



## **Adoption and Consultation Statement for the London Legacy Development Corporation Pudding Mill Supplementary Planning Document (March 2017)**

In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the London Legacy Development Corporation in its role as Local Planning Authority for its administrative area gives notice that it has **adopted** its Pudding Mill Supplementary Planning Document on **31 March 2017**.

### **Consultation**

Public consultation was undertaken between 31<sup>st</sup> October and 12<sup>th</sup> December 2016 with all parties whose details are held on the planning policy consultation list being notified by letter and/or email. The list comprises a range of statutory bodies, other bodies and organisations, including local organisations, businesses and individuals that have requested that they are consulted on planning policy matters when responding to previous consultations.

The consultation document and information on how to respond to it was also placed on the Legacy Corporation website and a paper copy made available for inspection in person at the offices of the London Legacy Development Corporation.

Twenty-two individual responses were received in writing as a result of the consultation and the responses received are summarised at Appendix 1 to this statement.

### **Modifications**

A number of minor modifications have been made to the supplementary planning document as a consequence of the consultation undertaken and these are set out as part of Appendix 1 to this statement.

### **Judicial Review**

Any person with sufficient interest in the decision to adopt this supplementary planning document may apply to the High Court for permission to apply for judicial review of that decision. Any such application must be made promptly and in any event not later than three months after the date on which this supplementary planning document was adopted.

## Appendix 1: Pudding Mill SPD Consultation Response Summaries and Responses

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
001	William Knatchbull for Assistant Commissioner (Fire Safety)	Whole document	Pump appliance access and water supplies are not addressed in the documents, however are adequate. Proposals should conform to Part B5 of Approved Document B.	Noted.	No change.
004	Local Resident	Whole document	<p>Document is well considered regarding size, density and layout.</p> <p>However, document should address the adjacent Strategic Industrial Location. The SIL will remain alongside the new residential neighbourhood, two schools and the stadium, and other residential developments including at Hackney Wick. Other more noise and environmentally friendly industrial uses could be introduced instead, which should be specified within the SPD. It appears that LLDC are considering approving the applications for concrete batching on the SIL which would render Pudding Mill unfit for residential purposes.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Opportunities and Constraints section includes reference to the SIL as a constraint on development. However it is recognised that further detail may be of use, therefore further reference to the description within Table 2 of the Local Plan will be included here.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Amend Opportunities and Constraints section to include further reference to the SIL.</p>
007	Theresa Gonet, Highways England	Whole document	No comments in relation to the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network.	Noted	No change
008	Helena Payne, Port of London Authority	Whole document	As the area lies outside the Port of London's policy area there are no specific observations to make, however will welcome aims at enhancing the role of the waterways for drainage, biodiversity, leisure and transport.	Noted.	No change.
010	David Wilson, Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Page 37	Support this section as it mentions SuDS and basement flooding etc but this should be improved to deal with water supply and wastewater/sewerage infrastructure. Co-ordinating infrastructure with development is a key sustainability objective of Local and Neighbourhood Plans as stated by	Policy S.5 of the Local Plan ensures that major developments demonstrate that there is capacity within the water and waste water system to meet the demands of the development. This policy will	An additional section will be added to Chapter 7 in relation to water supply and waste water.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>paragraphs 156 and 162 of the NPPF which specifically reference water supply and waste water and its treatment. The NPPG also includes water supply, waste water and water quality, ensuring investment plans align with development needs. Need to consider the demand and the impacts may have off-site further down the network. It is currently unclear what the net demand increase will be as a result of the SPD, so developers should demonstrate that adequate water supply and waste water infrastructure capacity exists on and off site, which could include need for appropriate reports and appraisals. Where capacity problems are identified developers should contact the water company to agree improvements and delivered prior to occupation. Developers should engage with Thames Water at early stage to establish demand for water supply and infrastructure as well as surface water drainage requirements and flood risk on and off site.</p>	<p>be a key consideration for development proposals within the site.</p> <p>In relation to the SPD the current section deals with flooding and surface water management and other infrastructure considerations are dealt with in Chapter 9: Delivery and Implementation. However, it is recognised that this chapter could benefit from information on what is required from developers with regard to water infrastructure; therefore additional wording will be added.</p>	
		Page 37	<p>It is the developer's responsibility to make provision for drainage to ground, watercourse and surface water sewers. The quantity of surface water entering the wastewater system to reduce flood risk. However SuDS are not appropriate in all area for example with high ground water levels or clay soils. They also require regular maintenance. Thames Water has an approach which limits the volume and rate, ensuring the sewerage network has capacity to cater for population change. SuDS improve water quality, water efficiency, landscape benefits, support wildlife and amenity.</p>	<p>Noted. This section highlights the key roles of SuDS and the responsibilities of developers. This can be expanded to highlight the role of SuDS in reducing surface water entrance into the wastewater and sewerage system.</p>	<p>Additional information will be included within the SuDS section to highlight the role in reducing surface water flow into the wastewater and sewerage system.</p>
		Page 37	<p>Water conservation and climate change expected to impact on availability of raw water and drinking water. Thames Water region is serious water stressed and pressures set to increase so supports</p>	<p>Policy S.5 of the Local Plan sets out the 110 litres per head target which will be a consideration when determining proposals</p>	<p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			water conservation and efficient use of water, including 110 litres per day per head target, which should be referenced in SPD.	within the area. It is not considered necessary to reference this directly within the SPD.	
		Page 37	<p>Support reference to basements but should be improved in relation to sewer flooding. Concerns relating to impacts on rainfall soak into the ground; need to prevent increases in surface water discharges into sewerage network.</p> <p>Basements are vulnerable to flooding, particularly sewer flooding as gravity system to discharge waste above ground does not work. Policy should require all new basements to be protected from sewer flooding through installation of suitable pumped device which will only apply when there is a waste outlet in basement. Should avoid pumping groundwater into sewer network.</p>	<p>Support welcomed. The whole of the site is situated within flood zones 2 and 3 therefore basements should be avoided and will not be encouraged. Therefore amending the wording to state that basements should include pumping systems could suggest that basements may be acceptable.</p>	No change.
		Page 37	<p>Should add the following wording to the SPD:</p> <p><u>Water Supply, Wastewater &amp; Sewerage Infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply, waste water capacity and surface water drainage both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and/or waste water infrastructure. Drainage on the site must maintain separation of foul and surface flows. Where there is an infrastructure capacity constraint the Council will require the developer to set out what appropriate</u></p>	<p>As above, it is recognised that this chapter will benefit from additional wording in relation to water supply and waste water.</p>	<p>An additional section will be added to Chapter 7 in relation to water supply and waste water. This will be similar to the suggested wording.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<u>improvements are required and how they will be delivered.</u>		
012	Polly Barker, TfL Property	Page 21	<p>Comments are submitted by TfL as a landowner, colleagues in TfL Planning will respond separately.</p> <p>TfL owns the land at and surrounding Pudding Mill Lane station. There may be potential to release a small portion of TfL land to the east of Marshgate Lane for development, and should be considered as part of commercial or residential development. Discussions are taking place between colleagues in Crossrail and LLDC (landowner) and TfL Property.</p>	The SPD currently makes a number of references to the potential for the re-alignment of Barbers Road. This could create a commercial block to adjacent to the railway line. This will be further clarified with amendments to Map 8.	Amend Map 8 to clarify the role of the land adjacent to the railway line.
013	Mark Furnish, Sport England	Whole document	<p>Providing sports facilities of right quality, type and location is key to encouraging physical activity. There are no objections to the SPDs provided acknowledgement that the increased demand will be met.</p> <p>SPDs should protect existing and plan for new facilities to comply with NPPF paragraph 73. Should set out within the SPDs that the developments should contribute towards meeting increased demand through on-site facilities or additional capacity off-site. Level of provision should be informed by evidence such as Sports Facility Strategy, Playing Pitch Strategy or other.</p> <p>Sport England and Public Health England's Active Design Guidance should be reflected in the SPDs: <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-andguidance/active-design/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-andguidance/active-design/</a> The new sports facilities referenced in the Pudding Mill SPD should be fit for purpose and designed in accordance Sport England design guidance: <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-</a></p>	<p>There are no existing sports facilities on the site. Local Plan policies, particularly BN.8 and Cl.1 ensure that needs for community infrastructure, play and recreation are met. The SPD already specifies that needs for open space and playspace will be met, additional reference can be made within the document in relation to broader sports requirements, which would need to be provided in accordance with the Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Sport England design guidance will be considered when determining proposals containing new sports and play equipment.</p>	<p>Include reference that sports requirements will also need to be met in the playspace section.</p> <p>Strengthen the text in relation to the design requirements of sports and play provision.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<a href="#">planning/tools-guidance/design-and-costguidance/</a>		
015	Claire McLean, Canal & River Trust	Page 9, Map 4  Page 13, Map 7	SPD references proposed vehicular bridge over Bow Back River. C&RT do not generally support new bridges due to impact on the character and appearance of the historic waterspace and increases in maintenance costs and anti-social behaviour. However proposals will be assessed with regard to need and impact on the network. Any bridge should be of sufficient height to allow navigation. A commercial agreement would need to be drawn up to deliver a new crossing to be approved by the Secretary of State.	Noted. Canal & River Trust will be consulted on any proposals.	No change.
		Page 11	SPD states that guidance will impact upon the design of the waterway. Canal & River Trust's document Guidance for Towpath Design, 2013 is of relevance and the Trust should be involved in any proposals for the waterway environment.	Noted.	No change to this page. However, comments will be considered alongside those of the Environment Agency and amendments will be made to the Waterway Management section to take account of these.
		Page 13	Support the aim to facilitate connections with other pedestrian and cycle routes, however the consent of the Trust should be sought for new accesses. This should be a formal agreement with the Estates team and a commercial payment.	Support welcomed.	No change.
		Page 15	Site allocation proposes a new bus/cycle/pedestrian connection over the River Lea and A12. Concern about impact of new bridges on character, maintenance and anti-social behaviour. However proposals will be assessed with regard to need and impact on the network. Any bridge should be of sufficient height to allow navigation. A commercial agreement would need to be drawn up to deliver a new crossing to be approved by the Secretary of	Noted.	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			State.		
		Page 18, Map 8	OIL is not a necessary buffer to the A12 and could be opened up to some publicly accessible commercial uses. Although adjacent to the A12 the height of the offside (non-towpath side) wall and vegetation screen the towpath, and thus not adversely affected by the road.	The principal role of the OIL is to maintain and/or re-provide the existing balance of employment uses in accordance with Policy B.1 of the Local Plan. The use of this land for employment purposes additionally provides a buffer between the A12 and residential beyond. The OIL designation does allow for some compatible employment uses. Any workshops or similar can potentially be located on the western side of the OIL, subject to meeting policy and design aspirations across the OIL, in particular that an appropriate buffer is provided within the OIL, or to the east of Cooks Road to mitigate residential impacts.	No change.
		Page 23	Maintaining OIL as a barrier to the A12 does not respect the position of the River Lea. Creating a barrier at the back edge of the towpath will enclose the river environment and fail to improve public amenity space, biodiversity and walking and cycling. SPD should make clear that 'appropriate uses' in Table 2 could be compatible with an active and attractive riverside environment, e.g. maker or co-working space opening out along riverside.	<p>The SPD does not propose that a physical barrier be provided at the edge of the site, instead it refers to employment uses providing a barrier between the road and the residential beyond. However, the wording can be amended to ensure clarity with this respect.</p> <p>As above, the uses within the OIL may be compatible with an active riverside environment, subject to fulfilling policy and design aspirations for the site. This is already reflected in Table 2.</p>	<p>Amend wording in relation to the role of the OIL as a barrier.</p> <p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
		Page 30, Map 9	Map should clarify that development should step down towards the waterways, particularly given the height of the river walls. Further consideration should be given to potential impacts of overshadowing including ecology of the watercourse and wind affecting navigation.	Map 9 is for illustrative purposes only and the heights will be set within the scheme details in accordance with Local Plan Policy BN.10 and the policies within the SPD. However, it is the intention that heights should step down at the waterways therefore some additional wording will be added to the text.	New wording will be inserted within the Building Heights section to confirm that heights should step down towards the waterways.
		Page 33	There is potential for use of the adjacent waterways for heating and cooling, which could help support the existing district heat network.	Noted.	No change.
		Page 34 & 35	Support creation and enhancement of towpath to provide additional open space.	Support welcomed.	No change.
		Page 37	Should consider potential for overshadowing of the waterspace and towpath, which can adversely affect the enjoyment of the waterways and ecology of the watercourse. Should enhance the waterways and assess the impact of tall buildings on wind, which impacts boat navigation.	The daylight and sunlight section deals with overshadowing generally, however additional reference can be made to the waterways in this respect. Proposals within the area will be required to conduct a wind assessment as part of their planning application.	Add additional reference to daylight and sunlight section to reference impacts on waterways.
		Page 37	Proposed flood mitigation measures should be considered in the context of the waterway character, particularly "increasing the height of the finished floor levels" and "improving flood defences and improving or replacing river walls, incorporating appropriate buffer strips adjacent to watercourses".	The Flooding and Surface Water management section will be reviewed in the context of the LLDC Flood Risk Review. Waterway character is considered within the Waterway Management section. Appropriate on site measures will be considered on a site by site basis.	Amend flooding section in relation to the LLDC Flood Risk Review.
		Page 39	Support the aims for the waterspaces including the reference to the Olympic Legacy Waterways	Support welcomed.	No change.



