycle access to Westfield and revision of all sub-standard and dangerous facilities installed so far (this includes cycle tracks in Mounfitchet Road and Westfield Ave and cycle parking located at locations where they are not needed (well behind John Lewis) and absent where they are needed (e.g. at the entrance near the tube exit (all full already) and at the junction of the boulevard and Westfield Ave (railings being used)) Add retention of bridge over Stratford High Street linking Greenway with a ramp for cyclists to use. Amendments and additions to achieve this are as follows: "4. Improving the highway network in Stratford Town Centre and its environs by removing the gyratory system, and to improve its environment, making it attractive for all users and to reduce congestion, especially by providing new high quality pedestrian and cycle ro	2C	Connectivity and transport	35		Partial change considered appropriate
RICS	The lack of sufficient public transport to the north and within Hackney will be an issue for people living and working in the area from the outset and it is important that provision is in place at an early stage to promote business activity and economic growth, rather than deter though negative experience of a lack of provision. In this section it is useful that plans to upgrade provision acknowledge improvements in the pipeline adjacent to the OLSPG area	2C	Connectivity and transport	35	DP C2	Supporting - No change
Bywaters	A key requirement for the Leyton Sub-area will be the required new links to and across the area connecting it physically, socially and economically with Stratford and the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. This is reflected in Development Principle C2 – Improving local connectivity and permeability, which is laudable. The application to Ruckholt Road, in the vicinity of its junction with Orient Way in particular, would appear to be a key requirement for this part of the area within the SPG. As well as an over-scaled roundabout, there are extensive poorly configured lands flanking Ruckholt Road, lands which should form an integral part of the restructuring and regeneration of Leyton. Without this the ability to create key, quality, connections through and between neighbourhoods is highly challenging.	2C	Connectivity and transport	35		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	In general Figure 2.C.3 Key Local Connections is welcome and represents well the Newham s aspirations for better connections.	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	Supporting - No change
LBTH	• [p36] As per our comments on the May draft, the all-movement junction across the A12 at Bromley-by-Bow, as proposed in the Tesco application, should be added to the map. The map shows a break in the existing cycle/pedestrian connection along the Lea Navigation at the western edge of Bromley-by-Bow. Following the completion of projects under the A11/A12 at Bow flyover, there is now a continuous riverside connection. The map should be updated to show this. DONE The connection numbered 2 on the same map would be difficult to deliver in Tower Hamlets, as it runs along the existing railway tracks and would require significant land take to go over or under the rail track to the new proposed town centre. If the recent Tesco planning application is delivered, this route will not be feasible due to the configuration of the scheme. The route should be redirected to Twelve Trees Crescent. In addition to the missing cycle/pedestrian connection that is shown on the map between Bromley-by-Bow and Sugar House Lane, the Bromley-by-Bow masterplan proposes a second additional pedestrian/cycle connection to the north. This is shown on the Vision Plan on page 2 of the Sep	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	See TFL response for update also TFL happy to review other comments on Fig 2.C.3	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	General comment - No change
TFL	Edit the existing local connections in vicinity of Pudding Mill Lane.	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.c.3	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace supports proposed connections within Figure 2.C.3.	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	Supporting - No change
British Waterways	Figure 2.C.3 Key local connections The existing riverside paths/towpaths (built or restored as part of the ODA remediation works) have not been indicated along the western bank of Waterworks River, or on the Old River Lea to the western side of Stadium Island, or along Bow Back River. There are also a number of new bridge crossings shown on this plan that we are not aware of and have not agreed. If these are intended to be provided we would need to agree these, though we are not aware that they are required.	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	Partial change considered appropriate
OPLC	Missing pedestrian/cycle link east-west in the north of the Olympic Park is provided during the Games and will be available immediately after the post games transformation – F03 bridge. There is also a further east west connection to the north – F02 bridge. The connection to the south of the Aquatics Centre is also provided through the post games transformation scheme. The connection across the Lee Navigation is also missing – F13 bridge. OPLC recommends that a full review of the connections is carried out to reflect the most recent planning permissions and proposals. The connection across the Belvedere exists. It is not possible to connect at towpath level on the west of the Lea at this point due to the gradient of the bank, Carpenters Rd and rail crossings. The feasibility of a river level connection on the east side of Lea is currently being explored.	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	Connection 7 (dotted blue line to Pudding Mill Lane from North of Bow Road should be vehicular.	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	All movements junction should be shown at Bromley by Bow where red dotted line meets the A12.	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	Southern Most Dotted blue line is not correctly aligned. Is should run south of the rail line through 12 trees gasholders.	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	Plan is incorrect in showing H14 as highway and H16 in place by 2014 (also pg 36).	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	Carpenters Road is a key connection and should be highlighted as such.	2C	Connectivity and transport	36	Fig 2.C.3	Accept - Review and amend
LBN	We would like to see Stratford Regional Station added as a node on the Carpenters/ Greenway/PML chain as well as specific mention of the cross-High Street connections. In particular, specific mention of the Pudding Mill Lane Sugar House Lane link is needed bearing in mind the future key bus link from the A12 via the Inter IKEA site to Pudding Mill Lane and the Orbit and Stadium. Bus links to the Olympic Park from LBTH are currently very poor (this is acknowledged on P33) and this would help address that. All of these links should be added to the schemes diagram on P36.	2C	Connectivity and transport	36		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p37] Our comments on the May draft voiced concern that the parking provision across the OLSPG area could compromise achieving the OLSPG's 'overarching development principle' for connectivity and transport. A particular concern, then as now, is that although the document states "where public transport accessibility is high, car parking levels should generally be low and car free development promoted", the caveat "provided the needs of families are met" remains. Given the high levels of family housing anticipated across the OLSPG area this wording could be used to justify significant levels of parking, generating high levels of car trips and threatening the achievement of the overarching development principle "to achieve a lasting shift to more sustainable forms of transport and movement". Modelling we have seen suggests that significant levels of car trips will be generated from OPLC's Legacy Communities Scheme, with mode share levels above those typical for an inner London borough. The draft OLSPG itself acknowledges the need to avoid additional on the nearby road network, which "is already operating at or near its capacity due to high levels of traffic demand" [p3	2C	Connectivity and transport	37		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	On page 37 2nd Para we welcome the approach to car parking where the needs of families and disabled people must be met notwithstanding the context of restraint necessary to accommodate development within the capacity of the road network.	2C	Connectivity and transport	37		Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBTH	• [p37] As the reference to the strategic transport sites (the rail heads) remains unchanged from the May 2011 version, our comment that this prejudices opportunities for alternative uses such as the proposed waste facility still stands. The text here should acknowledge the potential for intensification and co-location of uses, as the document does elsewhere. The reinforcement of the requirement for safeguarding of the Bow East and West railheads is unhelpful and at odds with our aspirations, acknowledged on p83, to provide a waste facility in that location. We suggest that the OLSPG could to help resolve this issue by including wording to the effect that “given the scale of change anticipated in this area, and the competing demands for land use, the Mayor’s expectation is that this safeguarding should be reviewed within the Plan Period.”	2C	Connectivity and transport	37		Partial change considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Development principle welcomed and supported. The proposal that “where public transport accessibility is high car parking levels should generally be reduced” is welcomed. The London Plan promises further guidance on car parking provision related to PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ratings and this will be of particular assistance in taking this proposal forward.	2C	Connectivity and transport	37	DP C3	Supporting - No change
BioRegional	Level of Commitment to Water and Rail: We are concerned that developments might investigate rail and waterway options but then opt for road-based freight – which would threaten the long-term viability of continuing the waterway use that has occurred during the construction of the Olympics Park.	2C	Connectivity and transport	37		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
British Waterways	Development principle C3 - Land use, freight and servicing We support the statement that “Development proposals should therefore investigate ways of using the OLSPG’s rail and waterway networks to carry construction and waste materials. Existing facilities for waterborne freight and waste use, and opportunities to provide wharf capacity should be explored by developers, landowners and planning authorities in masterplans and large-scale development proposals”. We also would support increased use of Three Mills Lock for barges serving the area’s development.	2C	Connectivity and transport	37		Supporting - No change
DB Schenker Rail UK Ltd	Going forward I wish to point out the importance of rail freight yards in East London and the general shortage of site capable of receiving rail traffic. MN summarised - Bow East and West important in the future as Rail use	2C	Connectivity and transport	37		General comment - No change
London Concrete	The failure of the SPG to include reference to the need to safeguard the Bow Midland West Rail Yard and associated facilities as a “Strategic Rail Freight Site” in accordance with National and London Plan Policy. Reference to the site as a “Strategic Transport Site” is not sufficiently precise and does not afford the appropriate level of protection for the existing or future use of the site.	2C	Connectivity and transport	37		Accept - Review and amend
RICS	While the need for car journeys is always likely to remain to some extent, extensive provision of public transport should minimise this need. The proposal to extend the Mayor’s cycle hire scheme across Tower Hamlets would help to reduce the need for car journeys and reduce the need for dependence on the car. The proposal to increase journeys by foot and by bike through linking routes is sensible, though it might be sensible to introduce cycle lanes on as many strategic roads as possible to make this a positive and safe experience. The transport of construction freight by water is an opportunity in east London not enjoyed in most other locations and is an area in which developers can make a contribution to a more sustainable east London, subject to the cost of waterborne transport when compared to rail and road freight charges and impact on viability.	2C	Connectivity and transport	37	DP C3	General comment - No change
Mineral Products Association	Summary - Strong Concern over the safeguarding of Bow West for Strategic Rail Freight Site rather than generic transport use. Lists 10 reasons why.	2C	Connectivity and transport	37		Accept - Review and amend
English Heritage	Context, paragraph 3 (page 39): we are pleased to see that conservation areas and listed buildings are mapped out as a base-line context for the urban form proposals which follow. However, for consistency with PPS 5 it would be more accurate to refer to heritage assets and their settings and to include registered parks and gardens, scheduled monuments and archaeological priority areas. Victoria Park, for example, is a Grade II* registered park, whose setting could be affected by proposals in Hackney Wick and Fish Island. There are also several archaeological priority areas identified within the SPG boundary which could have implications, for example, for the strategic approach to water management infrastructure or subterranean heat distribution pipe networks.	2D	Urban form	39	Para 3	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
ODA PDT	Overarching development principle welcomed and supported. However, there should be some recognition of the diversity of the built environment within the OLSPG area in the context of the reference to “city scale architecture” given that different locations within the OLSPG will need different approaches in terms of built form, development density and architectural form. This is addressed to some extent in the ‘context’ text that follows but the text focuses in on tall and large scale buildings rather than appropriate form and character in the context of different places in the OLSPG area. Greater emphasis here could help along with a reference to the differing characters being drawn out in the sub area sections of the document and in area specific policy and guidance within borough Local Development Frameworks. Figure 2.D.1 does, however, provide a useful context to considering the existing character and overall development pattern in the OLSPG area. Consider adding the following or similar to the end of the third paragraph of the ‘Context’ supporting text: “It is important that the form of development reflects and recognises the context and prevailing scale of its specific loca	2D	Urban form	39		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	Urban form - reference to Stratford City and the Olympic developments setting 'benchmarks' (p. 39) could be better phrased. These new developments create a new context, but shouldn't necessarily be replicated as seems to be implied. We object to the inclusion of a building heights map with the degree of detail shown as this cannot replace the 3 dimensional contextual analysis that is needed to justify development. Although we would prefer not to see the prescriptive building heights map, if it does stay, there should be careful caveats, that such heights are subject to excellence in design and a proper understanding of how it would fit in and define the area.	2D	Urban form	39		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p39] We strongly support the overarching development principle “to use the area’s unique open spaces, waterways, heritage buildings and contemporary city scale architecture and sporting facilities to create a network of new linked, inclusively designed and revitalised Lifetime Neighbourhoods”, which is in line with our own aspirations for the parts of the OLSPG area that fall within Tower Hamlets. It is therefore disappointing that the content of this section of the document is excessively focused on building heights (with guidance largely duplicating that presented in boroughs’ own policy documents) and has relatively little to say about how the broader aspirations will be realised, or on integration of urban form and the creation of a coherent place. This is reflected in the absence of any supporting development principles in this section of the document.	2D	Urban form	39		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• [p39] We strongly disagree with the suggestion that the “Olympic and Stratford City developments... set benchmarks in terms of scale of development, urban structure and land use which provide prompts for the development that follow in the delivery of the legacy.” While the scale and bulk of these developments may be appropriate in themselves, they are certainly not a suitable precedent for development across the entire legacy area, most of which will be on a significantly smaller and more human scale. This is presumably not the intended meaning, and we would suggest that this statement is removed, or at least reworded for clarification.	2D	Urban form	39		Accept - Review and amend
TFL	New wording: “The OLSPG supports the Mayor’s Green Grid objectives and Strategic Walk Network (SWN) as well as...”	2D	Urban form	39	Para 7	Accept - Review and amend
English Heritage	2.D Urban form: Overarching development principle and supporting text (page 39): we are concerned that the overarching development principle regarding urban form does not sufficiently capture the strategic approach towards the historic environment outlined within the area-based policies of the Guidance and in accurate reflection of the local policies such as Area Action Plans (AAPs) at Hackney Wick and Fish Island, as well as other local planning frameworks and masterplans.	2D	Urban form	39		Accept - Review and amend
English Heritage	The current development principle text suggests a blanket approach towards urban form in which contemporary and historic architecture are uniformly mixed across the SPG area without variation in neighbourhood character. A more nuanced development principle might highlight the concept of transition from contemporary city-scale around the Stratford City and High Street to a more restrained and heritage-led approach at the periphery, responding to conservation-area designations and the character of the surrounding residential hinterlands. This is particularly important at Fish Island and Hackney Wick, for example, where AAPs seek to enhance historic character around the existing and proposed conservation areas. At Stratford Town, the Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan envisages finer grain development and lower building heights around St John’s Church in order to enhance the historic character of the St John’s Conservation Area. These intentions are broadly expressed within the key urban form proposals on page 41, but they could usefully be summarised as an overarching design concept upfront within the opening sections of Section 2.	2D	Urban form	39		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