No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			Strategy. Particularly support the integration and improvement of the waterways along the Lee Navigation, City Mill River and Bow Back River and encouraging development to face towards the waterway, provide open, safe and connected spaces with natural surveillance at each part of the day.		
		Page 40	<p>Some concerns about the green edge along City Mill, in particular new trees and landscape species which could damage river walls. Should assess existing trees to ensure they are not damaging the river wall. Original towpaths should be restored.</p> <p>Support for encouraging greater public space at Vulcan's Wharf to improve the relationship to the river edge.</p> <p>Concerns about guidance for towpath along the River Lea. Failure to open out this towpath edge to more appropriate commercial uses will fail to fulfil potential of southerly aspect.</p>	<p>The introduction of new species should be appropriate to the location and existing trees assessed through the applications, where C&amp;RT will be given the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>As above, the OIL designation does allow some uses which could help open out the towpath, however the designation limits these to employment uses. The SPD does also highlight potential for greater public space at this location to take advantage of the southerly aspect. This can be directly referenced within the SPD.</p>	<p>Text to be amended to state new species should be appropriate to location.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Amend wording to reference that potential for more public space at Vulcan Wharf is to take advantage of the southerly aspect.</p>
		Page 41	Consideration should be given to the use of the waterways for waste and construction materials.	Policy T.10 of the Local Plan encourages the use of the waterways for transport. Can reference that this can also be considered for the site.	Insert reference to consideration of waterways for transport.
		Page 43	Further concern in relation to the width of the bridge	Noted. Canal & River Trust will be	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			at Marshgate Lane.	consulted on any proposals.	
		Page 46	<p>Ground floor commercial should be encouraged. Residential fronting waterspace can lead to shutters and retrofitted fencing, this should be considered in the original designs.</p> <p>Support the design aspiration that routes along waterways to provide green amenity space, informal play and public realm.</p> <p>Concern about statement suggesting that vehicles will be acceptable along the waterway. Even if used infrequently, they become barriers to interaction with waterspace and 'dead' space.</p> <p>The waterways are used as feeding corridors by bats. Lighting should not spill over onto the waterspace as it could disrupt bat habitat, and fittings should be 'bat-friendly'.</p>	<p>Map 8 sets out the appropriate land uses to deliver the aims of the site allocation. This includes areas with particular non-residential focus, at the Local Centre, the OIL, the east-west street and Barbers Road West. Outside these areas other non-residential uses may be appropriate. Encouraging non-residential uses outside these areas alongside the waterway would undermine this strategy. It will be expected that residential uses along the waterway would be appropriately designed.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>The routes along the waterway should primarily be for walking and cycling, the SPD highlights limited access for vehicles which is intended to be for access only. However the wording will be amended to clarify that it is not expected that vehicles will have a route alongside the waterway.</p> <p>Noted. Applications will be expected to consider habitat impacts when designing lighting schemes.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Amend wording to clarify, subject to design, vehicle use would only be for access.</p> <p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
		Page 48	Support relocation of waste site.	Support welcomed.	No change.
		Page 49	Concern about environmental impacts of new bridge and widening of Cook's Road bridge. Support for improved pedestrian towpath and river wall repairs and improvements.	Canal & River Trust will be consulted upon any proposals for the new or widened bridges.	No change.
		Page 51	Any infrastructure proposals requiring Trust consent should have a commercial agreement considered in the development costs. Support underpass improvements. Concern about all movements junction on Stratford High Street.	Noted. The Canal & River Trust will consulted upon any relevant proposals.	No change.
		Page 52	SPD should reference Environment Agency and Canal & River Trust ensuring proposals meet relevant environmental standards.  Should include reference to encouraging developers to seek pre-application advice from the Canal & River Trust.	The SPD already highlights the role of the Environment Agency and Canal & River Trust in ensuring proposals meet relevant standards.  The SPD already encourages pre-application discussions, although it will not be appropriate to specifically highlight C&RT, the text will be amended to include reference to relevant bodies.	No change.  Amend text to reference pre-application discussions are encouraged with relevant bodies.
		Page 68	Update photograph of Lock Keepers Cottage.	Photo is representing a historical context.	No change.
		Whole document	SPD should include reference to long term, or short stay visitor moorings. Area is lacking appropriate waterside facilities for boats including water, power and refuse.  Should reference Town and Country Planning	Policy BN.2 of the Local Plan sets out how the Legacy Corporation will work with partners to enhance the functions of the waterway, including new mooring. Figure 14 of the Local Plan also highlights the potential for new visitor moorings at Pudding Mill which can be referenced within the SPD.  The Local Plan policies were	Amend text to highlight that new visitor moorings may be appropriate.  No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			Association's Policy Advice note: Inland Waterways (2009), in particular Appendix 1 – 'Water proofing of planning policy': <a href="https://www.thenbs.com/PublicationIndex/document/s/details?Pub=TCPA&amp;DocID=294166">https://www.thenbs.com/PublicationIndex/document/s/details?Pub=TCPA&amp;DocID=294166</a>	developed with reference to this guidance, these policies will be applied therefore direct reference within the SPD is not necessary.	
016	Simon Chaffe, Matthews and Son on behalf of S Walsh and Sons	Whole document	<p>SWS have submitted a planning application for a concrete block manufacturing plant and other associated uses. Two further applications for concrete plants have also been submitted in relation to adjacent land. A Cumulative Environmental Report has been prepared in support of this, finding that the uses would have no significant adverse combined or cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Bow Goods Yard East is a Strategic Freight Site (SFS). The SIL status of the land has also been reinforced by the Local Plan Inspector in 2015, where appropriate uses were also identified. Have reviewed the SPD with regard to these designations and Site Allocation 4.3, concluding that the SPD does not pay due regard to guidance on the preparation of SPDs as set out in the Regulations.</p> <p>Representation should be considered in own right but supports that of Firstplan on behalf of United Asphalt.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Legacy Corporation has prepared the SPD in accordance with the requirements of the Regulations.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
		Page 5	Scheme changes at PDZ8 should be considered in light of the site allocation requirement to not prejudice the operation of the safeguarded rail site.	All proposals will be determined in accordance with the Site Allocation.	No change.
		Page 7, Map 3	Welcome the identification of the rail freight site on the site location map, however does not describe the site as included in the Local Plan. The rail site is comprised of the Bow Midland West Rail Site	Noted. The labelling and accompanying text to the map can be amended to acknowledge both parts of the SIL site and the	Label Bow Goods Yard West and Bow Goods Yard East on Map 3. Include further

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			operated by Aggregate Industries, London Concrete and others as an aggregate rail head and Bow Goods Yard East operating as an active rail head for the transfer of spoil and waste, which should be referenced as such on Map 3.	safeguarded rail site.	description within the label to this map.
		Page 9, Map 4	Map does not correctly detail both parts of the safeguarded rail site, and should include reference to the safeguarded rail site and the need to safeguard the existing and potential operation of the site.	Noted. This map does not need to specifically reference the parts of the site but the labelling can be amended to reflect the safeguarded freight site status. To aid clarity, additional reference can also be made to the safeguarded rail site within the accompanying text.	Label map to include safeguarded freight site. Reference to the safeguarded rail site to be included within the description to Map 4.
		Page 11, Map 5	Map 5 and the supporting text should reference the Safeguarded Rail Site status of Bow East and Bow West.	Noted. The map can be amended to show the safeguarded freight status.	Label map to also include safeguarded freight site.
		Page 15 & 16	Welcome full text to SA4.3, however should go further than stating the Local Plan text should be read in full. SPDs must not conflict with the adopted development plan, so wording should be amended to state this.	The Legacy Corporation is well aware with the requirements in relation to the production of SPDs, however it is not considered necessary to include reference to these requirements nor a need to again reference the site allocation, as all proposals will need to meet the requirements of the site allocation.	No change.
		Page 19 & 20, Map 8	Suggests potential for some new residential at Barbers Road West, however should consider the northern boundary of the site in same way as the western boundary (i.e. Cook's Road and OIL) to ensure there is an appropriate buffer with the SIL and safeguarded freight site. This should be amended in the description to include reference to a	Barbers Road West has been identified as a non-residential focussed location to provide the buffer between the SIL to the north and residential uses beyond. The wording at Barbers Road west is similar to the	Remove reference to 'buffer' within the description to Cooks Road within Map 8.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			buffer.	description of the OIL, which also is a buffer between the A12 and residential beyond. However to aid consistency with the wording for the map as a whole reference to the role of the buffer will be removed from Map 8. This is clearly explained within the supporting text on pages 21-24.	
		Page 26- 28	<p>The Delivery Principles section fails to recognise the policy requirement to not prejudice the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site, including locating noise sensitive uses away from the safeguarded site. Subsequent sections do deal with the interrelationship appropriately referencing the need for buffer zones and location away from heavier industrial uses. These same principles should be expressed for the SIL and safeguarded freight site in close proximity. So should add the following additional paragraph:</p> <p><u>With regard to all proposed residential development regard will need to be had to not prejudicing the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site and SIL areas located in close proximity but falling outside of the Site Allocation Boundary. This can be achieved for example by ensuring that noise sensitive uses are appropriately located, orientated, designed and mitigated to ensure they are compatible with the surrounding existing uses and allocations.</u></p>	It is accepted that the requirement of the site allocation to not prejudice the operation of the rail freight site could be better reflected within this section. Therefore some additional wording will be added, particularly in relation to Barbers Road West as this and the Local Centre will be the primary areas where this will be a strong consideration.	Additional wording will be added to this section to reinforce the message within the site allocation regarding not prejudicing the rail operations and siting and design.
017	Vilna Walsh, Firstplan on behalf of United Asphalt Ltd	Whole document	Representation made on behalf of United Asphalt Limited, who are preparing a planning application for rail-served asphalt plant at land comprising part of Bow Goods Yard East. UA are involved in	Noted	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>have also been involved in the preparation of Cumulative Effects Reports (CER) with the applicants for three applications at the site. The proposal is compliant with the policy for the SIL site in the Local Plan. The principal concern is the continued safeguarding of the site for such uses, ensuring continued operation is not prejudiced by development at Pudding Mill. Response has reviewed to ensure due regard is had to the SIL and safeguarded freight site and the SPD drafted in compliance with the site allocation.</p>		
		Whole document	<p>Bow East is a strategic freight site with a long history. Although use halted leading up to and including the 2012 Games, a condition was included to ensure reinstatement which commenced in 2013. Such sites are a valued and rare resource, the policy basis for protection included within the NPPF, London Plan, the Olympic Legacy SPG and the Local Plan. These documents highlight the strength of safeguarding the appropriate uses within the site and safeguarding of the site from surrounding development. The approach adopted within the Local Plan is fully supported and should feed through into the SPD.</p> <p>Guidance on the preparation of SPDs is also provided by the Regulations, the NPPF and the NPPG. Therefore the Pudding Mill SPD should be in accordance with this policy and the site allocation.</p>	Noted.	No change.
		Page 5	Scheme changes at PDZ8 should be considered in light of the site allocation requirement to not prejudice the operation of the safeguarded rail site.	All proposals will be determined in accordance with the Site Allocation.	No change.
		Page 7,	Welcome the identification of the rail freight site on	Noted. The labelling and	Label Bow Goods Yard

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
		Map 3	the site location map, however does not describe the site as included in the Local Plan. The rail site is comprised of the Bow Midland West Rail Site operated by Aggregate Industries, London Concrete and others as an aggregate rail head and Bow Goods Yard East operating as an active rail head for the transfer of spoil and waste, which should be referenced as such on Map 3.	accompanying text to the map can be amended to acknowledge both parts of the SIL site and the safeguarded rail site.	West and Bow Goods Yard East on Map 3. Include further description within the label to this map.
		Page 9, Map 4	Map does not correctly detail both parts of the safeguarded rail site, and should include reference to the safeguarded rail site and the need to safeguard the existing and potential operation of the site.	Noted. This map does not need to specifically reference the parts of the site but the labelling can be amended to reflect the safeguarded freight site status. To aid clarity, additional reference can also be made to the safeguarded rail site within the accompanying text.	Label map to include safeguarded freight site. Reference to the safeguarded rail site to be included within the description to Map 4.
		Page 11, Map 5	Map 5 and the supporting text should reference the Safeguarded Rail Site status of Bow East and Bow West.	Noted. The map can be amended to show the safeguarded freight status.	Label map to include safeguarded freight site
		Page 15 & 16	Welcome full text to SA4.3, however should go further than stating the Local Plan text should be read in full. SPDs must not conflict with the adopted development plan, so wording should be amended to state this.	The Legacy Corporation is well aware with the requirements in relation to the production of SPDs, however it is not considered necessary to include reference to these requirements within a general section on the adopted planning policy.	No change.
		Page 19 & 20, Map 8	Suggests potential for some new residential at Barbers Road West, however should consider the northern boundary of the site in same way as the western boundary (i.e. Cook's Road and OIL) to ensure there is an appropriate buffer with the SIL and safeguarded freight site. This should be amended in the description to include reference to a	Barbers Road West has been identified as a non-residential focussed location to provide the buffer between the SIL to the north and residential uses beyond. The wording at Barbers Road west is similar to the	Remove reference to 'buffer' within the description to Cooks Road within Map 8.