British Waterways	2.D Urban form We support the proposal here to "...use the area's unique open spaces, waterways, heritage buildings...to create a network of new linked, inclusively designed and revitalised Lifetime Neighbourhoods" and particularly linking this with the industrial heritage of the waterways which served the area. While we are pleased that the significance of the waterways and their potential opportunities are acknowledged here, we consider that there is potential for greater use of the waterway environment to support the wider aims of the SPG. The Lower Lee Valley Waterspace Strategy and Olympic Waterways strategy highlight opportunities for a range of moorings and leisure opportunities to activate and animate the waterspace, to help make the waterways the '5th Olympic Venue'.	2D	Urban form	39		Accept - Review and amend
London Cycling Campaign	"LLV OAPF to create a network of parks and open spaces focused on the River Lea. <i>These spaces and pedestrian links</i> will be used to help connect the area's new and existing communities, improve connections" Cycling should be included. We suggest amending italicised words to "These spaces and pedestrian/cycling links..."	2D	Urban form	39	Para 7	Accept - Review and amend
RICS	The approach described in aligning the draft guidance with Borough spatial frameworks seems a good approach, though this highlights the potential impact of Neighbourhood Plans where these articulate what may sometimes be the differing and perspectives of local residents. The development of what is essentially a new locality in east London does mean that in places there is considerable freedom where previous post-industrial landscape is to be completely redeveloped. It would be good to retain the historic element in the built environment where this is possible to help build communities that not only look forward, but that can look back and value the historic environment. This can help reinforce the character of local places and develop places with which people can identify. This is likely to apply more to the fringes of the OLSPG than to the urban centres but will be a factor in some waterside development and the Conservation Areas of Hackney and Fish Island, and the document rightly identifies the many opportunities for place shaping that use existing open space and the river and canal network. The scale of opportunities to optimise the green and blue grids and recognise existi	2D	Urban form	39		General comment - No change
NHS East London and City	We recommend that more detailed consideration is given to the opportunities for exercise and community participation within this network for people of all ages and all abilities. For example, play spaces, multi-use games areas, allotments and public and community gardens provide opportunities for people of different ages and abilities. Food growing in particular has excellent health and wellbeing outcomes for young and old alike but dedicated space is always difficult to come by in the inner city unless it is identified within strategic planning. We consider that the development principle should contain policy statements on the use of design codes, density standards and the provision of green infrastructure.	2D	Urban form	39	OA DP	Accept - Review and amend
Land Use Consultants	Consider inclusion of text supporting provision of green infrastructure within the built environment (such as street trees, living roofs and walls, planters and pocket parks) which may go some way to reduce recreation pressure elsewhere, whilst assisting adaptation to climate change and reduce air pollution.	2D	Urban Form	39		Accept - Review and amend
LBWF	One of the important aspects of Urban Form is to improve strategic challenge of 'Convergence' and connectivity by linking physical improvements brought about by the Olympics and its legacy with wider changes in their boroughs. This section should highlight how the built environment can influence socio-economic change in the surrounding neighbourhood.	2D	Urban form	39		Accept - Review and amend
BioRegional	Brownfield First: We are concerned that new development should first take place on previously developed land so that the full extent of green infrastructure in the OLSPG is retained, and in some cases enhanced. We are concerned that focus of development around green spaces does not impact upon biodiversity of the site and that the need for the developments to be resilient against climate change adaptation and storm surge/flooding is carefully planned in the way that the urban form interacts with the wider urban environment.	2D	Urban form	39		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	There are also elements of the text that could likewise be more carefully phrased and aligned with this diagram, notably reference the to tall buildings adjacent to Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park which will need to be very carefully articulated, distinct and set very high standards.	2D	Urban form	39		Accept - Review and amend
London Wildlife Trust	4. Add green infrastructure as a prominent measure or Development Principle Section to D Urban Form. This will include measures such as living roofs and walls, bio swales or rain gardens as features of sustainable urban drainage systems, pocket parks, meadow road-verges and street trees.	2D	Urban form	39		Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	The overarching development principles and 'context' set out in Section 2.D are supported and so too is the guidance relating to 'urban form for the Southern Olympic Fringe area.	2D	Urban form	39		Supporting - No change
LBH	The listed building directly west of the Hackney Wick Conservation Area should be removed. This dot is within Biggs square which is a recent housing development and is not listed.	2D	Urban form	40	Fig 2.D.1	Partial change considered appropriate
Lancaster PLC	As a minor point, the 35 storey proposal at 2-12 Stratford High Street has been (or is in the final stages of being) approved. This may need adding to Figure 2.D.1.	2D	Urban form	40	Fig 2.D.1	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
OPLC	Plan shows pre-demolition buildings on the Olympic Park therefore does not reflect current baseline and is misleading.	2D	Urban form	40	Fig 2.D.1	Accept - Review and amend
Leyton Orient Football Club and Matchroom Ltd	The built form of Leyton Orient Football Club is not shown on the figure and the site is shown with a green wash. The built form on the site should be shown on all figures and plans. The omission of the existing built form on the site and the green wash gives an incorrect impression that the site is a Greenfield area of open space. This is not the case. The site is a developed mixed use site. The built form should be shown on this figure with an 'existing building height of 7-10 storeys'.	2D	Urban form	40	Fig 2.D.1	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
RICS	Stratford The proposals for taller and higher density development in the Metropolitan Centre of Stratford seem appropriate and the desire to balance this with the conserving what is of value from the past in the town centre and Conservation Area seems a good balance. Please see earlier comment on the use of Transport Development Areas near major transport interchanges and support for urban intensification around Stratford. Northern Olympic Fringe/Hackney Wick/Fish Island The proposals for higher density in these areas need to be consistent in scale with the family housing. Southern Olympic Fringe The rationale for the tall buildings here is consistent with its identity as a District Centre and the need to maximise the assets of the two Conservation Areas is sensitive to the local context. Olympic Park The innovative approach here is based on the entirely new design for the Park and its future role. Figure 2.D.2 illustrates the localities where tall buildings are considered suitable, leaving much of the area with the existing scale. Please see earlier comment on Transport Development areas and related urban intensification.	2D	Urban form	41		Supporting - No change
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace considers that tall buildings should be considered in the Pudding Mill Lane area, especially where it adjoins the canal as such buildings are essential for the delivery of regeneration schemes and will assist in enabling the delivery of modern economic floorspace and housing within mixed-use developments. Workspace considers that tall buildings allow for the efficient use of land and provide excellent regeneration opportunities.	2D	Urban form	41	Fig 2.D.2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (Ransome & Company)	Workspace therefore objects to building guide height of 2 to 3 stories on land south of Pudding Mill Lane Station as cited in Figure 2.D.2 and considers that this area should include tall buildings. This area should be included as tall building location for the following reasons: The site is close to an excellent public transport network; There are no physical constraints that restrain building heights; A number of the existing buildings exceed the heights given in Figure 2.D.2; Tall buildings offer excellent regeneration opportunities; The proposed would sit uncomfortably against the adjoining high density areas and as such would create a disjointed urban form; and Increased density will provide a more appropriate urban form to front the adjoining canal.	2D	Urban form	41	Fig 2.D.2	Partial change considered appropriate
OPLC	OPLC does not agree that the quantum of development identified by the OLSPG can be delivered in the way promoted with the proposed building heights. It does not necessarily mean that lower densities give a more suburban feel which the OLSPG is certainly not. The LCS has carefully considered heights across the area it has proposals for. The OLSPG should consider greater building heights in the following LCS areas: PDZ 2 PDZ 4 PDZ 5 PDZ 6 PDZ 8 Detailed justification for this can be found in the LCS Design and Access Statement but OPLC would welcome a discussion with the GLA on this matter. OPLC will provide a more detailed analysis of storey heights across the LCS area. We do not believe that there should be prescribed building heights. Particularly as the OLSPG proposes lower buildings heights in the above locations that can achieve the number of homes both the OPLC and OLSPG hope to see delivered. Bromley by Bow Should not propose 4-6 storeys along the A12 this should be 4-6 as the A12 is a very harsh environment. See CABE comments on Bromley by Bow north. This is also not near Bromley by Bow station or district centre so counter to planning guidance. All	2D	Urban form	41	Fig 2.D.2	Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBTH	• [p41] Although we agree that the heritage buildings within Hackney Wick and Fish Island provide an important part of the area's character and should form the basis for master planning of new development, the text gives no real sense of how the overarching development principle will be achieved. It is not currently clear what value this part of the OLSPG adds to the existing and emerging guidance from the two relevant boroughs.	2D	Urban form	41		Partial change considered appropriate
LBWF	This section stresses the importance of building heights. This issue should be for guidance and should refer to the boroughs AAPs (such as NOF AAP).	2D	Urban form	41		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	Page 41 should not state Stratford as a soon to be Metropolitan Centre as this is dependent on meeting conditions set out in Core Strategy Policy INF5 referred to above. In various places throughout the document the correct reference should be to Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan.	2D	Urban form	41		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	"... – although not of the scale of Stratford are at Hackney Wick and the Northern Olympic Fringe sites to the west of Leyton town centre, with building heights at the former proposed in the range of six to eight storeys..." This should read four to six storeys in accordance with the Hackney Wick AAP.	2D	Urban form	41		Partial change considered appropriate
BioRegional	Conservation vs. Development: We are concerned about how the location of high buildings, particularly along the A11 west of Stratford and to the South East of Stratford centre, sits with the retention of areas of conservation value and the desire to increase connectivity across transport routes, such as the A11.	2D	Urban form	41		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
English Heritage	Key urban form proposals (page 41): we welcome the recognition shown in paragraph 5 to conservation-led regeneration at Fish Island and Hackney Wick Conservation Areas. In paragraph 4 it could be emphasised that higher densities at Hackney Wick do not necessarily require taller buildings.	2D	Urban form	41	PARA 5	Partial change considered appropriate
Neptune Group	We consider that a generic application of 4-6 stories across mid FI as a whole would be too prescriptive; as this covers for example, not only the conservation area, but also the waterfronts and key routes / crossing points, where the opportunities for height are clearly greater.	2D	Urban form	41		Partial change considered appropriate
Neptune Group	The heights framework (fig 2.D.2 and 3.5.4), although not prescriptive, should identify those areas with greater potential.	2D	Urban form	41		Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	The height proposed within Hackney Wick should be in accordance with the building height strategy outlined in the updated Hackney Wick AAP. The height for area around the MUA is considered too low and 4-6 maximum storeys are considered more appropriate.	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.2	Accept - Review and amend
LBH	As per the comments above made on Figure 2.2.1 OLSPG Areas of Change in relation to reflecting the OIA designation as per the Council's Core Strategy / including the small triangle of SIL.	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.2	Accept - Review and amend
LVRPA	The Authority is concerned that Figure 2.D.2 Proposed Context (for Urban Form on page 42) shows a 'Gateway site' notation over the Essex Wharf site on Lea Bridge Road, which states "identified by LA as suitable for taller buildings". This should be removed, the Authority is seeking to challenge the London Borough of Waltham Forest's grant of planning permission for residential development on this site.	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.2	Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	Figure 2.D.2 Proposed context We note heights of 4-6 storeys are proposed, and we consider that along the waterway, building heights should be kept reasonably low, particularly where proposed close to the back edge of the towpath.	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
East Thames & Southern Housing Group	The (unnumbered) Figure on page 42 provides a guide to building heights and, with regard to Bromley-by-Bow north, this indicates that heights of between 7-10 storeys would be appropriate along the frontage of the site to the A12, stepping down to 4-6 storeys to the east adjoining the River Lea. This site provides a major development opportunity and the context is such that it can support a high density development. The indicative heights set out on the plan on page 42 are supported but should be treated as a minimum.	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.3	Partial change considered appropriate
English Heritage	Building heights: in general we welcome the building heights strategy which sets out a plan-led approach with to tall buildings within the SPG area, following English Heritage/CABE's Guidance on Tall Buildings (2007). In illustrating building heights, both in the Development Principles (section 2) and the sub-area policies, the document should make clear that these illustrations do not endorse a blanket approach to heights in the areas concerned, rather that these are subject to further detailed guidance in local policy and master planning work. For example, on pages 42 and 68 8 storeys are recommended for the "island" site at Stratford Town, yet it may be more appropriate for buildings within and fronting the St John's Conservation Area to be less tall in response to the local historic character.	2D	Urban form	42		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (GVA)	Figure 2.D.2 references the Stratford Masterplan (LB of Newham, Dec 2010) as the source from which the proposed recommended building heights in the area of change have been derived. However, this document locates the site within an area where proposed building heights of four storeys are recommended. To ensure consistency with the approach to building heights being taken by the LB of Newham in the Stratford Masterplan, therefore, it is considered that the OLSPG and Figure 2.D.2 should be updated and that the site should be identified as an appropriate location for building heights falling within the identified 4-6 storey category.	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.2	Partial change considered appropriate
Workspace Group (GVA)	Figure 2.D.2 identifies the proposed building heights which are considered to be appropriate throughout the OLSPG area. This identifies the Marshgate Business Centre within a corridor where a recommended building height of 8 storeys is generally considered appropriate, and where landmark building heights of 16-24 storeys are also considered to be appropriate. Within this corridor, the site is specifically identified as being appropriate for buildings of 2-3 storeys. Related to this, the OLSPG also appears to associate the delivery of family housing with the requirement for this to be located in predominantly lower rise buildings given the height parameters which are suggested for the area of change. However, it does not necessarily follow that successful family housing needs to be at low densities and it should therefore be recognised that well designed quality medium and high density development can provide for family housing with equal levels of success.	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Workspace Group (GVA)	This would enable the site to be capable of delivering a suitable transition in scale terms between areas to the south where building heights of 11 plus storeys are proposed, and areas to the north and west where a lower scale of development away from the taller buildings proposed along Stratford High Street would be more appropriate. We consider that this would represent a sensible approach in townscape terms which would avoid the abrupt change in scale between land to the north and south of the Bow Back River which is currently proposed. It is also considered that this transitional stepping down from Stratford High Street would represent a more appropriate townscape response than that currently proposed in the OLSPG which not only identifies this abrupt change in scale along the Bow Back River but also identifies an area along the railway to the west of Pudding Mill Lane DLR Station as being appropriate for buildings in the 4-6 storey height parameter. Whilst it is recognised that taller buildings might arrive in the potential gateway site next	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
H Forman & Son	We note the building heights shown for Fish Island generally as being 4-6 storeys at Figures 2.D.2 and 3.4.5. We consider this should be seen as minimum benchmark, and consider that areas lying outside the conservation areas, for example, waterfront locations, have the opportunity to accommodate a greater capacity of development. The suggested heights should be tested through further urban design analysis, which we consider would demonstrate that heights above the suggested 4-6 storey level will be able to deliver good quality environments in appropriate locations.	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.2	General comment - No change