No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			buffer.	description of the OIL, which also is a buffer between the A12 and residential beyond. However to aid consistency with the wording for the map as a whole reference to the role of the buffer will be removed from Map 8. This is clearly explained within the supporting text on pages 21-24.	
		Page 26- 28	<p>The Delivery principles section fails to recognise the policy requirement to not prejudice the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site, including locating noise sensitive uses away from the safeguarded site. Subsequent sections do deal with the interrelationship appropriately referencing the need for buffer zones and location away from heavier industrial uses. These same principles should be expressed for the SIL and safeguarded freight site in close proximity. So should add the following additional paragraph:</p> <p><u>With regard to all proposed residential development regard will need to be had to not prejudicing the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site and SIL areas located in close proximity but falling outside of the Site Allocation Boundary. This can be achieved for example by ensuring that noise sensitive uses are appropriately located, orientated, designed and mitigated to ensure they are compatible with the surrounding existing uses and allocations.</u></p>	It is accepted that the requirement of the site allocation to not prejudice the operation of the rail freight site could be better reflected within this section. Therefore some additional wording will be added, particularly in relation to Barbers Road West as this and the Local Centre will be the primary areas where this will be a strong consideration.	Additional wording will be added to this section to reinforce the message within the site allocation regarding not prejudicing the rail operations and siting and design.
017	Vilna Walsh, Firstplan on behalf of Aggregate Industries UK Ltd	Whole document	Representation made on behalf of Aggregate Industries UK Ltd (AI) and London Concrete Limited at Bow Goods Yard West. Their principal concern is the continued safeguarding of the site for such	Noted.	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
	and London Concrete Limited		uses, ensuring continued operation is not prejudiced by development at Pudding Mill. Response has reviewed to ensure due regard is had to the SIL and safeguarded freight site and the SPD drafted in compliance with the site allocation.		
		Whole document	<p>Bow Goods Yard West is a Network Rail Strategic Freight Site (SFS) operating as rail served depot for the inward transportation of construction materials, including aggregates.</p> <p>Such sites are a valued and rare resource. A number of representations have been made to the Local Plan, the Hackney Wick Fish Island SPD, the Olympic Legacy SPG and the Fish Island Area Action Plan to ensure that this important and valuable employment and freight site is appropriately and robustly safeguarded. These documents highlight the strength of safeguarding the appropriate uses within the site and safeguarding of the site from surrounding development. The approach adopted within the Local Plan is fully supported and should feed through into the SPD.</p> <p>The policy basis for protection has been included within the NPPF, London Plan, the Olympic Legacy SPG and the Local Plan. Guidance on the preparation of SPDs is also provided by the Regulations, the NPPF and the NPPG. Therefore the Pudding Mill SPD should be in accordance with this policy and the site allocation.</p>	Noted.	No change.
		Page 5	Scheme changes at PDZ8 should be considered in light of the site allocation requirement to not prejudice the operation of the safeguarded rail site.	All proposals will be determined in accordance with the Site Allocation.	No change.
		Page 7,	Welcome the identification of the rail freight site on	Noted. The labelling and	Label Bow Goods Yard

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
		Map 3	the site location map, however does not describe the site as included in the Local Plan. The rail site is comprised of the Bow Midland West Rail Site operated by Aggregate Industries, London Concrete and others as an aggregate rail head and Bow Goods Yard East operating as an active rail head for the transfer of spoil and waste, which should be referenced as such on Map 3.	accompanying text to the map can be amended to acknowledge both parts of the SIL site and the safeguarded rail site.	West and Bow Goods Yard East on Map 3. Include further description within the label to this map.
		Page 9, Map 4	Map does not correctly detail both parts of the safeguarded rail site, and should include reference to the safeguarded rail site and the need to safeguard the existing and potential operation of the site.	Noted. This map does not need to specifically reference the parts of the site but the labelling can be amended to reflect the safeguarded freight site status. To aid clarity, additional reference can also be made to the safeguarded rail site within the accompanying text.	Label map to include safeguarded freight site. Reference to the safeguarded rail site to be included within the description to Map 4.
		Page 11, Map 5	Map 5 and the supporting text should reference the Safeguarded Rail Site status of Bow East and Bow West.	Noted. The map can be amended to show the safeguarded freight status.	Label map to include safeguarded freight site.
		Page 15 & 16	Welcome full text to SA4.3, however should go further than stating the Local Plan text should be read in full. SPDs must not conflict with the adopted development plan, so wording should be amended to state this.	The Legacy Corporation is well aware with the requirements in relation to the production of SPDs, however it is not considered necessary to include reference to these requirements within a general section on the adopted planning policy.	No change.
		Page 19 & 20, Map 8	Suggests potential for some new residential at Barbers Road West, however should consider the northern boundary of the site in same way as the western boundary (i.e. Cook's Road and OIL) to ensure there is an appropriate buffer with the SIL and safeguarded freight site. This should be amended in the description to include reference to a	Barbers Road West has been identified as a non-residential focussed location to provide the buffer between the SIL to the north and residential uses beyond. The wording at Barbers Road west is similar to the	Remove reference to 'buffer' within the description to Cooks Road within Map 8.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			buffer.	description of the OIL, which also is a buffer between the A12 and residential beyond. However to aid consistency with the wording for the map as a whole reference to the role of the buffer will be removed from Map 8. This is clearly explained within the supporting text on pages 21-24.	
		Page 26- 28	<p>The Delivery principles section fails to recognise the policy requirement to not prejudice the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site, including locating noise sensitive uses away from the safeguarded site. Subsequent sections do deal with the interrelationship appropriately referencing the need for buffer zones and location away from heavier industrial uses. These same principles should be expressed for the SIL and safeguarded freight site in close proximity. So should add the following additional paragraph:</p> <p><u>With regard to all proposed residential development regard will need to be had to not prejudicing the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site and SIL areas located in close proximity but falling outside of the Site Allocation Boundary. This can be achieved for example by ensuring that noise sensitive uses are appropriately located, orientated, designed and mitigated to ensure they are compatible with the surrounding existing uses and allocations.</u></p>	It is accepted that the requirement of the site allocation to not prejudice the operation of the rail freight site could be better reflected within this section. Therefore some additional wording will be added, particularly in relation to Barbers Road West as this and the Local Centre will be the primary areas where this will be a strong consideration.	Additional wording will be added to this section to reinforce the message within the site allocation regarding not prejudicing the rail operations and siting and design.
019	Mike Davies, Davies Planning on behalf of Brett Concrete Ltd	Whole document	Applications have been submitted for concrete batching plants on Bow Goods Yard East, a strategic rail head to the north of Pudding Mill. The Local Plan inspector confirmed that the uses	Noted.	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>identified as appropriate to Bow Midland Yard West are also appropriate for Bow Goods Yard East.</p> <p>LLDC's environmental consultants have considered that the proposals both individually and cumulatively cause no significant adverse environmental impact.</p>		
		Whole document	<p>The SPD should be in accordance with the Development Plan and it is in this context that the SPD has been reviewed to examine the impact of development at Pudding Mill on the lawful operation of Bow Goods Yard East.</p> <p>Consider that the SPD has not taken into account the site allocation requirement to not prejudicing the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site. Supports the submission by Firstplan on behalf of United Asphalt.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>All proposals within the area will need to accord with the principles within the site allocation. Some amendments will be made to take account of other comments made in relation to the need to ensure uses do not prejudice the rail freight site and the SIL.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Text will be amended to better reflect the site allocation requirement to not prejudice the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site.</p>
		Page 5	Scheme changes at PDZ8 should be considered in light of the site allocation requirement to not prejudice the operation of the safeguarded rail site.	All proposals will be determined in accordance with the Site Allocation.	No change.
		Page 7, Map 3	Welcome the identification of the rail freight site on the site location map, however does not describe the site as included in the Local Plan. The rail site is comprised of the Bow Midland West Rail Site operated by Aggregate Industries, London Concrete and others as an aggregate rail head and Bow Goods Yard East operating as an active rail head for the transfer of spoil and waste, which should be referenced as such on Map 3.	Noted. The labelling and accompanying text to the map can be amended to acknowledge both parts of the SIL site and the safeguarded rail site.	Label Bow Goods Yard West and Bow Goods Yard East on Map 3. Include further description within the label to this map.
		Page 9,	Map does not correctly detail both parts of the	Noted. This map does not need to	Label map to include