Lancaster PLC	We would support the building heights shown for this site (11 storeys plus) at Figures 2.D.2 and 3.4.5.	2D	Urban form	42	FIG 2.D.2	Supporting - No change



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Workspace Group (GVA)	Notwithstanding the above, and the intention of the OLSPG to deliver guidance on recommended building heights across the subject area, our client does not support the rigid definition of appropriate heights in different 'zones'. Individual sites should be assessed on their merits in accordance with the criteria for tall buildings set out in the London Plan and where it can be demonstrated no harm arises that cannot be mitigated in terms of townscape, environmental impacts and infrastructure capacity, then development should be considered acceptable. Where the OLSPG seeks to retain this rigid definition of height zones, appropriate wording should be added to recognise that building heights 'generally' or 'predominantly' fall within the identified height parameters. This would then provide future building designers with the scope to respond to the OLSPG guidance and to provide buildings which respond to the particular physical characteristics of sites and the context set by the surrounding area.	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Lend lease	Urban Form – With respect to Figure 2.D.2 Proposed Context, we would like to note that the recommended building heights for 'Stratford City' i.e. Westfield and The International Quarter conflict with the current Outline Planning Consent for the scheme approval ref 07/90023/VARODA. To reflect the true context of this area the recommended heights would be better reflected by current consents.	2D	Urban form	42	Fig 2.D.2	Accept - Review and amend
LBTH	• [p43-44] The draft acknowledges elsewhere our investigation of the feasibility of an energy generating waste facility in Fish Island South, potentially linked to the energy centre at Kings Yard. This should also be referenced in this section of the document, and shown on the map on page 44.	2E	Sustainable development	43		Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	We welcome the inclusion of Development Principle E1 (Energy), which sets out the London Plan policies central to achieving low carbon development in the OLSPG area, as well as the local means of implementing them (including the two energy centres in the OLSPG area and energy networks). Reference to the potential linking of the energy networks in the OLSPG area to the Thames Gateway Heat Network is supported and consistent with the Core Strategy. However, it is considered that the OLSPG should include a requirement for residential development to achieve at least Code for Sustainable Level 4 as minimum and for non-residential development to achieve a comparable BREEAM standard (at least 'Very good'); this would be consistent with the Core Strategy and in-line with the Policy 5.2 of the London Plan, which sets out energy standards consistent with the energy aspects of the Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulations. Council considers that reference to these national standards would provide for certainty and consistency in achieving sustainable development in the built environment.	2E	Sustainable development	43	DP E1	Accept - Review and amend
LBTH	• [p43] We strongly support development principle E1, in relation to energy, and particularly the requirement for bridges and development to be designed to allow the expansion of the decentralised energy networks beyond the Olympic Park. However, we suggest that the principle should be expanded to incorporate renewable technologies and the requirement to reduce urban overheating. While significant CO2 savings will be achieved by use of the energy centres for heating and cooling, there are opportunities to further reduce emissions through the integration of renewable energy technologies, in line with chapter 5 of the London Plan 2011. It is therefore important to secure the delivery of renewable energy technologies where possible for all new development. We recommend that wording to the effect that "where feasible, development proposals in the OLSPG area should provide a reduction in expected carbon dioxide emissions through the use of on-site renewable energy generation" should be added to the text. In relation to urban overheating, London Plan policies 5.9 (overheating and cooling), 5.10 (urban greening) and 5.11 (green roofs and development site environs) all note the benefits of urban greening and incorporating green roofs and walls into developments.	2E	Sustainable development	43		Accept - Review and amend
LBN	We welcome the overarching development principle, which is consistent with the Core Strategy.	2E	Sustainable development	43		Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	The development principle is welcomed and supported along with the supporting text, particularly in seeking the extension of the existing\developing heat network within the Olympic Park and Stratford City and the highlighting of the need for new bridges to include provision to carry this and other utilities required for the growth being planned in the area. The supporting text includes reference to the desirability to allow for further future connections to other heat networks to the north and south of the Olympic Park area. This is welcomed. However, a reference to the need for a wider strategy of energy related carbon reduction within the OLSPG area as a whole would be welcomed, for example through opportunities to maximise the efficiency of building fabric/design, the appropriate use of renewable energy and the use of CHP/CCHP within developments large enough to justify such provision (with the opportunity to link into and become part of any area wide heat networks that are delivered in the future. Consider adding to the end	2E	Sustainable development	43	DP E1	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
BioRegional	Limited Sustainability: We are concerned that this is the last principle presented in the report, which encourages the reader to consider each of the principles A-D, before sustainability is presented or considered. We are also concerned that the extent of the sections in the report on sustainability are very limited (including p67, p75, p83, p91) and do not appear to represent a continuation of the pre-games commitment to a legacy that creates a sustainability blueprint for developments in London.	2E	Sustainable development	43		Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	The overarching development principle is welcomed and particular the reference to continuing the emphasis on sustainability that has been a focus in delivering the Games time and Legacy Olympic Park and permanent venues. Reference to the emphasis on achieving sustainable development within the Governments' draft National Planning Policy Framework may also help to reinforce the emphasis of this section of the document. Consider reference to proposed definition of 'Sustainable Development' within the draft NPPF.	2E	Sustainable development	43	OA DP	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
NHS East London and City	We welcome the commitment to promoting exemplar standards of sustainable design and construction and environmental quality across the OLSPG area. We recommend that the SPG clarifies further what this means in practice, particularly by defining an ambition in terms of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The recommendation in the SRF report Healthy Urban Planning in Practice for the Olympic Legacy Masterplan Framework is for Code Level 5 including all health and wellbeing criteria. To be considered 'exemplar' we consider that development in the OLSPG area, particularly the Legacy Communities Scheme should seek to achieve this level. We also welcome the commitment to create a new part of London 'which is ready to respond to the challenge of climate change', particularly the considered approach to flood risk mitigation, sustainable drainage, water stress and urban greening. Some of the secondary benefits to health and wellbeing of such measures are identified, such the use of water storage to improve amenity and biodiversity.	2E	Sustainable development	43	OA DP	Supporting - No change
BioRegional	E1. This principle has no real value with its inclusion of the words 'wherever feasible'. It only relates directly to creation of a decentralised energy network. We would have liked to see a wider commitment to reduce the demand for energy (through improvement of the build fabric of new homes above statutory standards and a commitment to retrofit all existing homes within the OLSPG area, together with public buildings and work places). Currently this principle limits the focus on energy to just one aspect, which is low rather than zero carbon and does nothing to set out any wider commitment to sustainable (zero carbon) legacy in the OLSPG area. The current principle will minimise impact by only focusing on district heating whereas some areas may provide better opportunities for other measures such as roof mounted solar thermal. We would propose the following additional energy related guidance: "Any new buildings within the OLSPG will be expected to reduce their energy demand through energy efficiency measures to : • 39 kWh/m <sup>2</sup> /year for apartments and mid-terrace houses; and • 46 kWh/m <sup>2</sup> /year for end-terrace, semi-detached and detached houses".	2E	Sustainable development	43	DP E1	Partial change considered appropriate
BioRegional	We are also concerned about the absence of any focus on sustainable construction and reducing the resource and embodied carbon footprint of the development itself in the OLSPG.	2E	Sustainable development	43		Accept - Review and amend
BioRegional	The OLSPG approach, limiting responses to climate change to discussions about energy and waste means that the plan does not explore: - The link between effective planning and sustainable living (behaviour change aspects, as set out in the 'I Will if you Will' report ; - The importance of spatial planning and interlinking of transport, infrastructure, homes and other (community/work) buildings to reduce overall impacts through avoiding the need to travel and scale of other resource use; - The link between resource consumption (not considered here) and carbon footprint - food; - biodiversity; - The link between environmental quality (including green infrastructure links and urban open land) and sustainable living; or - The importance of social infrastructure and equity in enabling communities to develop in ways that they live within resource limits and limit climate change impacts.	2E	Sustainable development	43		Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
BioRegional	Local Leadership: Therefore, we are concerned that this is at odds with both the current planning framework (PPS1) and new (NPPF) which both propose a central focus on sustainable development. In the spirit of Localism, we would have expected to see this prioritisation of sustainability nationally to be retained with the same level of leadership locally. If this is retained as a separate principle we therefore suggest that it is stressed how this is cross-cutting, and will underpin sustainability both at the build stage and built quality, so that it delivers sustainability, as well as facilitates and enables sustainable living. As sustainability has not been considered in an overarching manner, addressing overall aspects of policy as opposed to these three detailed areas of impact, we are concerned that the OLSPG does not comply with the Strategic Environmental Appraisal regulations.	2E	Sustainable development	43		Partial change considered appropriate
BioRegional	We also feel it is important that the OLSPG clearly sets out a requirement for master-planning to be carried out in a way to maximize environmental and social sustainability. We recommend that this include research by UCL' spatial syntax group (or similar) to carry out a social sustainability impact assessment to ensure that the development plans are best-practice in meeting local needs, quality of life and sustainable communities.	2E	Sustainable development	43		Partial change considered appropriate
BioRegional	Interconnectedness: Considering the report structure we would have expected to see all aspects of environmental sustainability to be covered here including sustainable construction and material/resource use during the construction stage to be included here – and aspects of social sustainability (including Quality of Life and community resilience) to be considered under the first Development Principle. However, the One Planet Living process employed on the Olympics brought these two aspects, together with sustainable economy considerations, together so that the risk of trade-off is avoided and win-win solutions, that deliver both social and environmental sustainability, can be developed from the outset.	2E	Sustainable development	43		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Sustainable Development Commission	The LSDC recommends that the SPG requires a more thorough approach to sustainability than contained so far in 2.E (sustainable development) and that it should go beyond the broad treatment of energy, flood and waste measures covered so as to convey a longer term approach to the area leading to new standards related to economic, social and environmental sustainability that build on the lessons from the planning for 2012 and actively avoid the development path taken to date by the rest of London.	2E	Sustainable development	43		Accept - Review and amend
British Waterways	2.E Sustainable development BW promote use of our canal/river water for cooling of adjacent buildings, which can be more efficient and sustainable than other methods, and is used for several district heating networks and data centres around are network. This would also be relevant further up the Lee Navigation in the Upper Lee Valley, and our Utilities team would be willing to offer advice for this. As promoted elsewhere in the document, we would also mention the significant potential for moving waste by waterborne freight.	2E	Sustainable development	43		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Sustainable Development Commission	The LSDC is therefore recommending that carbon emissions per capita should be included in the convergence criteria.	2E	Sustainable development	43		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Sustainable Development Commission	In order to maintain the level of innovation and excitement that London has enjoyed over the past few years, the LSDC recommends that the next iteration of the SPG includes a clearer identification of how innovation in the low carbon economy will be encouraged.	2E	Sustainable development	43		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Wildlife Trust	3. Change Development Principle E from Sustainable Development to Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation from which the Development Principle Sections of Energy, Flood risk and Waste management spring.	2E	Sustainable development	43		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
RICS	The proposals for energy and water infrastructure should help set new standards of excellence in east London and should be a blueprint for sustainable development elsewhere in the UK and beyond. Links with sustainable energy in the Upper Lee Valley and more widely into the London Thames Gateway should ensure that this becomes a mainstream initiative that is not isolated to the OLSPG area and generate considerable new employment in a range of skills. The emphasis on open space should help provide both a high quality environment for residents and for biodiversity. RICS has recently carried out work on the value of open green space in avoiding the worst impacts of the heat island effect which can increase urban temperatures by as much as 7 degrees Celsius <a href="http://www.rics.org/site/scripts/press_article.aspx?pressReleaseID=541">http://www.rics.org/site/scripts/press_article.aspx?pressReleaseID=541</a> With much local green space that residents can enjoy it is possible that impacts on Epping Forest and the Upper Lee Valley will be less severe than otherwise.	2E	Sustainable development	43		Supporting - No change
LBN	We welcome the inclusion of Development Principle E2 (Flood risk and water conservation and management), which sets out regional and local strategies for achieving flood resistant development consistent with the Core Strategy. Reference to Surface Water Management Plans and evidence emerging from the Drain London project, as well as collaboration between the GLA, Local Authorities and the Environment Agency is welcomed. However, we consider the OLSPG could be strengthened by noting that the four boroughs have also prepared Strategic Flood Risk Assessments; these should be regarded by planning decisions in the OLSPG area as central to minimising the risk of tidal and fluvial flooding in the OLSPG area and beyond.	2E	Sustainable development	45	DP E2	Accept - Review and amend
ODA PDT	Development principle welcomed and supported.	2E	Sustainable development	45	DP E2	Supporting - No change
BioRegional	E2: Flood risk and water contamination management Given the stress that London's water supply is currently under it is essential that all opportunities to reduce water demand are taken. The Code for Sustainable Homes sets stringent minimum standards for water consumption for residential buildings. However, for non-residential buildings BREEAM does not require such high water efficiency standards. We would therefore propose the additional policy wording to provide a standard that buildings can be assessed against. "It is expected that all new non-residential buildings within the OLSPG area will achieve maximum credits from BREEAM credit area WAT 1; and that any new landscaping in the area should be designed so that irrigation is not required."	2E	Sustainable development	45	DP E2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Environment Agency	Page 45 - Please note that Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments (PFRAs) have now been completed by the London Boroughs and the outputs of these should inform future iterations of this plan.	2E	Sustainable development	45	Col. 2 Para 3	Accept - Review and amend
Environment Agency	We welcome the statement that "Sustainable drainage systems should be complimented by urban greening measures such as living roofs, and walls or planting that should form an integral design feature of new developments" and feel that reference to the benefits to biodiversity that SUDS themselves can make would enhance this statement further. We have suggested some potential additional wording: When looking to install SUDS, the use of detention basins and swales can themselves enhance biodiversity; the creation of well vegetated shallow bays and the avoidance of smoothly finished surfaces (which provide less physical habitat diversity for plants and animals), as well as ensuring that only native plants or plants of local providence are used as part of the SUDS regime.	2E	Sustainable development	45	Col. 2 Para 3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBWF	Page 45, 3rd paragraph states that, '... the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMPs) will be completed in spring 2011 and will include new modelling...' Have the SWMPs been finished yet, if so any recommendation to be included?	2E	Sustainable development	45		Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	Page 45 British Waterways are also working with the Environment Agency to improve the water environment of the Lee Navigation and Olympic Park waterways.	2E	Sustainable development	45		General comment - No change