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
		Map 4	safeguarded rail site, and should include reference to the safeguarded rail site and the need to safeguard the existing and potential operation of the site.	specifically reference the parts of the site but the labelling can be amended to reflect the safeguarded freight site status. To aid clarity, additional reference can also be made to the safeguarded rail site within the accompanying text.	safeguarded freight site. Reference to the safeguarded rail site to be included within the description to Map 4.
		Page 11, Map 5	Map 5 and the supporting text should reference the Safeguarded Rail Site status of Bow East and Bow West.	Noted. The map can be amended to show the safeguarded freight status.	Label map to include safeguarded freight site.
		Page 15 & 16	Welcome full text to SA4.3, however should go further than stating the Local Plan text should be read in full. SPDs must not conflict with the adopted development plan, so wording should be amended to state this.	The Legacy Corporation is well aware with the requirements in relation to the production of SPDs, however it is not considered necessary to include reference to these requirements within a general section on the adopted planning policy.	No change.
		Page 19 & 20, Map 8	Suggests potential for some new residential at Barbers Road West, however should consider the northern boundary of the site in same way as the western boundary (i.e. Cook's Road and OIL) to ensure there is an appropriate buffer with the SIL and safeguarded freight site. This should be amended in the description to include reference to a buffer.	Barbers Road West has been identified as a non-residential focussed location to provide the buffer between the SIL to the north and residential uses beyond. The wording at Barbers Road west is similar to the description of the OIL, which also is a buffer between the A12 and residential beyond. However to aid consistency with the wording for the map as a whole reference to the role of the buffer will be removed from Map 8. This is clearly explained within the supporting text on pages 21-24.	Remove reference to 'buffer' within the description to Cooks Road within Map 8.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
		Page 26- 28	<p>The Delivery principles section fails to recognise the policy requirement to not prejudice the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site, including locating noise sensitive uses away from the safeguarded site. Subsequent sections do deal with the interrelationship appropriately referencing the need for buffer zones and location away from heavier industrial uses. These same principles should be expressed for the SIL and safeguarded freight site in close proximity. So should add the following additional paragraph:</p> <p><u>With regard to all proposed residential development regard will need to be had to not prejudicing the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site and SIL areas located in close proximity but falling outside of the Site Allocation Boundary. This can be achieved for example by ensuring that noise sensitive uses are appropriately located, orientated, designed and mitigated to ensure they are compatible with the surrounding existing uses and allocations.</u></p>	<p>It is accepted that the requirement of the site allocation to not prejudice the operation of the rail freight site could be better reflected within this section. Therefore some additional wording will be added, particularly in relation to Barbers Road West as this and the Local Centre will be the primary areas where this will be a strong consideration.</p>	<p>Additional wording will be added to this section to reinforce the message within the site allocation regarding not prejudicing the rail operations and siting and design.</p>
020	Laura Fletcher-Gray, Savills on behalf of Bellway	Whole document	<p>Representations made on behalf of Bellway who have an interest in part of the land at Pudding Mill. The representations have taken account of the NPPF, NPPG, London Plan and Local Plan. Pleas that the SPD informs landowners how Local Plan policies should be implemented alongside the site allocation.</p>	Noted.	No change.
		Map 1, page 6	<p>Supporting text to map 1 should provide timescale for bringing forward parts of the site and how LLDC can assist in consolidating land parcels or resolving limitations caused by irregular boundaries.</p>	<p>This chapter provides the development context. Phasing information is included within Chapter 9: Delivery and Implementation. This section can also be amended to set out the</p>	<p>No change to this section. Amend Chapter 9 in relation to LLDC's powers.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				range of LLDC's powers.	
		Page 5	<p>It is useful that the SPD highlights the existing consents and that these replace 56% of existing employment floorspace. This should be annually updated within the SPD.</p> <p>Should have clarity on potential PDZ8 scheme changes prior to adoption of the SPD.</p> <p>Should reference the land pressures and support for mixed use development identified within the 'A City for all Londoners' document, which references potential for some industrial relocation and co-existence of residential and some industrial uses.</p>	<p>It is not proposed that the SPD be reviewed annually. Information on planning applications and consents granted will be available via the Legacy Corporation's planning application web viewer.</p> <p>Amendments to PDZ8 will be determined in accordance with the Development Plan.</p> <p>It is considered that the emphasis within the Local Plan and the SPDs in turn supports and complements the position taken by the Mayor of London in relation to mixed use development and industrial location. Therefore it is not necessary to specifically state these aims within an introductory section.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
		Map 4, pages 9 & 10	<p>Should add the Archaeological Protection Area and identify Policy BN.12 in summary.</p> <p>Add land ownership boundaries</p>	<p>As shown within Figure 19 of the Local Plan a majority of the Legacy Corporation area is covered by the Archaeological Protection Area, and therefore BN.12 will be a consideration for proposals within the boundary. Therefore as this is wider than the site allocation, it is not required to specifically mention this within the opportunities and constraints section.</p> <p>The land ownership boundaries</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>