Thames Water	Development Principle E2 – Flood risk and water conservation management We welcome the policy on flood risk and water conservation management.	2E	Sustainable development	45	DP E2	Supporting - No change
Environment Agency	This paragraph states "A number of River Basin Management Plans have been prepared by Thames Water which..." Thames Water would not have prepared the River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) and therefore this paragraph should be reworded to reflect this. Alternatively it could state that a number of RBMPs have been produced by the Environment Agency but in consultation with many partners, which ...	2E	Sustainable development	45	Col. 2 Para 5	Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Environment Agency	For your benefit, please find below some general information on RBMPs. This is from our website and therefore the information can be used as required: Water in rivers, estuaries, coasts and aquifers will improve under measures set out in River Basin Management Plans, drawn up for river basin districts across England and Wales under the Water Framework Directive. River Basin Management Plans are plans for protecting and improving the water environment and have been developed in consultation with organisations and individuals. They contain the main issues for the water environment and the actions we all need to take to deal with them. Everyone uses water in their daily lives, whether for recreational activities, industry, agriculture or as a water consumer. The River Basin Management Plans have been approved by the Secretary of State for the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and the Welsh Minister.	2E	Sustainable development	45	Col. 2 Para 5	General comment - No change
Thames Water	The following sub text to the policy addition should be included: "Where there are potential infrastructure capacity constraints an infrastructure strategy will need to be produced by the developer in liaison with the relevant statutory undertaker to ensure the appropriate upgrades are in place ahead of occupation of the development. Where there is a capacity problem or potential adverse amenity impact on future occupiers, and no improvements are programmed by the statutory undertaker, the Mayor will liaise with the relevant Council to ensure the developer funds in full the appropriate improvements which must be completed prior to occupation of the development."	2E	Sustainable development	45		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Thames Water	We also welcome the reference within the sub text to the policy to the inadequacy of the combine sewerage system and the reference to the work we are carrying out to improve water quality in the River Lea, this includes the Lea Tunnel project, and we also have plans to improve the water quality in the Salmons Brook, upstream of the Olympic Legacy Area, through our plans for the Deephams Sewage Works Upgrade. Given the importance of these projects to improving water quality in the Lower Lea Valley, we would welcome direct reference to both these projects in the SPG. Further detail on both these schemes can be provided to you if required.	2E	Sustainable development	45		Partial change considered appropriate
RICS	The document recognises that the OLSPG area is mostly with the natural flood plain of the River Lea and seeks to manage the existing flood risk and that of new development that uses open spaces as flood storage capacity. There is though a significant amount of transport infrastructure and some essential social infrastructure at potential risk of flooding and this could increase in time due to climate change impacts. It is essential that the risks continue to be monitored and recognised and that defences, including water storage capacity in open green space is adequate for the current and future level of development. A particularly disquieting impact would be the flooding of the area with groundwater that is polluted by sewage if floods were to persist and the impacts on water quality of pollution by sewage of storm water runoff could be a serious concern, particularly in view of the planned population increase in the area of 60 000. It is vital that sustainable drainage and other flood prevention measures are employed to minimise impacts and there is a real need for urban greening to manage runoff. Planning ahead for the future impacts of climate change and a suite of manage	2E	Sustainable development	45	DP E2	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Thames Water	Please add following text "The Mayor will seek to ensure that there is adequate infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, to serve all new developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate infrastructure both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users or future occupiers."	2E	Sustainable development	45		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Wildlife Trust	In respect of flood risk and water conservation & management (DP E2), reference should also be made to the Lower Lee Water Framework Directive pilot, now being carried out – through a partnership steered by the Environment Agency – which will prepare a Catchment Management Plan by December 2012.	2E	Sustainable development	45	DP 2E	General comment - No change
LBH	As per the comments above on Figure 2.2.1 OLSPG Areas of Change in relation to reflecting the OIA designation as per the Council's Core Strategy / including the small triangle of SIL. Amend Figure 2.E.2 to reflect the OIA boundary as per Hackney's Core Strategy Proposals Map. Also map the small triangle of SIL as an 'Area of Change'.	2E	Sustainable development	46	Fig 2.E.2	Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBH	The flooding probabilities for Zone 3a need to be amended. In accordance with PPS 25, this zone comprises land assessed as having a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding (>1%) or a 1 in 200 or greater annual probability of flooding from the sea (>0.5%) in any year.	2E	Sustainable development	46	Fig 2.E.2	Accept - Review and amend
LBWF	Details of 'Green Enterprise facility' should be promoted and analysed. At present various waste facilities are shown on the map. Wider issues of waste capacity should be given consideration.	2E	Sustainable development	47		General comment - No change
LBN	However, it is worth reminding the OLSPG's authors that Fish Island (south) is in Tower Hamlets and that waste facilities displaced from Fish Island (mid and north) have to be found a home within Tower Hamlets' waste plan area. LB Newham has a safeguarded site for a medium to large scale facility at Beckton Riverside.	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	General comment - No change
LBN	We note that emphasis given to incineration for energy has not been written with regard to the waste hierarchy which requires waste to be recycled where possible, first, and that only residual waste (SRF) should be burnt. We would therefore like to see reference to "The management of waste, firstly with regard to re use, then recycling and only then the potential to secure energy from waste technologies or preferably through co-location and then by locating facilities as near as possible to the source of arisings.	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	The preference for "re-use and recycling first" should be clearly inferred throughout the policy.	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	Accept - Review and amend
LBN	We support the requirements for sustainable transportation of waste, to reduce its impact on the road network, though it is recognised that this will not always be practicable. We wonder, for example, whether it will be practicable for waste to be carried along the Lea Navigation to Edmonton--has this been fully explored?	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	The inspector's fact-check report has been received; it is anticipated that, subject to Council approval, the JWDPD will be adopted by the end of March 2012.	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	Accept - Review and amend
LBTH	[p47] The text under development principle E3, waste management and contamination, should look beyond simple identification of existing waste management facilities and consider the wider issue of waste capacity. This part of the document should again refer to and promote the opportunity to develop a new green waste to energy facility in Fish Island South linked to the Kings Yard energy centre. Such a facility would provide a sustainable way of dealing with household waste across Tower Hamlets, reducing reliance on land fill and converting waste to energy to serve new homes in the Olympic Park, Fish Island and Hackney Wick. Without a proactive approach to dealing with the processing of waste there is a risk that existing waste sites will be restricted to that use in accordance with London Plan policy. This could threaten the long term regeneration of key opportunity sites within the area, such as the McGrath waste facility in Fish Island North.	2E	Sustainable development	47		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBH	The Green Enterprise District in 2.E refers mainly to waste services and sustainability jobs rather than green spaces. Green jobs are to be welcomed, but there is no detail provided about what they mean or how it relates to green spaces. Request clarification on what is meant by Green Jobs and whether the proposed 'green jobs' are intended to provide opportunities for the management of green space.	2E	Sustainable development	47		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
ODA PDT	Development principle welcomed and supported.	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
BioRegional	E3. Contaminated Land. We are concerned that although the title of this principle is 'waste management and contamination' there is no mention of contaminated land in the principle itself and the supporting text refers only to the need for a study to be carried out. With the relaxation of national planning policy with the NPPF proposing to remove the presumption to develop previously developed land first, together with the requirement for local Strategic Housing Land Allocation Assessments to over-allocate by 20% in future Local Development Frameworks we are concerned that this could leave many contaminated sites undeveloped. A clear statement prioritizing development of previously developed land should be added. Negative Local Impacts: We are concerned that the decontaminated Olympics Park may be developed in preference to contaminated sites in and beyond the OLSPG area, which would limit the potential for green infrastructure, urban open land and allotments to be provided alongside the housing, retail and industrial development.	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
BioRegional	Reuse and remanufacturing will generally be more sustainable than recycling or energy generation solutions, even if they require further transport. They also create more (green) jobs which we believe should be part of the legacy strategy for the Olympics.	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
BioRegional	We note (from Figure 2.E.3) that the OLSPG forms the bulk of the Green Enterprise District. We propose therefore, that a focus on reuse, remanufacturing and associated activities could be a crucial part of this strategy – with low-value resource and energy efficiency jobs to accompany the focus on high-value manufacturing of green products. This could be done in partnership with academic institutions in East London (including UEL) and third-sector organizations and include setting up large sites or industrial zones for retrofit, reuse and social enterprise start-ups.	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
BioRegional	Limited Commitment: The section on Sustainable Development of the Olympics Park (p59) has a series of statements that make no commitment (they use phrases such as 'there is considerable potential...', 'set to promote...', retention of trees ... is important (not required) and 'where possible ...'. The only requirement here is to incorporate sustainable urban drainage on the park. This is a far cry from the commitment to a Sustainability Blueprint in the Olympic Park legacy referred to above. Likewise there are no sustainability requirements set out the development of Stratford (section 3.3, page 67).	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	Partial change considered appropriate
LBN	The policy contained in this section reflects the policies set out in the near-adoption Joint Waste DPD (for Newham, Redbridge, Barking-and-Dagenham and Havering). It needs to make reference to the Waste Hierarchy which appears in the Waste Strategy for England (2007), see entry JW9 at: <a href="http://www.newham.gov.uk/Planning/LocalDevelopmentFramework/JointWasteDPDExaminationLibrary.htm">http://www.newham.gov.uk/Planning/LocalDevelopmentFramework/JointWasteDPDExaminationLibrary.htm</a> .	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	Development principle E3 – Waste management and contamination We support the reference to utilise the waterways to transport waste material to Edmonton Eco Park. With the amount of development to come forward within the OLSPG boundary, there will be sufficient critical mass to make waterborne freight viable for this purpose, particularly within this Green Enterprise District.	2E	Sustainable development	47		Supporting - No change
London Concrete	References to the potential for Fish Island to accommodate a new waste management facility. In particular, the Bow Midland West Rail Yard should be excluded from the area of search for such a facility. It is a strategic rail freight site which should be specifically safeguarded for these purposes.	2E	Sustainable development	47		Accept - Review and amend
RICS	The approach taken in this section to develop energy from waste and to safeguard existing waste facilities seems sound and the development of the new East London Green Enterprise District's capacity to use the new waste technologies to manage waste sustainably is positive and a potential generator of new employment opportunities. In view of the scale of industrial land contamination in east London the proposal to carry out a strategic land contamination study seems very sensible. The cost to developers of decontamination can be very considerable and this can create barriers to development if schemes become non-viable due to the cost, so a coordinated approach to decontamination may make a real difference in practice to development on a number of sites.	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	Supporting - No change

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
BioRegional	The sentence proposing promotion of energy generation using waste focuses this policy towards measures at the bottom of the waste hierarchy. This should only be considered once waste reduction, reuse and recycling are incentivized, and should favour 'energy recovery (highly efficient plants that meet the R1 test) rather than disposal. Resources should first be considered as a product (for reuse or remanufacturing), before choosing disposal routes that recover its material value (recycling), before energy generation is considered as an option. We propose that instead the policy removes the statement with regard to promoting energy generation and instead includes a statement to say, 'An efficient approach to the use of waste as a resource where embodied carbon is retained through reuse, high value recycling and remanufacturing facilities should also be supported.'	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	Partial change considered appropriate
Environment Agency	Collocation of materials reprocessors and manufacturers of recycled products near to recycling facilities should be more explicitly favoured as this will help to lead to the establishment of a viable closed loop economy with a balanced mix of economic sectors. The document should establish requirements that waste infrastructure be of high quality and good design, as this will reduce the impacts on neighbouring users and ensure that such facilities can be integrated into areas of mixed use development. We would encourage the document to consider the waste generated during the redevelopment of the area, including construction and demolition wastes and include guidance concerning the need to reduce waste arisings during these phases, and identify and exploit opportunities to maximise the use of recycled materials and those with high levels of recycled content. Such an approach helps to minimise the amount of waste generated in the first instance, but also helps to reduce the embedded energy content of new developments. Where facilities constructed as venues or to provide support for the Olympic Games are reconfigured or dismantled attention should be given to ensuring	2E	Sustainable development	47	DP E3	Partial change considered appropriate
LVRPA	The notation for a waste management facility on Essex Wharf should also be removed (Fig 2.E.3 Waste Management Sites and Green Enterprise District page 48).	2E	Sustainable development	48	Fig 2.E.3	No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
British Waterways	We would support the provision of a waste management facility on Waterworks River, to Three Mills Lock, as this is an appropriate main freight route.	2E	Sustainable development	48		Supporting - No change
LBH	It is important that child yield is not underestimated. It is recommended that population projects and child yield are of change. This would result in around 3,300 children and 6,900 jobs. This form and scale of development indicates a need for five form entry of primary school provision, five form entry of secondary school provision' This area covers parts of Hackney as well as parts of Tower Hamlets. This has made it more difficult to assess how realistic e.g. the estimated child yield is; since either borough only has access to its own plans. We welcome the plans for new schools. It is important that enough education facilities are planned and hence that the child yield is not underestimated. The OPLC has planned for two 3FE primary schools in this area (one in Hackney, one in Tower Hamlets) and we believe that their child yield estimates are too conservative. Looking at these figures, 3,300 children are estimated to lead to a need for 5FE primary and 5FE secondary provision; i.e. 150 children per year group. However, 3,300 children divided by 16	2E	Sustainable development	48		Partial change considered appropriate
Clive Durdle	Significant typo in 4.4 that illustrates you have not understood my previous submission and comments.	Add Docs				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Clive Durdle	Experience of IWA and BWB is that "fright" on water is minimal. Majority use is leisure and interestingly this is a clear area of development that because it is not mentioned is obviously not being planned for.	Add Docs				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Clive Durdle	The proposals require a clear water strategy. This is NOT water as an utility but water as a resource for living, working, leisure. and ecology. I am surprised at this obvious gap because living afloat is becoming more and more popular in major cities around the world, and the Olympic area does have very significant canal and river resources.	Add Docs				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Clive Durdle	Where is your marina and house and canal boat strategy?	Add Docs				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
English Heritage	Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5) (2010), policy HE3.1 requires planning authorities to "set out a positive, proactive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment in their area". In reflection of this we seek to ensure that the SPG acknowledges the contribution that heritage assets and the historic environment can make to place-making and regeneration, and that new development enhances their settings. The SPG should also promote conservation of heritage assets for their intrinsic historic significance (policy HE7).	Add Docs				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
ODA PDT	ODA boundary wrong (Viv Ramsey).	Appendix		105	Fig 5.1	New planning arrangements depicted
English Heritage	Appendix 2: to accompany the boundaries on pages 105 – 107 it might be useful to provide a list of statutory and non-statutory plans which provide the evidence base of the SPG. Conclusion.	Appendix x 2	Maps	104		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Inclusive London	The Mayor's commitment to the Social Model of disability should also be clearly mentioned. The OLSPG recommends that inclusive design principles are 'embedded' into planning applications, planning frameworks etc. Similarly, Inclusion London recommends that the Mayor's commitment to accessibility and inclusivity, including the inclusive design principles, is embedded into the OLSPG and mentioned throughout the whole document, rather than just providing details of inclusive design principles in the Appendices, which could give the impression of them being an afterthought or of little importance.	Appendix x 3	Inclusive design	108		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Lancaster PLC	Finally, as a minor point, Figure 3.4.3 is missing, 3.4.4 is wrongly labelled and 3.4.5 is missing from the list of figures at appendix 4.	Appendix x 4	List of figures	112		Accept - Review and amend
OPLC	Mixed Use Development definition. Development of a variety of use classes, Employment/ Residential and Commercial development plots.	Appendix x 5	Glossary	113		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
MPA/MPS (CgMs)	MN summary - MPA support Glossary Social (and community) infrastructure	Appendix x 5	Glossary	117		Supporting - No change
Land Use Consultants	Reference to Policy 7.14 of the London Plan is welcomed. This should be strengthened by inclusion of supporting text referencing that measures to reduce air pollution are required to address potential impacts on European Sites, particularly Epping Forest SAC, and that in accordance with the London Plan developments should be at least 'air quality neutral'. Along with measures to encourage sustainable transport and reduce motor vehicle use, this would provide further certainty that air pollution impacts would be addressed.	C.1	Connectivity and transport	33	ISC&C	Partial change considered appropriate
Land Use Consultants	Insert wording stating that the potential for impacts on European Sites must be considered when investigating transport enhancement options, particularly railway enhancements in the vicinity of European Sites. Detailed proposals may require HRA.	C.1	Connectivity and transport	33	ISC&C	Partial change considered appropriate
Land Use Consultants	Insert wording stating that the potential for impacts on European Sites must be considered when investigating transport enhancement options. This would require assessment of enhancement works and the potential increased use of canals in the vicinity of the Lee Valley SPA and Ramsar site. Detailed proposals may require HRA.	C3	Connectivity and transport	37	LUF&S	Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	p.13 Theme 2 It is suggested that the additional text is added into the box: Demonstrate how the proposal will promote walking and cycling Demonstrate the	Convergence note	Section 6 Theme 2	13		Additional document - Consider
LBH	p.14 Theme 3 It is suggested that the additional text is added into the box: Demonstrate how any affordable housing will contribute to meeting need, by placing proposed levels of affordable rent in the context of average local rents and incomes for the area.	Convergence note	Section 6 Theme 3	14		Additional document - Consider
LBH	This threshold is 1,000sqm floorspace for commercial developments or 10 housing units for housing development. It is at this threshold that planning authorities seek planning benefits/contributions in the form of affordable homes, training opportunities, enhancements to educational facilities, etc. The proposed 100 new homes as a threshold, if adopted, will obscure or mask the actual contributions major developments in the OLSPG area are making towards achievement of convergence objectives, as it would exclude other developments which boroughs really consider to be major schemes, not only for their internal statistics but also when they are making returns to the GLA's London Development Database.	Convergence note	General			Additional document - Consider
LBH	Request further consideration and clarification around what constitutes a 'major application' and agreeing this new threshold with the Boroughs.	Convergence	General			Additional document - Consider
London First	The above sections are a repetition of information contained in other documents. We are not sure what value is provided by including this information again.	Convergence	Section 2-5			Additional document - Consider

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
TFL	In section 6, there are no particular transport related measures listed, although transport and connectivity improvements could be considered to be rolled up into Theme 2 healthier lifestyles and Theme 3 Developing Successful Neighbourhoods. The "Supporting healthier lifestyles" example measures are very narrow considering the outcomes listed. The role of transport and connectivity for convergence could be interpreted in several ways to comply with London Plan policies, which in addition to transport policies could include access to enable transport to employment (Policy 4.12), or walking and cycling to promote health and physical activity (Policy 3.2).	Convergence note	Section 6			Additional document - Consider
TFL	It is suggested to references to transport and connectivity improvements, such as: Amount and detail of local connectivity improvements to improve access. (e.g. connections identified in SPG, walking and cycling routes, either financial or in build-out of development) Amount and detail of transport enhancements to improve access and capacity.	Convergence note	Section 6			Additional document - Consider
London First	This theme is the most tangible part of the advice note in terms of requiring an applicant to submit information that they might not already include as part of the standard planning application process.	Convergence note	Section 6 - theme 1			Additional document - Consider
London First	It should be noted that it may not always be feasible to successfully provide local training initiatives and employment opportunities as required in the advice note. For example, local training initiatives can be offered, but that does not necessarily mean they will be taken up.	Convergence note	Section 6 - theme 1			Additional document - Consider
London First	Likewise, jobs during the construction phase of development may require specialist skills which local people are unable to provide. The same applies for commercial development in terms of the nature of the job provided by the development upon completion.	Convergence note	Section 6 - theme 1			Additional document - Consider
London First	The advice note should recognise that there is inherent uncertainty in getting local people to participate in local training and job initiatives. In supporting the promotion of such programmes, the guidance must reflect that it is simply, for a variety of reasons, not always possible to successfully implement them.	Convergence note	Section 6 - theme 1			Additional document - Consider
London First	The information requirements in this section (education, healthcare and community facilities) are already required as part of the standard planning application process. In the future they will also, in the majority of cases, be delivered through payment of the borough Community Infrastructure Levy. The need therefore to provide further information about such contributions seems to be redundant.	Convergence note	Section 6 - theme 2			Additional document - Consider
London First	As above, the information requirements in this section (public realm improvements, design standards and affordable housing) are already required as part of the standard planning application process.	Convergence note	Section 6 - theme 3			Additional document - Consider
LBH	LBH welcomes the inclusion of the comments forwarded previously on Convergence. Suggested additions relate to Section 6 and the measures for the three themes: It is suggested that the additional text is added into the box: Demonstrate how these job opportunities will contribute to promoting GLA, Host Borough and OPLC equality, diversity, increased income and sustainable employment objectives. Demonstrate how local businesses will be able to access contracts and supply chain opportunities created through the proposal's development and operation. Demonstrate how the proposal will assist with promoting local entrepreneurship, business start ups and growth, and social enterprise opportunities.	Convergence note	Section 6 Theme 1			Additional document - Consider
TFL	Section 7 about the administration and support going forward will need to be completed. The final version should incorporate that TFL will need to be involved, partly as operator of public transport services, stations and stops, and as highway authority for the A12 and for approval of signals and other matters on Borough highways.	Convergence note	Section 7			Additional document - Consider
English Heritage	Draft Convergence Advice Note – we welcome the urban form objectives provided under Theme 3 Successful Neighbourhoods (page 14) for benefit this could have for the historic environment. Improving the public realm includes ensuring that historic character is addressed sensitively in new development, including in the strategic management of building heights. In the case of the SPG area itself, this is particularly relevant at the fringes of the SPG area where there are groups of heritage assets.	Convergence note				Additional document - Consider
HUDD	Overall the draft advice note is supported. It would be helpful if the guidance explained the relationship between a convergence statement and other assessments and statements submitted with a planning application, in particular, the relationship between the statement and a health impact assessment (as required under London Plan Policy 3.2).	Convergence note				Additional document - Consider

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
HUDU	It would also be helpful if the suggested planning measures under each theme referred to the relevant London Plan policy, to help demonstrate that complying with the planning policy framework will help to achieve convergence.	Convergence				Additional document - Consider
HUDU	Under Theme 2- Supporting healthier lifestyles, the planning measures are restricted to the provision of social infrastructure. Although only examples, it is suggested that a wider ranges of measures are developed, informed by the planning principles in the Strategic Regeneration Framework Urban Planning for Healthy Communities subgroup's report 'Healthy Urban Planning in Practice for the Olympic Legacy Masterplan Framework' (see attached).	Convergence note				Additional document - Consider
HUDU	Under section 7. 'Support/further information' the relevant Primary Care Trust clusters could be added – NHS East London and the City and NHS Outer North East London.	Convergence				Additional document - Consider
London First	Unfortunately we do not think that the advice note adds much meaningful guidance, and the concerns raised in our original response have not all been adequately addressed (contained again in Annex 1, for ease).	Convergence				Additional document - Consider
London First	It would appear that the majority of information that applicants are being asked to provide to meet the convergence objective is information that is already submitted as part of the standard planning application process. Where there is a clear duplication of information requirements, applicants should only have to submit the information once.	Convergence note				Additional document - Consider
North London Waste Authority	The NLWA recommends that the information provided in Para 5.66 is updated with more recent performance data, as the information provided is based on 2008 data. For example, in December 2011, the Authority published its Annual Monitoring Report ( <a href="http://www.nlwa.gov.uk/docs/nlwa-general-documents-and-plans/annual-monitoring-report-201011.pdf">http://www.nlwa.gov.uk/docs/nlwa-general-documents-and-plans/annual-monitoring-report-201011.pdf</a> ) which provides performance data for 2010/11. The Annual Monitoring Report shows that for 2010/11, the overall recycling rate for household waste in the North London area was 29.4% and that 29% of municipal waste was sent to landfill and 47% sent for energy recovery. In addition, the North London Waste Plan ( <a href="http://www.nlwp.net/documents/documents.html">http://www.nlwp.net/documents/documents.html</a> ), published May 2011, provides some performance information which supersedes the 2008 North London Waste Plan- Issues and Options Report referenced in the OLSPG Delivery Study.	Delivery Study		68	68-70	No change - completed background document
North London Waste Authority	The NLWA believes that the waste generation rate of 449 kg per person per year, quoted in Para 5.67, is too high and recommends that this is reviewed. For example, the Authority's 2010/11 Annual Monitoring Report shows that the amount of household waste collected per head of population is decreasing and in 2010/11 the average waste generation rate was 399kg per person per year. This is also supported by the recent announcement from London Councils ( <a href="http://www.nlwp.net/documents/documents.html">http://www.nlwp.net/documents/documents.html</a> ) that household waste generation per person is decreasing in London.	Delivery Study		68	68-70	No change - completed background document
North London Waste Authority	The NLWA is the statutory waste disposal authority for the north London boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest and is responsible for managing the waste collected by these boroughs. Therefore, within the Olympic Legacy area, the NLWA is responsible for the management of the waste arising from Waltham Forest and Hackney only. The Authority recommends that this information is used to update Para 5.73.	Delivery Study		68	Para 5.73	No change - completed background document
North London Waste Authority	The NLWA is the statutory waste disposal authority for the north London boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest and is responsible for managing the waste collected by these boroughs. Therefore, within the Olympic Legacy area, the NLWA is responsible for the management of the waste arising from Waltham Forest and Hackney only. The Authority recommends that this information is used to update Para 5.73.	Delivery Study		68	Para 5.73	No change - completed background document
North London Waste Authority	The NLWA recommends that the information provided in Para 7.20 is updated to reflect the information supplied in Para 1.4 of this consultation response. The NLWA has a long term contract with London Waste Ltd, who currently manage and operate Edmonton Ecopark. However, this contract will end in December 2014. There is currently no spare capacity at Edmonton Ecopark. The Authority is presently undertaking a major procurement to develop a network of new and refurbished waste treatment facilities. From commencement of the new facilities, anticipated in 2016, there may be the opportunity to manage additional wastes from the Olympic Legacy area. However, this would be subject to negotiation with the Authority and awarded contractor.	Delivery Study		93		No change - completed background document
LBH	'All three and four year olds are entitled to 15 hours of free nursery education for 38 weeks of the year.' Free nursery education is available for children from the first term after their third birthday (children born in Sept-Dec can start in January; Jan-Mar children can start in April and May-August children in September).	Delivery Study	3.11			No change - completed background document

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBH	'The catchment area for early years education is typically within a distance of 800m.' Many parents use childcare facilities near to or on their route to work. Increasingly, quality is a much greater influence than distance.	Delivery Study	3.13			No change - completed background document
LBH	Section 3.133 indicates Hackney's Open Space Standard as 1.2ha per 1,000 population (referenced as the Tower Hamlets standard in the Hackney SIA). This sentence is misleading as LBH does not have any adopted standards for open space or parks.	Delivery Study	3.133			No change - completed background document
LBH	'Recent policy changes have resulted in an extension of provision of early years education to provide for 15% of the most disadvantaged two year olds. The policy is being implemented through a pilot scheme with the private and independent sector expected to cater for the majority of new demand.' The proposed 2 year old policy is currently out for consultation – with % and where capacity will be built still unknown.	Delivery Study	3.14			No change - completed background document
LBH	'In 2009, Hackney had two dedicated nursery schools, and each of the borough's 53 primary schools has a nursery classes (sic!) attached.' Each of the borough's 53 primary schools has one or two nursery classes attached, catering for 25FTE or 50 FTE.	Delivery Study	3.19			No change - completed background document
LBH	'Consultation with LB Hackney revealed that there is currently a surplus in capacity, although this varies across age groups and also geographically across the borough. Due to a mismatch in the location of surplus and the areas of high demand, Hackney has experienced pressure on services and in 2010 had to open temporary classrooms. There has been some expansion of provision recently, for example, the addition of extra forms of entry to Gainsborough Primary School which is located within the OLSPG boundary. However, the current spare capacity at this school is expected to be filled in two to three years time, which is typical across the borough.' This is not entirely correct. The Learning Trust suggest amending language to convey message that for Reception, Year 1 and Year 2, there is no capacity in the north and east of the borough; but some places in the south. For years 3-6, there is some capacity. All temporary classes opened in 2010 (4.5FE) have become permanent and we expect to need more classes over the next few years. One extra Reception class was added to Gainsborough school in 2010 – this is also permanent now. This amendment might also reflect o	Delivery Study	3.37			No change - completed background document