No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>Should clarify the role of the land along the railway embankment.</p> <p>Supporting text should clarify that the waste transfer station provides a constraint to all development and should outline here and in the Delivery and Implementation section how LLDC will assist developers with relocation. The guidance should be strengthened in relation to the LLDCs jurisdiction and long term vision.</p> <p>Should confirm the distance between the SIL and the site boundary.</p> <p>Should acknowledge flexibility in relation to the potential realignment of Barbers Road.</p> <p>Note removal of OIL from diagram, support this as it would enable a comprehensive masterplan and appropriate uses. Continuation of OIL will give rise to potential residential amenity issues.</p>	<p>are shown in Map 1. Adding these to this map would reduce clarity.</p> <p>This map shows the opportunities and constraints and the shading does not refer to any specific requirements. However, Map 8 will be amended to provide clarity in relation to the areas adjacent to the railway line.</p> <p>The supporting text acknowledges that the waste site is a constraint to development, however does not constrain all development. The Delivery and Implementation section contains information in relation to LLDCs role in relation to the relocation of the waste site.</p> <p>The proximity of the SIL is shown within the mapping, including a measure of distance will serve no purpose within the document. The opportunities and constraints map shows the current alignment of the road as a marker within the site boundary. The SPD contains flexibility in relation to the potential re-alignment throughout the document.</p> <p>The OIL is a policy requirement contained within the site allocation and Policy B.1 of the Local Plan. It is not necessary to replicate this</p>	<p>Amend Map 8 to clarify the use within land adjacent to the railway line.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				requirement within every map- including a contextual map relating to opportunities and constraints.	
		Page 11	Correctly acknowledges that the influence of the SPD extends beyond the site allocation boundary. There is no clear justification of the boundary of the area of influence. Due to the impermeable nature of the railway tracks the area of influence should be moved southwards. The southern boundary should be moved closer to Stratford High Street, and exclude SA3.5 to the east.	Map 5 is showing how the guidance within the SPD will influence areas beyond the boundary of the site allocation. This diagram is not intended to be interpreted that the guidance should be used in development proposals outside the site. However to make this more clear the line can be amended to dotted lines.	Amend Map 5 to show the spheres of influence all as dotted lines.
		Map 7, page 14	Map does not show realignment of Barbers Road, however is acknowledged in supporting text. Text should be more flexible to give choice as to whether appropriate within emerging masterplan for land at Cook's Road, Barbers Road and PDZ8. Should amend key to include the figure used for junction at Cooks Road.  Could add the ownership boundaries to this map.	The text on page 14 is not correctly identified within the Map 7. This will be amended to show the potential re-alignment of Barbers Road. Corrections will also be made in relation to the key.  Again adding ownership boundaries to the map will reduce clarity.	Amend Map 7 to show potential re-alignment of Barbers Road and correct key.  No change.
		Page 17	Should confirm that policy list is not exhaustive.	The wording of the section states that all policies should be considered. However, if it is felt necessary to add that the list is not exhaustive then this can be added.	Further clarify text to state that policy list is not exhaustive.
		Page 18	Support the general approach and objectives but Table 1 should be flexible to encourage all appropriate B Class uses. Note IN.2 is referenced	Table 1 sets out the current uses within the site alongside the policy requirements which relate to	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			and loss of waste may be acceptable, but should flag points 4 to 7 of the policy to assist in its relocation as waste is a non-conforming use.	those uses. Including further detail in relation to the requirements of IN.2 is too detailed for this table.	
		Map 8, pages 19 & 20	<p>Should update map to show the appropriate uses for land adjacent to railway line at Barbers Road and update to show impending Crossrail departure.</p> <p>Consider Cook's Road buffer appropriate. Should confirm where the residential uses are appropriate along Barbers Road.</p> <p>Subtext to map is that consented schemes have informed the land uses.</p>	<p>Map 8 currently does not identify any uses for areas adjacent to the railway line at Barbers Road. As already identified within on page 41, the re-alignment of Barbers Road could create a new commercial block adjacent to the railway line. This will be reflected within amendments to Map 8. The map reflects the departure of Crossrail, where the western edge will be retained for operational purposes.</p> <p>The requirements at Barbers Road are different to that within the east side of Cooks Road, which will be required for a buffer should the development come forward within this parcel ahead of any redevelopment of the OIL. The Map is not intended to provide plot by plot detail; the text within page 28 provides detail of where residential may be appropriate.</p> <p>The uses identified within Map 8 have been informed by site specific factors and evidence, including within the Pudding Mill Land Use and Design Framework</p>	<p>Amend Map 8 to clarify the role of the land adjacent to the railway line.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				(2014), which draws upon existing permissions, amongst other factors.	
		Page 21	<p>Welcome that non-residential uses will be more appropriate at lower levels along the east-west street. Should also identify B1a as appropriate alongside B1b and B1c. A and D classes should also be included at the western end given likely population.</p> <p>Should regularly update the SPD in relation to proportion of employment floorspace to be re-provided and the potential changes to PDZ8.</p>	<p>As offices (B1a), A and D2 uses are town centre uses, these should be directed towards the Local Centre boundary and therefore are not identified as being appropriate along the western end of the east-west street. D1 community uses may be appropriate in addition to the provision of B class employment at the western end of the street.</p> <p>As above, it is not proposed that the SPD be reviewed annually. Information on planning applications and consents granted will be available via the Legacy Corporation's planning application web viewer</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
		Page 23	<p>Redevelopment of the OIL does need an appropriate buffer. Paragraph relating to the extent of this buffer does not relate to delivery timings. Emphasis should be placed on mitigation within the OIL itself.</p> <p>Welcome text stating that more compatible uses should be placed along the eastern edge of the OIL.</p> <p>Consider the stacked format B1b and B1c</p>	<p>The text includes flexibility in relation to the extent of the buffer required at the eastern side of Cook's Road. Failure to include a buffer along the east side of Cook's Road could lead to potential conflicts between the heavier industrial uses and residential.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Given the current industrial uses</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>appropriate at Barbers Road but should not dismiss other non-residential uses, in particular A and D classes.</p> <p>Support the residential focussed parts of the site. Should acknowledge that other non-B Class uses also offer employment and should be encouraged at Cooks Road.</p>	<p>on the site, and the requirements of Policy B.1 in relation to the re-provision of employment floorspace Barbers Road West has been identified as an Employment-focussed location. Other A and D classes may be considered in proposals in addition to B class floorspace.</p> <p>The SPD already states that some ancillary B1b, B1c, A or D class floorspace may be acceptable.</p>	No change.
		Page 24, Table 2	Table highlights potential compatibility issues between residential and some employment generating uses. Welcome the recognition of design implications of employment on lower floors or in standalone blocks. Table should be updated to reflect Cook's Road permission.	Support welcomed. Table 2 is a guide to generally appropriate employment typologies and is not intended to reflect permissions.	No change.
		Page 24	Some explanation of LLDCs stance should a lack of demand for employment floorspace be identified away from the local centre. To avoid vacancies a flexible range of uses should be identified, including A and D classes.	The Legacy Corporation's evidence suggests that there is demand for employment floorspace within the area. Only B1a uses need to be located in the Local Centre, and given the size of the site, it is not anticipated that demand will fall away as distance from the local centre increases.	No change.
		Page 26	SPD considers medium densities to be appropriate, however given the scale of housing need across London this should be flexibly applied to the area as a whole not just the local centre.	The site allocation sets out that medium-density development is appropriate for the site. The SPD reflects this adopted policy position.	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>Family housing as an objective is considered more onerous than the wording of SA4.3 that states a 'significant proportion'. The section should highlight the appropriateness of this by parcel of land, with context considered. For Cook's Road the relationship with the OIL should be a consideration. Agree that family housing is unlikely to be appropriate at Barbers Road.</p> <p>Guidance in relation to affordable housing should reflect policy that viability will be a consideration, which is particularly important at this site where contamination and flooding are factors. Should also reflect the Mayor's draft Housing and Viability SPG.</p> <p>East-west street housing typologies are too prescriptive so more flexibility should be applied.</p> <p>Section relating to the OIL refers to residential amenity, this should reference residential amenity within the OIL and on the surrounding land parcels.</p> <p>Transitional uses along Cook's Road need to reflect delivery timing as the text currently reflects the OIL being delivered first.</p>	<p>Policy H.1 sets out how housing delivery should relate to a 'balanced mix' which is interpreted as 33/33/33. The significant proportion of family housing at 35% is therefore appropriate, being above the balance. This is not therefore considered more onerous. It is considered that the SPD does already highlight where parcels of land should deliver family housing.</p> <p>The current text reflects the adopted policy position within Policy H.2. Reference can be introduced to the Mayor's draft Housing and Viability SPG.</p> <p>The SPD is a guide, and is no more prescriptive for the east-west street than other parcels.</p> <p>The wording within this section will be amended to confirm that this is referring primarily to future residents' amenity requirements within an employment designated site.</p> <p>The text does not indicate that the OIL would need to be delivered first. The phasing identified within</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Amend to include reference to the Mayor's draft Housing and Viability SPG.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Amend to state that the section is referring primarily to future residents' amenity requirements within an employment designated site.</p> <p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				Map 13 shows parts of Cook's Road first followed by the northern part of that site and the OIL along similar timescales. Amendments to this phasing strategy are also shown on page 47.	
		Page 29	Support taking cues from the past in line with the NPPF. The design approach within the OIL which sets out large expanses of glazing, louvers and metal is too prescriptive. Should encourage the Cook's Road to be more active.	The form of development identified for the OIL has been identified to reflect the form of development expected within the OIL, i.e. primarily employment of a larger grain. The SPD is a guide, and is no more prescriptive for the east-west street than other parcels.	No change.
		Page 30	Support the aspiration for a variety in building heights, however 21m is too onerous.  Welcome the map identifying Barbers Road with potential for some higher elements, but there should be greater flexibility considered stacked employment is suggested. Impact of height on open space noted, however SPD should specify where these areas are. Should state that buildings over 21m should be used for wayfinding and where design quality is demonstrated.	The 21m threshold comes directly from the Pudding Mill site allocation within the adopted Local Plan.  Support welcomed. Map 10 on page 33 identifies potential locations for open space. Policy BN.10 already sets out a number of criteria and considerations in relation to proposals for tall buildings and how these should be considered.	No change.  No change.
		Page 31	Welcome guidance on built form; however do not support reference to avoidance of podium developments. Large podiums are tried and tested, particularly for mixed use developments, and lack of support for these typologies could hinder delivery so should be removed.	The guidance is primarily suggesting that the grain should be fine. It is considered that the fine grain will prevent 'large' podium developments coming forward, therefore the wording	Amend wording to clarify the wording in relation to fine grain and podium developments.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				can be amended to clarify.	
		Page 33	Should consider the financial costs of high sustainability standards. Guidance states connection to an extended heat network is required; but should specify timescales and delivery mechanisms. Consideration of a Pudding Mill network should also reflect delivery timings of land parcels and also should not preclude individual boilers due to viability impacts.	The approach sets out within this section follows that within Policy S.3 of the Local Plan. Neither the policy nor the SPD precludes individual boilers; however proposals should consider all other options, including heat networks ahead of this.	No change.
		Page 41	Guidance covers odours from the waste site but should also cover how LLDC can assist in removing this obstacle. Design of the masterplan should not be dictated by this use as it will be removed. Consider that appropriate mitigation/phasing could be utilised with legal agreements to ensure long term aspirations are not compromised.  Comments on screening and re-alignment of Barbers Road also apply to this section.	Chapter 9 sets out further detail in relation to the re-location of the waste site and the Legacy Corporation's role in facilitating this change. It is not considered necessary to repeat this within this section.  The wording within this section shows flexibility in relation to the option for re-alignment of Barbers Road.	No change.  No change.
		Page 45	Guidance should further address Barbers Road due to the challenging context. Welcome the flexibility in relation to the realignment of the road.  Guidance for western side of Cook's Road encourages active frontages so facade design section should be adjusted to reflect this.	The SPD covers the potential re-alignment of Barbers Road in a number of sections and this section reflects the potential impacts on the street design and guidance. No further details were provided on what should additionally be included.  The guidance does reflect the fact that active uses may be positioned on the western side of Cooks Road.	No change.  No change.
		Page 48	Should have clear definitions of the three phases.	Map 13 currently places parts of	Amend map to provide