LBH	'The OPLC have planned to providing one three forms of entry primary school in the Hackney area of the OLSPG area. Further details are not yet available as discussions on area use and size are ongoing. Current plans for an expansion of provision in LB Hackney are for an additional 140 places in 2010 and for 45 in 2012. Currently options are being explored for additional increases of a further 30 places in 2012, in addition to 30 additional places in 2013 and 90 in 2014-15. It should be noted that education in LB Hackney is run by an independent body, the Learning Trust, although responsibility for education will return to the Council on 1st August 2012 when the Learning Trust terminates.' The additional places added in 2010 are the same ones that are mentioned in 3.37. These were also added in 2011 and are now permanent.	Delivery Study	3.43			No change - completed background document
LBH	The catchment area for primary schools is typically 800m. The cut off distance for primary schools varies greatly. Hackney's most popular primary school has a cut off of 0.146 miles and it was 0.590 miles to the oversubscribed school with the furthest cut off point. At the same time 15 schools with of 40 could offer places to all applicants who required one. (These 40 schools do not include our VA schools where priority is given to applicants with evidence of religious practice.)	Delivery Study	3.54			No change - completed background document
LBH	'It is likely that the introduction of academies and free schools will affect the structure of provision in the OLSPG area going forward.' This might apply to the primary school provision too.	Delivery Study	3.58			No change - completed background document
LBH	'30 pupils per class, 150 pupils per FoE' and 'Minimum of six FoE per school' This does not seem to make sense – a minimum of six FE per school would mean 180 pupils per year, not 150. All Hackney's new Academies have been 6FE, i.e. 180 students.	Delivery Study	3.61			No change - completed background document
LBH	'There are 11 secondary schools in LB Hackney in addition to a number of specialist schools catering for children aged 11-16. Recent information fed back through consultation with the borough suggests that there is now little or no spare capacity, with an estimated 3% surplus, which falls below the recommended 5% advised by the Audit Commission.' There are 12 secondary schools in Hackney. One of them is an orthodox Jewish girls' school.	Delivery Study	3.63			No change - completed background document

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBH	It is noted that the OLSPG assumes that the proportion of dwellings by sub area to be 60% market, 24% intermediate and 16% social rented which results in the projected capacity of the OLSPG area. To be fully compliant with LBH policy, the total proportion affordable would be 50%, with a split of 30% social rent/Affordable Rent and 20% intermediate, however it is noted that these are borough-wide targets and there would be some flexibility on a site by site basis. Introducing a higher proportion of affordable housing OLSPG wide in line with Borough targets may impact on the projected capacities detailed in table 2.1 which underpins the residential population and social infrastructure provision requirements. This should be considered when reviewing the population projections.	Delivery Study	2.3 and table 2.2			No change - completed background document
LBH	'Leakage rate to the private sector of 6.6% for all households.' Although some parents may choose to send their children to private schools, The Learning Trust are sceptical about the estimate that 6.6% of the projected cohort would attend private provision. In Hackney, with the exception of the orthodox Jewish community, who are extremely unlikely to access housing in this area, a very small percentage of children go to private schools. In addition to this, since the recession started there has been a nationwide reduction in the number of children attending private schools.	Delivery Study	3.17, 3.35 and 3.61			No change - completed background document
LBH	Reflect the outcomes of GLA/ LBH meeting where necessary / appropriate in the OLSPG Infrastructure Delivery Section. Recommend that GLA Planning / Demography lead on the review of population projections and coordinate with Boroughs to agree the detail of the revision.	Delivery Study	Accommodation schedules			No change - completed background document
LBH	Tenure Mix: It appears that the relative proportions of intermediate and social rent have been transposed in paragraph 2.3. From table 2.1, it looks as though the proportions are 24% social rent and 16% intermediate, which is better.	Delivery Study	Accommodation schedules			No change - completed background document
TFL	The report does not appear to identify the size of the funding gap. It only estimates the amount of money which could be collected from section 106 and does not estimate the money from other sources. There are also no clear next steps in terms of meeting the funding gap or prioritisation and triggers. The matter of cumulative development and triggers is particularly relevant to transport, but is just as valid for other infrastructure items.	Delivery Study	General			No change - completed background document
TFL	A map that shows developments sites (both in and outside the MDC boundary) that are in either public or private ownership would be very useful. Publicly owned land could be released for development as a policy initiative to start development, whereas private owner would only do so where development values were sufficiently above EU values to yield an acceptable return.	Delivery Study	General			No change - completed background document
TFL	4.4 – Bullet 2 add wording “Key strategic roads... central and south London and to areas outside London.”	Delivery Study	Section 4		4.4	No change - completed background document
TFL	4.7 – Amend wording for clarification - the LCS interventions are also not included here because they had not been developed at the time the OLSPG Transport Study was being prepared.	Delivery Study	Section 4		4.7	No change - completed background document
TFL	Table 4.1 - the separate Bow Roundabout line item should be labelled viii so it matches with the list in 4.11.	Delivery Study	Section 4		Table 4.1	No change - completed background document
TFL	6.53 - seems to be lacking explanation why boroughs are not able to justify a CIL currently – the report has investigated development value but doesn't appear to include anything specific on existing use value to explain that conclusion.	Delivery Study	Section 6		6.53	No change - completed background document
TFL	The Mayor's CIL is mentioned later in 7.15 (in a section on transport interventions) but it should be expected to see reference to the need for all development to pay the Mayor's CIL from 1 April 2012 in this section. (Hackney £35 / sq. m, Newham, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest £20 / sq.m.).	Delivery Study	Section 7		7.15	No change - completed background document
TFL	7.3 - Final sentence doesn't make sense. 7.14 - Typo on footnote 74 reference 7.27 - There should be a reference to the limitation on the use of more than five s106 agreements for pooled contributions towards items of infrastructure. 7.45 - It is unclear what is meant by the „levy “ is that is mentioned – is that CIL? 7.49 - typo – „borders“ 7.54 - Query for clarification on the difference in the timing of new Homes Bonus payments compared to s106 contributions? If the NHB is paid on occupation this may be later if s106 payment is made on commencement. 7.67 Agree that there will need to be further work to investigate timing and prioritisation – a particular matter for transport and cumulative development affecting highway and public transport networks.	Delivery Study	Section 7			No change - completed background document

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBH	The tenure breakdown of number of homes in tables 2.1 and 2.4 do not seem to match up, e.g. the number of social rent homes in HW/FI shown in table 2.1 is 1,406, but in table 2.4 is 271. The figures for private and intermediate similarly do not match.	Delivery Study	Table 2.1 and 2.4			No change - completed background document
LBH	Bedroom size mix: From table 2.4, we were surprised that just over half of all intermediate homes were 3-bed+ (and over 25% 4-bed+). While LBH would not necessarily object to a high proportion of family homes, there could be affordability problems associated particularly with the 4-bed+, which could impact on saleability of the homes.	Delivery Study	Table 2.4			No change - completed background document
HUDU	Resident population – page 10 To more accurately assess the impact on healthcare services a more detailed population projection is needed broken down by age groups and ideally ethnicity. It is understood that the GLA's DMAG team are providing population forecasts for the Legacy Communities Scheme and perhaps their methodology can be applied to the OLSPG study.	Delivery Study				No change - completed background document
HUDU	Health Care (page 30) The section on healthcare reflects the demand outputs from the HUDU model. However, there are a number of omissions in the overall assessment:- GP capacity is assessed at a borough-wide scale. There is no assessment of secondary or community healthcare provision or requirements There is no evidence of consultation with the PCTs over capacity or planned provision / emerging strategies.	Delivery Study				No change - completed background document
HUDU	It is suggested that a thorough assessment of healthcare requirements is undertaken taking to account the phasing of development, projected population and health needs, accessibility and cross-boundary issues.	Delivery Study				No change - completed background document
North London Waste Authority	To minimise the impact of waste traffic, the NLWA is investigating the use of the River Lee for the transport of materials to and from the Edmonton EcoPark. The GLA and the local planning authorities would additionally need to support investment in the whole of the navigable waterway network to make water transport opportunities feasible and viable. stress that any developments along the river should be prevented if they would restrict the use of the river for transporting materials and waste to and from Edmonton Ecopark.	Delivery Study				No change - completed background document
English Heritage	Intensification of the Olympic area will undoubtedly cause greater use of surrounding green infrastructure, including historic spaces such as Victoria Park. There may be opportunities to fund improvements to existing green spaces, as well as providing new green infrastructure.	Delivery Study				No change - completed background document
Riverine Centre	A key objective of the Trustees for the comprehensive development of the site is the delivery of a significantly larger faith based use than currently exists on the site. It is considered that an objective of regional guidance should be to support the delivery of community uses on appropriate sites where an identified need has been established. Within the above context, we are extremely disappointed that the background documents, and in particular the Infrastructure Delivery Study prepared by URS, do not consider the need for faith or religious facilities in any way.	Delivery Study				No change - completed background document
Riverine Centre	Policy 3.16 notes that policy preparation should provide for the regular assessment of the need for social infrastructure (which includes places of worship) at the local and sub-regional levels. The Policy goes on to states that adequate social infrastructure is particularly important in areas of major new development and regeneration and should be addressed in relevant planning documents and frameworks	Delivery Study				No change - completed background document
Riverine Centre	Given the OLSPG covers such a large area of change where social infrastructure requirements will be extremely important, we are disappointed that the URS Report does not cover a wider range of social infrastructure needs. We suggest that given the policy basis within the London Plan, this Report should cover a much wider assessment of social infrastructure including places of worship.	Delivery Study				No change - completed background document
Workspace Group (GVA)	We recognise that the provision of family housing and affordable housing are Mayoral priorities for the OLSPG area. The likelihood of viable delivery of a low density family housing scheme in a location that is currently dominated by industrial employment uses is questionable. In this context of 'optimising' development a cluster of higher density 3 gva.co.uk development would provide a core site that could provide the catalyst for the Southern Olympic Fringes renewal.	Delivery Study				No change - completed background document
Workspace Group (GVA)	In the context of this additional background information we consider that it is unsuitable for broad decisions to be made about the form of housing that could be delivered on the site and the scale of potential development. Both criteria are overly prescriptive in the OLSPG.	Delivery Study				No change - completed background document

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBH	There is an error on table 12 OLSPG child population yields. There has been a mix up in labelling intermediate and social rented figures. The labels should be swapped.	Dev Capacity Model	Table 5.4			New approach to population adopted
LBH	The population figures uses are considered modest. As they stand, the figures do not align to the models used in the LCS or other demographic models used by the GLA's demography team.	Dev Capacity Model				New approach to population adopted
LBH	Recommend that GLA Planning / Demography lead on the review of population figures and coordinate with Boroughs to agree the detail of the revision.	Dev Capacity Model				New approach to population adopted
LBH	The Borough welcomes the meeting with GLA officers on 16/02 to discuss and further understand the methodologies and assumptions behind both methodologies (OLSPG and the Hackney Wick AAP).	Dev Capacity Model				New approach to population adopted
LBH	Table 4 – Housing Mix percentages. There are some errors in this table which subsequently results in a different average unit size of 81m2 For 2 bed, this should read: Ave (61+ 70 + 83) + 10% = 78 (taken from London Plan 2011). The Size (m2) for proportion of 100 units = 2340 Total then = 8145m2 / Unit size should then be 81m2 This will have implications on the development capacity outputs GLA to note comments for meeting with LBH scheduled on the 16/02. identified by the GLA for the various Sub Areas including Hackney Wick / Fish Island. This will be raised and discussed in more detail along with the Borough's development capacity assumptions at the meeting with the GLA on the 16/02.	Dev Capacity Model				New approach to population adopted
Workspace Group (GVA)	We understand the broad structure used to assess the urban structure (Para 4.4), capacity calculation (Para 4.5) and scenario typology selection (paras 4.9 – 4.11). However, we consider that the level of analysis is not commensurate with the amount of detail set out in the document in relation to scale of development. We consider that the additional background papers provide an adequate basis for a sub strategic level of guidance but that a greater understanding of physical characteristics such as townscape would be necessary to identify suitable scale for the areas of the OLSPG.	Dev Capacity Model				New approach to population adopted
North London Waste Authority	National Indicator 193 is no longer applicable; however this information is still reported through National Waste Data Flow. The NLWA recommends that the report is updated to reflect this.	Energy Study	Section 6.1.1	20		No change - completed background document
North London Waste Authority	The NLWA recommends that the information supplied within the table showing NLWA municipal waste to landfill is updated to reflect more recent data. The NLWA's 2010/11 Annual Monitoring Report provides data for the years 2009/10 and 2010/11.	Energy Study	Section 6.1.1	20		No change - completed background document
North London Waste Authority	In addition it is recommended that the following sentence; "This waste is transported by rail from Hendon Rail Transfer Station to a landfill site that is able to recover energy in the form of landfill gas, which is then converted to electricity." is updated to state the following: This waste is transported by rail from the Hendon Rail Transfer Station and Edmonton Road Transfer Station to landfills. All waste that is sent to landfill from the north London area is sent to sites that recover energy from waste in the form of landfill gas which is then converted to electricity.	Energy Study	Section 6.1.1	20		No change - completed background document
North London Waste Authority	The information provided within this section regarding the NLWA procurement is incorrect. The NLWA suggests that the following information is used to replace the existing paragraph within the report: The NLWA is currently undertaking a major procurement to develop a network of new and refurbished waste treatment facilities. Accordingly, the NLWA is seeking to procure two contracts: the first is the Waste Services Contract. This contract will develop a sustainable waste management solution for north London, including building and operating new waste and recycling facilities. Waste that cannot be recycled will be used to create a Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF). The second contract (the Fuel Use Contract) is for the utilisation of the resultant SRF. The Fuel Contract will be for a single lot and not split into three separate bundles of SRF as stated in the report. As the procurement is already underway, there is no opportunity for the SRF to be sent to a facility that is not already part of the proposals put forward by our short listed bidders. Therefore, it is recommended that the Summary of Potential MSW Resource is amended to remove the 300ktpa SRF from NLWA. Further	Energy Study	Section 6.1.1	20		No change - completed background document

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
North London Waste Authority	In addition to referencing the Waste Incineration Directive, the NLWA recommends that the Industrial Emissions Directive ( <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/quality/industrial/eu-international/industrial-emissions-directive/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/quality/industrial/eu-international/industrial-emissions-directive/</a> ) is mentioned within this section of the report.	Energy Study	Section 6.1.2	22		No change - completed background document
North London Waste Authority	The NLWA also recommends that Wood fuel Hub project is also referenced in this section ( <a href="http://www.cchangeproject.org/woodfuelreestation">http://www.cchangeproject.org/woodfuelreestation</a> ).	Energy Study	Section 6.2	22		No change - completed background document
North London Waste Authority	Under the Waste/Recycling heading the NLWA recommends that the existing paragraph is amended to: "London Waste Ltd in partnership with a wood reprocessor is a principal wood recycling operation in the North London. The company processes around 49,000 tonnes (2012) of wood each year received from the Boroughs in north London as well commercial producers. The wood is chipped then graded dependent on end market, essentially the vast majority is sold to large consumers such as Slough Heat and Power with board manufacturers being the second next end market."	Energy Study	Section 6.2	22		No change - completed background document