No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>LLDC encourages interim uses which are supported provided does not delay delivery of permanent uses.</p> <p>Should also take account views in relation to the waste transfer station and compatibility of uses within this section.</p>	<p>the site within three phases. No timescale are currently attributed to this; however those within Phase 1 are parts of the site with planning permission, or shortly to receive planning permission, so are expected to commence within the first three years. The parts of the site within Phase 3 relate to the outline permission phased from 2022-2031. As highlighted within the text the transformation is expected to happen primarily over the next 10 years ie 2017-2027. These details can be drawn together to show some additional definition.</p> <p>The encouragement of interim uses is in the context of Policy B.3 which seeks to ensure these circumstances for interim uses.</p> <p>Noted. Page 48 provides detailed guidance in relation to the waste transfer site and appropriate measures in relation to its relocation.</p>	<p>some phasing year indications.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
		Page 51 & 52	<p>Guidance should reference the CIL Regulation 122 and NPPF paragraph 204.</p> <p>Mention of widening of Cooks Road should be</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary to reference the CIL Regulation or the NPPF directly as these are over-riding considerations which have already been taken into account.</p> <p>The detail of the project to widen</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>investigated in relation to land ownership, ground levels and physical space.</p> <p>Note the assumed development costs which could be appropriate provided proposals are not overly burdened by such obligations or stalled by this.</p>	<p>Cooks Road bridge will be progressed at an appropriate point in the development of the area.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	No change.
		Page 52	<p>Welcome encouragement of pre-application discussions but could be enhanced by encouraging that applicants engage with the Quality Review Panel at an early stage.</p> <p>Mention of viability reviews where there is a departure from affordable housing targets or other policy requirements noted, but could also mention Mayor's emerging Affordable Housing and Viability SPD.</p>	<p>The views of the Quality Review Panel will be sought on applications of relevance. This can be referred to within the SPD.</p> <p>The viability assessment section will be updated to reflect the draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPG.</p>	<p>Amend to include reference to consultation with the Quality Review Panel.</p> <p>Amend viability assessment information to reflect the draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPG.</p>
		Appendix A, Page 53-54	Inclusion of the Employment Space Typologies from the LLDC's Employment Space Study 2015, appropriate.	Noted.	No change.
		Whole document	Welcome further guidance for Pudding Mill area, officers should consider response made.	Noted.	No change.
021	Chris Gascoigne, DP9 on behalf of London Square	Whole document	Response relates principally to the approach within the Other Industrial Location, which includes client's land at Vulcan's Wharf. The client's intention is to bring forward a proposal for the OIL in partnership with the other landowners, providing a balance of employment-generating and residential uses.	Noted.	No change.
		Page 22	Section states that at least 7,000sqm of employment floorspace is required for replacement in the OIL. This approach should be extended to allow a development which delivers an increase in job densities within B use classes in accordance	Policy B.1 sets out how proposals within the OIL should provide equivalent use, in density and floorspace, maintaining the existing balance of uses within	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			with Policy B.1 (5b).	Table 2. In relation to new uses within the OIL, Policy B.1 (5) (a) is relevant which also states that B2/B8 uses should be maintained and/or re-provided. Therefore it is not appropriate to amend the wording to state that job density will be a consideration within this location. Where any proposal within the area proposes a loss of employment floorspace the policy test within policy B 1 (5) will be applied.	
		Page 27	<p>OIL section states that the introduction of new residential uses should be minor. This terminology is inconsistent with Table 2 of the Local Plan which states that the OIL can include “an element of residential, providing a transition to the lower employment mix of uses within the remainder of Pudding Mill” and para 4.13 which states that “where identified within Table 2, residential will be appropriate when the employment-generating potential and industrial capacity are not compromised and amenity and servicing issues have been addressed”.</p> <p>Reference to “minor” would constrain development options so should be deleted.</p>	The wording within the Other Industrial Location section is intended to confirm that the OIL is a designated employment site and therefore the re-provision of employment floorspace is the primary consideration. Where there is potential for new uses, such as residential to be introduced these should be subsidiary to the primary employment use, ensuring that the industrial capacity and residential amenity are maintained. It is however accepted that the use of the term ‘minor’ may not adequately reflect this, therefore this section will be amended to confirm the above.	Amend wording to remove reference to ‘minor’ residential to confirm that the primary role of the OIL is employment, with some potential for residential subject to industrial capacity and acceptable residential amenity.
		Map 9, page 30	Including “up to and around 21 metres” for the OIL is unnecessarily prescriptive and a constraint on options. Site allocation identifies that proposals above the 21m will be considered against Policy	The text on page 31 of the SPD provides further guidance in relation to building heights within the OIL and other parts of the	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>BN.10. Also note the SPD objective for there to be “variation in scale, height and massing to create a distinctive and interesting townscape”. This threatens an objective assessment of proposals against BN.10. The map also lacks contextual analysis of actual building heights on neighbouring sites, particularly on Stratford High Street. Map should be removed or labelled as indicative.</p>	<p>SPD area. 21m is the generally expected building height identified within the site allocation and Table 10 of the Local Plan. Any proposals for over this threshold will be subject to the policy tests within BN.10, as confirmed within page 30 of the SPD. There is nothing in the SPD which is more prescriptive than that already set out within the Local Plan policy.</p>	
024	Adrian Toolan, Network Rail	Whole document	<p>Concern is continued safeguarding of the rail sites and that future development of the area does not operate on the operational rail use. Land is currently leased to United Asphalt and Brett Concrete Limited who have voiced concerns about impacts of development.</p> <p>Bow Midland East is a strategic rail freight site which can only be varied with the agreement of the Freight Operating Company (FOC). It is one of a number of sites which are in shortage across London that provide the construction industry with raw materials. Rail transport removes vehicles from congested roads and cuts vehicle emissions by doing so.</p> <p>Rail continues to transport large volumes of construction materials (circa 40% of all raw construction materials), supermarket goods, mail and waste on a regular basis.</p> <p>Remind LLDC that the land is safeguarded in London and Local Plans as strategic industrial land with strategic rail head. This should be continued with future proposals giving full consideration to</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The site is safeguarded within the London Plan and the Local Plan. This is also reflected within the site allocation. The SPD</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			this. Should not inhibit ability to use freight to full potential and no restrictive conditions are placed on the site. Confirm support of representations made on behalf of United Asphalt and Brett Concrete Limited.	provides guidance in relation to the interpretation of these policies within the site and is in accordance with the approach of the Local Plan.	
026	Tim Neale, Transport for London	Whole document	Views relate to planning officers and do not relate to Mayoral decisions. May not be GLA view and a separate response submitted on behalf of TfL as a landowner.	Noted.	No change.
		Whole document, Chapter 4	TfL happy to give advice in relation to any responses relating to transport or connectivity matters. Mapping should be stated as indicative and may be other connectivity routes across site.	Noted.	No change.
		Whole document	On-going discussions between LLDC and TfL in relation to highway proposals which need to continue. A further response from TfL may be required to update the text.	TfL have been given the opportunity to comment upon revised wording and provided some additional comments.	Amend the document to correct mapping on page 14 and update CED timescales on page 5.
		Whole document	There are some inconsistencies relating to the nature of new bridge at Marshgate Lane and the Stratford High Street junction. SPD should confirm that bridge is for buses, cyclists and pedestrians and junction may not be all movements.	The SPD will be reviewed to remove inconsistencies in relation to the Marshgate Lane bridge and the Stratford High Street junction.	Amend document to remove inconsistencies in the connectivity and delivery and implementation sections.
		Page 4	Pudding Mill Lane DLR station	Noted.	Correction.
		Page 9, Map 4	Suggest change "Proposed Vehicular Access" to "Bus / pedestrian / cycle bridge" in key	Key can be amended to clarify as suggested.	Amend key to Map 4 to show proposed bus/pedestrian/cycle bridge.
		Page 11	Bow Vision proposals improving connectivity and the pedestrian and roadside environment within the area, including removal of the flyover.	Amendments can be made to clarify.	Amend page 11 in relation to reference to Bow Vision.
		Page 12	Should remove "The programme for the twin tracking of the DLR in this area is continuing and this will enable more frequent trains to serve the site" and change to "Replacement and expansion of	Amendments can be made to clarify.	Amend page 12 in relation to DLR double-tracking.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<u>the DLR train fleet will allow longer &amp; higher-capacity trains to operate on this line. Double tracking remains a long-term aspiration to enable more frequent trains.</u>		
		Page 12	Change "A new bus route is also proposed to run from" to "The enhanced connectivity would allow a bus route to run from.."	Amendments can be made to clarify.	Amend page 12 in relation to bus route amendments.
		Page 14	Alter text bullet point 5 to "Junction Improvements on Stratford High Street" and change map key text to "Junction improvements" as the junctions may not be all-movement and various bridge, contraflow options will be explored through Bow Vision.	Amendments can be made to clarify.	Amend page 14 in relation to Stratford High Street Junction improvements.
		Page 19, Map 8	Map has no legend but should show DLR double tracking safeguarding	It is considered that including the DLR twin-tracking on the map will detract from the aims, however a note will be added confirming the location of DLR double-tracking.	Add note relating to double-tracking to Map 8.
		Page 28	Should add "Units facing the railway lines will need to be designed to reduce noise from the railway" to the Barbers Road section.	Text can be amended in relation to the noise impacts of the railway line and design.	Amend text in relation to design responses to the noise from the railway line.
		Page 30	Should add following to the façade design section after residential balconies: "Facades facing the railway lines will need to be designed to reduce noise and also to avoid the risk of items falling from balconies or opening windows onto railway infrastructure"	Text can be amended in relation to impacts of the railway infrastructure on design.	Amend text in relation to design responses to the railway infrastructure.
		Page 33, Map 10	Any new play space adjacent to the station should be contained to have regard to the operation of the station and safety.	All new playspace will be expected to meet appropriate standards, and be designed appropriately to its location.	Amend text on page 35 in relation to the playspace being designed appropriately for its location.
		Page 35	Not as much detail on public realm as the BBB SPD. Should add sentence relating to on-going engagement with Newham and TfL.	There is more detail in relation to public realm within the Bromley-by-Bow SPD as proposals within	Amend to reference engagement with LB Newham and TfL in the