LBH	Incorrect reference to Newham's regeneration project. This should read Hackney's regeneration project.	Energy Study	8.3.3			No change - completed background document
English Heritage	as noted in our response to SPG itself, energy proposals which have the potential to affect buried archaeology within the SPG area should be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment.	Energy Study				No change - completed background document
LBH	The future estimated heat demand has been based on the GLA's development capacity outputs. These outputs are lower (in particular for housing) than the Hackney Wick Area Action Plan capacity figures. It has been noted previously that there is a meeting between Council and GLA officers on the 16/02 to discuss both development capacity models in more detail. Any changes to GLA development outputs may have a bearing on this study and its conclusions (in addition to other supporting documents) and therefore used to update this study where appropriate / applicable.	Energy Study				No change - completed background document
LBH	Any changes to GLA development outputs that may arise from the meeting scheduled on the 16/02 will need to be reflected within the final OLSPG, in particular the 'Scale of Change' section within the Hackney Wick and Fish Island Sub Area.	General	General			Accept - Review and amend
London Wildlife Trust	6. Finally, the Trust would like to issue its support of the recommendations made in the Habitats Regulations Assessment commissioned as part of this consultation.	Habitat Reg Assessment	Sustainable development			Supporting - No change
North London Waste Authority	The area covered by the Waste Management Sites and Infrastructure within the OLSPG area (2010) figure includes the Gateway Road Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) which provides a service to local residents allowing them to bring items for reuse, recycling or disposal. This facility is presently managed by Bywaters under contract to LB Waltham Forest, and the NLWA is responsible for the transport and disposal of waste from the centre.	IIA		50		Accept - Review and amend
North London Waste Authority	HWRCs are important facilities allowing the public to access a wider range of recycling facilities than possible with kerbside collection service, and also deal with bulky items. They also have a vital role to play in meeting London's waste self sufficiency target.	IIA		50		Accept - Review and amend
North London Waste Authority	The Gateway Road HWRC site is identified as an existing Waste Management Facility and such facilities are "safeguarded" by the London Plan and North London Waste Plan. Therefore, a compensatory site will be required for any waste management site lost to a non-waste use.	IIA		50		Accept - Review and amend
North London Waste Authority	The NLWA is supportive of the Mayor's aspiration to regenerate the area surrounding the Olympic Park in order to maximise the benefits of the London 2012 Games, however should the Gateway Road HWRC site be redeveloped, compensatory provision will be required. This will need to be of a sufficient size for the range and quantity of materials likely to be received and be capable of meeting the maximum throughput that the lost site could have achieved. It will also need to be located in a suitable place to meet the needs of the population it serves. For example, the Authority aims for 95% of residents to live within two miles (measured as a straight line) of a Household Waste Recycling Centre (or Reuse and Recycling Centre as referred to by the London Mayor).	IIA		50		Partial change considered appropriate



Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
North London Waste Authority	The NLWA would also recommend that consideration is given in developing any replacement facilities to support the needs of local businesses, in particular local small-to-medium enterprises. In its Review of Waste Policy in England 2011, the Government highlighted that it wants to encourage local authorities to consider whether HWRCs and other bring bank facilities could be adapted to accept business waste and recycling at an affordable cost to the business user (in addition to serving householders). The introduction of such services in other authorities has shown that this can be a successful model which maximises the benefit of HWRCs to a local area. The Authority would be keen to explore such opportunities if a replacement facility was being considered.	IIA		50		Partial change considered appropriate
North London Waste Authority	It is envisaged that almost 30,000 new homes will be developed in the Olympic Legacy area which in themselves will generate a considerable additional demand for local waste management services, such as HWRC facilities. Any future development of this area must ensure that adequate provision is made for HWRCs to accommodate new demand, whether this is in the form of an enlarged compensatory site or an additional site. Furthermore, the NLWA believes that finding such a site, securing appropriate planning permission and making it ready for use should be the responsibility of the promoter of change, liaising throughout with the local waste collection and disposal authorities.	IIA		50		Partial change considered appropriate
North London Waste Authority	In addition, the Authority recommends that an Equalities Impact Assessment be carried out as the background studies develop into firm strategies and plans, to ensure that they do not discriminate against specific target groups and where possible, contribute to improving the lives of local communities	IIA		50		Accept - Review and amend
North London Waste Authority	The NLWA recommends that the residual household waste data per household for the OLSPG area boroughs is updated. For example, the NLWA's data shows that in 2010/11 the residual waste generation per household for Hackney and Waltham Forest was 568kg and 742kg, respectively. This shows that both boroughs are 'improving' and that Waltham Forest is not 'deteriorating' with respect to residual waste generation as stated in the report, compared to the 2008 generation figures quoted in the report. Therefore NLWA recommends that this section of the report is updated to reflect more recent residual waste generation figures.	IIA		50		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LCC	In this context we consider that both the Infrastructure Delivery Study and the Integrated Impact Assessment are too optimistic in assuming that the limited transport interventions relating to cycling in the OLSPG will have a sufficiently positive impact on reducing motor traffic congestion in the park area. We note that congestion is expected to increase, even without a development on the massive scale envisaged (29,000 dwellings, 59,000plus people and 54,000plus jobs). The OLSPG must therefore be significantly strengthened to deliver the full potential of the Olympic site as a centre for sustainable transport.	IIA		53		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
TFL	P 108 Noted that this refers to the Habitats Regulation Assessment which includes a comment that air quality should be addressed in connectivity & transport section and which may therefore need to be incorporated into the revised final OLSPG document.	IIA		108		Accept - Review and amend
LCC	As we have noted previously the potential to increase cycling levels in the Olympic Park area is exceptional. This unique opportunity must not be missed through poor design or misplaced investment. Given the outstanding transport links at Stratford, the employment opportunities both within the park and in close proximity to the park , the provision of universities and schools, health centres and a major shopping zone all within a short cycle ride of homes and businesses, a target of 25% of journeys under 5 miles by cycle should be adopted and all developments in the park area and its surroundings designed with this target in mind. note -p53 of the IIA)	IIA				Partial change considered appropriate
LCC	Existing Developments in the Olympic Area (corrections and poor implementation) The LCC submission of 18 November highlighted a series of outstandingly poor implementations of cycling facilities in the Olympic area (primarily on the four lane roads around the Westfield shopping centre) which include sub-standard cycle lanes, major obstructions in cycle tracks, hazardous surfacing and poor junction design. They all illustrate the discrepancy between plans and reality. and indicate that cycling provision is not being taken sufficiently seriously at the planning and implementation stage, but is currently a poorly overseen afterthought.	IIA				Partial change considered appropriate
LCC	Quality Standards The lack of adequate connections to other parts of Newham is particularly poor and will undermine the use of the park's exceptional facilities by the borough's residents. We strongly advise the adoption of Dutch standards where cycleways and other facilities are provided and adherence, as a minimum, to the London Cycle Design Standards	IIA				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LCC	In order to meet the key objective of the OLSPG of "a lasting shift to more sustainable forms of transport," which is realistically the only option to counter congestion in the area and improve local connectivity, it is necessary to ensure that coherent high quality cycle provision is an absolute priority. That requires taking on board the matters raised in the LCC submission of 18 November 2011, those raised in this response and also addressing the cycling links to adjoining boroughs and other parts of Newham.	IIA				Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LCC	The lack of adequate connections to other parts of Newham is particularly poor and will undermine the use of the park's exceptional facilities by the borough's residents. We strongly advise the adoption of Dutch standards where cycleways and other facilities are provided and adherence, as a minimum, to the London Cycle Design Standards	IIA				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
North London Waste Authority	The area covered by the Waste Management Sites and Infrastructure within the OLSPG area (2010) figure includes the Gateway Road Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) which provides a service to local residents allowing them to bring items for reuse, recycling or disposal. This facility is presently managed by Bywaters under contract to LB Waltham Forest, and the NLWA is responsible for the transport and disposal of waste from the centre.	IIA Scoping Report		93		No change - completed background document
English Heritage	We welcome the level of detail provided in relation to heritage assets, including archaeology which is a particularly sensitive issue for the area. For completeness, after the list of listed buildings provided on page 35, it would be useful to identify the conservation areas affected by the SPG proposals.	IIA Scoping Report				No change - completed background document
English Heritage	Likely evolution of the baseline - page 36: the second sentence of this paragraph, which begins "despite the possible demolitions" is unclear. Should this refer to demolitions which have already gained consent, this should be made clear. Otherwise, we question whether the document should predict demolitions of historic buildings within the SPG in general. This should be clarified.	IIA Scoping Report				No change - completed background document
English Heritage	Appendix A – review of relevant plans, programmes and policies; this section could usefully include the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (2010) which accompanies PPS5, and relevant guidance documents published by English Heritage, for example, Seeing History in the View (2011), The Settings of Heritage Assets (2011) and Understanding Place (2010) which deals with historic character.	IIA Scoping Report				No change - completed background document
LBN	In general this document, has a legible structure and clear explanation of underlining principles, in particular Convergence. The vision needs to be more ambitious having a more definite commitments.	Overview	Vision	3		Partial change considered appropriate
British Waterways	At '1.3 Delivering the vision' and the introduction at 2.1, the area's waterways are described as barriers. Here, and elsewhere in the document, we object to this description, as we consider that waterways are the connecting link through different areas and bring communities together. At '2.A Homes and communities' it states "...severance caused by the many waterways, strategic roads and railways that crisscross the area, have led to a patchwork of isolated communities and disconnected centres in many of the areas around the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park". The remediation of the land within the Park and the restoration of the formerly derelict waterways has allowed the area to be opened up for public access, and the waterways will be an important part of the area's attraction that will draw residents and communities to enjoy them.	Overview		5		Partial change considered appropriate
BioRegional	Overall Sustainability We would recommend that reference is made to the Mayor's sustainable design and construction SPG. <a href="http://legacy.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/sds/docs/spg-sustainable-design.pdf">http://legacy.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/sds/docs/spg-sustainable-design.pdf</a> At the time that the London Plan was being developed the Code for Sustainable Buildings appeared to be imminent. However, the Code for Sustainable Buildings is unlikely to be released any time in the near future. It is therefore essential that a BREEAM standard is required for non-residential buildings in the OLSPG area. We would therefore recommend the following policy wording: All new non-residential buildings within the OLSPG should achieve a BREEAM rating of "Excellent".	Overview	Sustainable development	43		Accept - Review and amend
Environment Agency	While the Olympic Legacy SPG makes several references to the value of biodiversity it does not mention Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) – either the London BAPs (with their subsequent priority habitats) or those in the constituent Boroughs. There are several habitats which are common to all the boroughs, as well as the London BAP. These are: Parks and Urban Greenspaces, Rivers and Streams, Standing Water and Woodland. Therefore special mention of these habitats, their importance, and how development can enhance these, could be mentioned within the SPG.	Overview	Sustainable development	43		Accept - Review and amend
Environment Agency	The SPG mentions the All London Green Grid as a possible vehicle for biodiversity delivery, and following on from this point reference could be made to the Area Frameworks as these will have enhancement projects already identified and new developments within the sub areas could link with these where possible. For example the Lee Valley and Finchley Ridge Area Framework covers the OLSPG area.	Overview	Sustainable development	43		Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
Natural England	Specifically we do not think that the OLSPG is consistent with Policy 2.18 of the London Plan because it does not identify the full range of functions that green infrastructure can deliver or set out a strategic approach to implementing them. It is notable that Policy 2.18 is not referenced and nor is Policy 5.10, the Mayor's policy on urban greening, which would be highly relevant to the third bullet point above.	Overview	Sustainable development	43		Accept - Review and amend
Design Council	MN has summarised - Connectivity - we believe there should be a centrally controlled mechanism for delivering transport infrastructure rather than piecemeal via developments. Southern subway connection into park could be underused in Winter months. Needs a focus on the Belvedere as a communication Nexus.	Overview	Deivery	95		No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	Delivery issues around the potential use of CIL outside the OLSPG boundary must be given consideration. The development of the OLSPG must be complementary to its neighbours. CIL sharing will provide a mechanism to give confidence to investors and communities alike.	Overview	Deivery	98		Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• Strategic and local connectivity in the legacy area is a critical issue, particularly on the western side, and it is positive that the approach taken broadly aligns with our own. We would welcome further emphasis of the need to address the major barriers to local connectivity; some detailed observations on the specific proposed interventions are provided below. The SPG's approach to parking provision, which in our view may compromise the achievement of "a lasting shift to more sustainable forms of transport", is of some concern.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• As we commented in our response to the consultation on the proposed MDC earlier this year, it will be vital for the MDC to take a broad view of infrastructure requirements in the legacy area, and one that is not fettered by its boundary. Appropriate funding and delivery arrangements will need to be put in place to accommodate such a position, and it would be helpful for the SPG to acknowledge this issue in its treatment of delivery.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	• In the period after the Games there will be extensive areas of land on which development will not come forward for some years. It would therefore be useful for the SPG to address the potential for interim uses and temporary opportunities which will arise over that time, particularly in relation to business and employment.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
LBN	The inclusion of detail such as building heights and employment land transition is overly prescriptive and not strategic in nature. It undermines the more valid LDF processes which are subject to Examination in Public scrutiny, local engagement as well as soundness tests. The geographical extent of the area which takes in large parts of West Ham, Maryland and Forest Gate is a significant concern particularly where its requirement differ to those set out in borough Core Strategies e.g. the aim for at least 30% family housing across the area would undermine Newham's 39% family housing target (Core Strategy Policy H1).	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBN	We consider that a document of this nature should be accompanied by an Equalities Impact Assessment as well as a Sustainability Appraisal.	Overview				General comment - No change
LBTH	The restatement of the Mayor's commitment to the principle of convergence, as expressed Strategic Regeneration Framework, is very welcome, and we strongly support the proposed requirement for developers to include a statement explaining how schemes will help achieve the SRF convergence outcomes.	Overview				Supporting - No change
ODA PDT	While the document understandably focuses its guidance on the main areas of development opportunity, the broadly drawn OLSPG boundaries include many areas that are of more settled form and character. It is considered that the guidance could say more about these places and this is reflected in some of the comments made within this table.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	The emphasis on provision of family housing and affordable housing is generally in line with our own priorities. Provision of affordable housing should respond to local housing priorities and need, and should recognise issues of affordability in relation to Affordable Rent. Further clarification is required on the anticipated housing growth in the Hackney Wick and Fish Island sub-area.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
LBTH	• The SPG chapter on Urban Form is a missed opportunity. Its focus on building heights, and the absence of useful guidance on critical issues such as how design and place making can contribute to the creation of the envisaged network connected and successful neighbourhoods, means that this section adds little value to existing regional and local policy.	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBTH	• We welcome the SPG's acknowledgement of our aspiration to deliver a waste-to-energy facility in Fish Island South, but the document's reinforcement of the existing safeguarding of the Bow East and West railheads is at odds with this aspiration and therefore unhelpful. It would be useful if the SPG could help to resolve this issue.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	There is minimal detail provided on a stronger vision for the wider region i.e. beyond the immediacy of the Olympic Park. Further thought is needed on this.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
LBH	In a number of sections, there is text that reads like further development principles / parameters which is embedded and lost within the contextual text. It is recommended that these are bulleted so that it becomes clear what further development principles apply in addition to the over arching Development Principles. For example: Development Principle B2 – paragraph 2, second sentence.	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBH	Stripping out of detail which is more suited to Development Plan Documents at borough level. The inclusion of detail such as building heights and housing quantum's leaves it open to becoming outdated and challengeable as it is not underpinned by the robustness of evidence ancillary to the LDF processes Amend the document where appropriate / necessary in light of the comments provided. Request that a second focussed consultation is run as proposed by the GLA that will permit the Boroughs to add to or revise their initial comments in light of the new supporting documentation. the OLSPG boroughs are engaged in.	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBH	There are a number of supporting documents which underpin and inform the OLSPG that are still being finalised and therefore have not been available to review and examine. LBH requests that a second consultation period is run which allows the Council to make further comments on the OLSPG in light of the new background documentation.	Overview				General comment - No change
ODA PDT	Overall the OLSPG document is welcomed and supported, providing an appropriate approach to strategic supplementary guidance to the London Plan. The ODA PDT involvement at officer level in the process of developing the document and representation on the steering group for OLSPG is also welcomed. ODA PDT looks forward to on-going cooperation and coordination of appropriate work streams that will aid its work in respect to Legacy proposals and will prove helpful in the proposed planning policy work that is likely to be undertaken by the prospective Mayoral Development Corporation. Specific matters of detail are raised through the comments that follow within this table.	Overview				General comment - No change
Avivia	Avivia supportive and would like to be stakeholder in redevelopment options for Leyton Mills Retail Park	Overview				Supporting - No change
Natural England	Biodiversity and green infrastructure are considered as part of the Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance (OLSPG) falls short of what we would have expected.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
Natural England	The natural environment is a cross-cutting issues that deserves much fuller consideration.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
Natural England	Natural England would advise that the best solution to this deficiency would be to include a development principle specifically that covers green infrastructure.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
BioRegional	Materials Existing buildings on the site should be given temporary uses where possible. All new buildings within the OLSPG should demonstrate that at least three of the key building elements are specified to achieve at least an A+ to B rating for reduced lifecycle impact according to the BRE's Green Guide to Material Specification (or any replacement guide) rating.	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
BioRegional	Promoting sustainable lifestyles For developments within the OLSPG area with over 200 residential units, provision should be made for a green caretaker/s to be available on site who can advise new residents about the best use of the sustainability features in their home/ business, and how they can use the on-site infrastructure to lead a more sustainable lifestyle.	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
North London Waste Authority	Any waste facilities redeveloped should have a suitable compensatory site supplied in particular the Gateway Road site 30,000 homes must have sufficient provision of HWRC facilities.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
London First	We support the ambition of convergence, it is a vague concept, The requirement for new development above a threshold to include a statement explaining how it supports convergence requires greater clarity before it can be introduced. How does this new requirement differ from the vast amount of assessments and evidence that applicants are already required to submit with a planning application?	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
London First	Convergence - It is not clear how new developments will be able to accurately interpret, and therefore support the convergence policy. Equally, as the concept is vague, there is a danger that what does and does not support convergence will be arbitrarily assessed.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
London First	Convergence - It is also unclear about the extent to which a developer's convergence statement must explain how the development supports every aspect of this policy or just some aspects of the policy. Depending on the type of development being undertaken, it is likely that some aspects of the convergence policy will be of greater relevance than others.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
London First	Convergence - Furthermore, it is not clear how this policy – which in theory could have significant financial implications – will be treated in relation to assessing the viability of development where, for example, the Mayoral and borough Community Infrastructure Levies (CILs) may apply as well as planning obligations.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
London First	We welcome the forthcoming Delivery Study	Overview				Supporting - No change
National Grid	Wish to be involved in formation of any DPDs - ALSO HAVE PROVIDED A LOT OF INFORMATION ON POWER SUPPLY	Overview				General comment - No change
Natural England	We consider that the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been carried out using a robust and appropriate methodology and we would wholly support the recommendations and conclusions that it reaches particularly under Sections 4.2 and 4.3. Natural England advises the GLA that given the quantum of development proposed, and in the absence of additional development principle(s) that are in line with these recommendations, the OLSPG would have a likely significant effect on the identified European sites and therefore an appropriate assessment would be necessary.	Overview				Supporting - No change
Port of London Authority	Thank you for consulting the PLA on the Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance - Consultation draft. I have now had the opportunity to review the document and would advise that the PLA is generally supportive of the documents vision and development principles. As you will be aware, the PLA owns some of the riverbed and foreshore up to Mean High Water mark within the SPG area. It will therefore be important to have early discussions with the PLA should any works be proposed in, on or over their land with a view to ensuring that navigation, river regime and environment is not detrimentally affected by any proposal.	Overview				Supporting - No change
Design Council	MN has summarised - strategy, identity and aspirations - Guidance should help to prioritise competing aspirations, offer more guidance on how to create a place desirable to work and live. It should protect heritage assets. Blue and Green space Masterplan would be of benefit, as would a cultural strategy.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
Design Council	Convergence - GLA needs to define convergence clearly and place mechanisms capable of attaining this objective.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
Clive Durdle	I strongly commend a detailed strategy to encourage sustainable and accessible floating homes of various types. I have written about this here. <a href="http://clivedurdle.wordpress.com/2010/02/17/building-an-eco-village/">http://clivedurdle.wordpress.com/2010/02/17/building-an-eco-village/</a>	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
London Sustainable Development Commission	The LSDC recommends that the next iteration of the SPG specifies what is expected in terms of impacts on the adjacent local communities so that there can be a framework for assessing the direct benefits of future development in terms of a legacy that will be experienced by the existing population.	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
London Sustainable Development Commission	The LSDC supports the guidance outlined in the London Housing Design Guide and recommends that this should be reflected in the convergence criteria.	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
NHS East London and City	Overall, we are impressed by the scope of the SPG and its vision of an Olympics legacy that transforms the existing communities of East London as well as creating high quality new settlements and public environments. We are pleased to see this explicitly linked to the vision of the Strategic Regeneration framework to achieve convergence of the socioeconomic conditions of the people of the host boroughs with the average for London.	Overview				Supporting - No change
Shelter	The Olympic Legacy is by far London's most significant and high profile new development project, and one that will be eagerly observed around the world. As such the Olympic Legacy SPG represents an important statement of the Mayor's vision for the future of London: it is therefore vital that it makes a strong, credible commitment to delivering its stated aims of vibrant, sustainable, neighbourhoods. Without a sufficient commitment to providing the truly affordable housing that London so desperately needs the Olympic Area SPG risks failing both on its own terms, and in the eyes of London's people.	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
Stratford Centre/CEPF Chariot SARRL (Quod)	Overall the Owners of the Stratford Centre are very positive about the future of Stratford Town Centre and support the general approach taken in the OLSPG to encourage its change and integration. It is, however, vital for the OLSPG to provide the framework for renewal on the Stratford Island site which is realistic; allows the town centre to respond to the challenges that Westfield Stratford City brings to the existing Stratford Town Centre; and is sufficiently flexible to ensure that shared regeneration objectives can be delivered without delay.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
OPLC	The OPLC looks to the GLA to help agree and co-ordinate appropriate methodologies for population projection and child yield. It is noted that social infrastructure requirements are not set out for each sub area and does not consider how social infrastructure may be delivered across the sub-zonal boundaries.	Overview				General comment - No change
OPLC	Where comments are made here on specific areas or themes they equally applicable across the whole document.	Overview				General comment - No change
LBN	Further discussion is needed on social infrastructure to provide what is required in terms of the existing and emerging population profile as well as the plans of key education and health providers in particular. Given our current experience of provision of school places not keeping pace with growth we are concerned that this document demonstrates that an adequate amount of school provision will be delivered in time for new homes.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
LBTH	The current draft of the Fish Island AAP identifies the need for one or two new primary schools and one new secondary school in Fish Island, and new primary and secondary schools are also proposed in Bromley-by-Bow. The SPG should reflect this position.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
LBH	This section and the remainder of the document should refer to the Multi Use Sports Venue (MUSV) as the Multi Use Arena (MUA).	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
LBH	Further discussion with the GLA is required in relation to the development capacity work produced in light of the recently completed capacity work. LBH and the Learning Trust welcome further discussions the GLA to discuss development capacity work / population and child yields and social infrastructure needs.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
Met Police Service	The MPS considers it vital that no opportunity be missed to ensure that new developments are designed with a view to reducing or removing the opportunity to commit crime. The MPS therefore believes it is essential that strong links are made in the main text of the SPG, rather than the policy context appendices, with the London Plan policies that support designing to protect against crime (policy 7.3) and, in the case of areas that may become crowded places, designing to protect against terrorism (policy7.13).	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
London Gypsy & Traveller Unit	Spatial Policies S2 Stratford and West Ham Within the SPG there should be included the commitment to locate and build a Site for the 15 Traveller family who were relocated to Parkway crescent due to the Olympics.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
London Gypsy & Traveller Unit	The promise that was made to the families by the LDA, subsequently followed up by a commitment from the OPLC should be appearing in some form, in the SPG. The residents have been to many meetings about this and as nothing firm has transpired they believe the next move is to place the commitment in the SPG. We can provide you with copies of letters and meetings as evidence of what was promised over the years leading up to their move to Parkway Crescent . There should also be a sentence to agree the process by which the decision is to be made, taking into account the needs of the Gypsies. The commitment that was made at the time included maps of the proposed Stratford areas, now Stratford North/ Chobham village /Carpenters District. For many reasons already lodged with the authorities the residents need to be relocated in that area.	Overview				Partial change considered appropriate
Leyton Orient FC (URS)	The viability of the development is a key factor particularly at Eton Manor. The present Legacy Plan lacks any substantial commercial component that will encourage development to come forward especially in the present economic conditions.	Overview				No change - Draft OLSPG considered appropriate
LBH	all references to Lea Navigation should be changed to Lee Navigation.	Overview				Accept - Review and amend
LTGDC	General: the OS base for each map omits the existing bridges between Bromley by Bow/Sugar House Lane and Three Mills and the listed House Mill at Three Mills Lane. This should be corrected.	Overview				Proposed connections reconfigured
London Concrete	For clarification purposes it is confirmed that the Bow Midland West site is not currently being used for Olympic construction activity. It is used, as outlined in the covering letter, by a number of rail related uses, including the London Concrete's batching plant. It is a fully active rail served site. London Concrete have allowed for some site improvement works to be undertaken by the ODA, in advance of the sites temporary closure for the duration of the games, when part of the site will be used by the ODA for vehicle screening purposes.	Transport Study	Connectivity and transport	22	3.1.2	No change - completed background document
ODA PDT	p121 It is noted that this states that the "Transport Study does not recommend a station at Lea Bridge ...	Transport Study	Connectivity and transport	121		No change - completed background document
ODA PDT	p135 Marsh Lane Footbridge works are not being funded by OPTEMS or being currently implemented.	Transport Study	Connectivity and transport	135		No change - completed background document
ODA PDT	p9 The conclusion that "the growth in public transport use appears to be in the counter-peak direction" is surprising given the scale of new residential development proposed – of which a significant number are likely to be employed in central London. This will critically affect the transport impacts and the reasons for this could usefully be expanded upon.	Transport Study	Connectivity and transport			No change - completed background document
ODA PDT	fig 4.2 This highlights that even background growth will see significant adverse impacts on the highway and public transport networks that has the potential to constrain development even if the OLSPG development had no further adverse impacts.	Transport Study	Connectivity and transport			No change - completed background document
ODA PDT	The Transport Study helpfully sets out the approach used in considering transport. It highlights the transport issues of delivering the OLSPG area's regeneration but equally highlights that many of these issues arise regardless of this regeneration.	Transport Study	Connectivity and transport			No change - completed background document
ODA PDT	p12 The further studies to assess and understand potential transport measures is welcomed and should be a priority.	Transport Study	Connectivity and transport			No change - completed background document
ODA PDT	This provides a broad-brush view of "required connectivity schemes". Early analysis to refine the case for these and define them will be important as highlighted in the "Further Studies" section.	Transport Study	Section 5 – Improving Local Connectivity			No change - completed background document
ODA PDT	This sets out hypothetical alternative outcomes. However even if these were achieved (higher public transport mode share or mode shift from car to walk and cycle), highway and public transport congestion/crowding remain above the background growth and the reference case.	Transport Study	Section 6 – Options for Transport Solutions			No change - completed background document

Consultee	Issue/Comment	Section	Topic	Page	Further Ref/Para	Recommendation/Action
ODA PDT	Section 4.9 considers weekend impacts and clearly includes Main Stadium use with a 60,000 capacity. It is unclear whether the weekday PM peak analysis also takes into account weekday evening stadium use, which would significantly add to the impacts – particularly on public transport. It is not clear what assumptions are made regarding other Olympic Park events.	Transport Study	Stadium assumptions			No change - completed background document