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				this area have been developed by the Masterplan produced by the consortium of developers. The SPD then comments upon how the broad principles meet the policy requirements, and therefore more detail is provided. Clarity can be provided in relation to future engagement with LB Newham and TfL more generally within the delivery and implementation chapter.	delivery and implementation chapter.
		Page 36	Welcome reference to Legible London signage but should delete reference to combining with other street furniture.	The reference to combining wayfinding with street furniture will be removed; however the principle of combining different forms of street furniture remains so will be moved to the street furniture section.	Remove reference to combining wayfinding with street furniture and amend within the street furniture section.
		Page 41	Should reference the need to safeguard for double tracking to section relating to realigning Barbers Road	A new paragraph will be added to confirm the relationship with the DLR double-tracking. Consideration will also be given to where else within the document this is required.	Add a paragraph in relation to DLR double-tracking.
		Page 43	Should amend route to highway and reference 'two way running' along Marshgate Lane.	Text can be amended as suggested in relation to the highway and two way running	Amend text as suggested.
		Page 49	Other requirements should reference DLR double tracking.	Reference to DLR double tracking can be made within this section.	Amend section to reference DLR double-tracking.
		Page 51	Some inconsistencies in relation to projects including on-going discussions about Bow Vision, including how work is taken forward and funded. The infrastructure funding section may therefore	Suggested amendments are considered appropriate.	Amend to reflect suggested text.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>need to be reviewed before adoption. Wording should be amended as:</p> <p>The Legacy Corporation will also continue to work <u>in partnership with TfL and Newham Council</u> to consider sources of funding, project delivery mechanisms and timing of delivery.</p> <p><del>All movements junction</del> <u>Junction improvements</u> at Stratford High Street gaining access to the new bridge at Marshgate Lane.</p> <p>Delivery of these projects will involve work between developers and the Legacy Corporation, and TfL <u>and Newham Council</u> in relation to the bridges and junctions.</p>		
		Whole document	TfL has a key role in the delivery of several projects across the area and wish to continue to work closely in developing proposals and aligning currently thinking on infrastructure projects.	Noted.	No change.
027	John Lett, GLA	Whole document	All plan documents need to be in general conformity with the London Plan. GLA is content that SPDs promote growth and balance other policy considerations.	Noted.	No change.
		Whole document	<p>As SPDs propose release of industrial land LLDC needs to ensure the scale is in accordance with Local Plan and does not compromise retention of other industrial land within LLDC or boroughs.</p> <p>TfL detailed comments attached.</p>	The Legacy Corporation is content that the content of the SPDs is in accordance with the approach set out within the Local Plan and the London Plan.	No change.
		Page 38	The emphasis on sustainable drainage within the Pudding Mill SPD, should reflect the preference for direct discharge of rainwater into the adjoining watercourses, rather than applying detention or delay for anything other than rainwater harvesting	Preference for rainwater discharge into watercourses in first instance will be reflected within the SPD.	Amend SUDS section to reflect preference for rainwater discharge into watercourses in first instance.



No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			purposes.		
		Whole document,	Views relate to planning officers and do not relate to Mayoral decisions. May not be GLA view and a separate response submitted on behalf of TfL as a landowner.	Noted.	No change.
		Whole document, Chapter 4	TfL happy to give advice in relation to any responses relating to transport or connectivity matters. Mapping should be stated as indicative and may be other connectivity routes across site.	Noted.	No change.
		Whole document	On-going discussions between LLDC and TfL in relation to highway proposals which need to continue. A further response from TfL may be required to update the text.	TfL have been given the opportunity to comment upon revised wording and provided some additional comments.	Amend the document to correct mapping on page 14 and update CED timescales on page 5.
		Whole document	There are some inconsistencies relating to the nature of new bridge at Marshgate Lane and the Stratford High Street junction. SPD should confirm that bridge is for buses, cyclists and pedestrians and junction may not be all movements.	The SPD will be reviewed to remove inconsistencies in relation to the Marshgate Lane bridge and the Stratford High Street junction.	Amend document to remove inconsistencies in the connectivity and delivery and implementation sections.
		Page 4	Putty Mill Lane DLR station	Noted.	Correction.
		Page 9, Map 4	Suggest change "Proposed Vehicular Access" to "Bus / pedestrian / cycle bridge" in key	Key can be amended to clarify as suggested.	Amend key to Map 4 to show proposed bus/pedestrian/cycle bridge.
		Page 11	Bow Vision proposals improving connectivity and the pedestrian and roadside environment within the area, including removal of the flyover.	Amendments can be made to clarify.	Amend page 11 in relation to reference to Bow Vision.
		Page 12	Should remove "The programme for the twin tracking of the DLR in this area is continuing and this will enable more frequent trains to serve the site" and change to "Replacement and expansion of the DLR train fleet will allow longer & higher-capacity trains to operate on this line. Double tracking remains a long-term aspiration to enable more frequent trains."	Amendments can be made to clarify.	Amend page 12 in relation to DLR double-tracking.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
		Page 12	Change "A new bus route is also proposed to run from" to "The enhanced connectivity would allow a bus route to run from.."	Amendments can be made to clarify.	Amend page 12 in relation to bus route amendments.
		Page 14	Alter text bullet point 5 to "Junction Improvements on Stratford High Street" and change map key text to "Junction improvements" as the junctions may not be all-movement and various bridge, contraflow options will be explored through Bow Vision.	Amendments can be made to clarify.	Amend page 14 in relation to Stratford High Street Junction improvements.
		Page 19, Map 8	Map has no legend but should show DLR double tracking safeguarding	It is considered that including the DLR twin-tracking on the map will detract from the aims, however a note will be added confirming the location of DLR double-tracking.	Add note relating to double-tracking to Map 8.
		Page 28	Should "Units facing the railway lines will need to be designed to reduce noise from the railway" to the Barbers Road section.	Text can be amended in relation to the noise impacts of the railway line and design.	Amend text in relation to design responses to the noise from the railway line.
		Page 30	Should add following to the façade design section after residential balconies: "Facades facing the railway lines will need to be designed to reduce noise and also to avoid the risk of items falling from balconies or opening windows onto railway infrastructure"	Text can be amended in relation to the noise impacts of the railway line and design.	Amend text in relation to design responses to the noise from the railway line.
		Page 33, Map 10	Any new play space adjacent to the station should be contained to have regard to the operation of the station and safety.	All new playspace will be expected to meet appropriate standards, and be designed appropriately to its location.	Amend text on page 35 in relation to the playspace being design appropriately for its location.
		Page 35	Not as much detail on public realm as the BBB SPD. Should add sentence relating to on-going engagement with Newham and TfL.	There is more detail in relation to public realm within the Bromley-by-Bow SPD as proposals within this area have been developed by the Masterplan produced by the consortium of developers. The SPD then comments upon how	Amend to reference engagement with LB Newham and TfL in the delivery and implementation section.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				the broad principles meet the policy requirements, and therefore more detail is provided. Clarity can be provided in relation to future engagement with LB Newham and TfL regarding public realm principles within applications.	
		Page 36	Welcome reference to Legible London signage but should delete reference to combining with other street furniture.	The reference to combining wayfinding with street furniture will be removed; however the principle of combining different forms of street furniture remains so will be moved to the street furniture section.	Remove reference to combining wayfinding with street furniture and amend within the street furniture section.
		Page 41	Should reference the need to safeguard for double tracking to section relating to realigning Barbers Road	A new paragraph will be added to confirm the relationship with the DLR double-tracking. Consideration will also be given to where else within the document this is required.	Add a paragraph in relation to DLR double-tracking.
		Page 43	Should amend route to highway and reference 'two way running' along Marshgate Lane.	Text can be amended as suggested in relation to the highway and two way running	Amend text as suggested.
		Page 49	Other requirements should reference DLR double tracking.	Reference to DLR double tracking can be made within this section.	Amend section to reference DLR double-tracking.
		Page 51	Some inconsistencies in relation to projects including on-going discussions about Bow Vision, including how work is taken forward and funded. The infrastructure funding section may therefore need to be reviewed before adoption. Wording should be amended as:  The Legacy Corporation will also continue to work	Suggested amendments are considered appropriate.	Amend to reflect suggested text.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p><u>in partnership with TfL and Newham Council</u> to consider sources of funding, project delivery mechanisms and timing of delivery.</p> <p><del>All movements junction</del> <u>Junction improvements</u> at Stratford High Street gaining access to the new bridge at Marshgate Lane.</p> <p>Delivery of these projects will involve work between developers and the Legacy Corporation, and TfL <u>and Newham Council</u> in relation to the bridges and junctions.</p>		
		Whole document	TfL has a key role in the delivery of several projects across the area and wish to continue to work closely in developing proposals and aligning currently thinking on infrastructure projects.	Noted.	No change.
028	Polly Barker, TfL Property (additional comment)	Page 21, Map 8	The ground floor area of the DLR station has the potential for some commercial uses to contribute to the delivery of non-residential floor space.	New non-residential floorspace on the ground floor of the DLR station can contribute to the development of the Local Centre. As a result of other representations made Map 8 will be amended to show some guidance for potential uses for parts of the site currently not shown.	Amend Map 8 to show potential uses for parts of the site currently not showing landuse.
029	Laura Jenkinson, GVA on behalf of Workspace Group	Whole document	Responding on behalf of Workspace Group, whose principal interest is in land at Marshgate Lane. There is a resolution to grant permission on this site, once granted will deliver 4,300sqm new business centre, 247 new flats and 7 townhouses. Note that LLDC is aware of the difficulties in bringing the site forward. Workspace is committed to doing so, subject to securing a delivery partner. Comments have particularly been prepared with delivery in mind.	Noted.	No change.
		Whole	Client broadly supports content of SPD with	Support noted.	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
		document	revisions necessary to comply with Regulations to ensure is appropriately flexible and that does not contain new policy. Providing detailed comments in relation to infrastructure delivery, employment, building heights and design guidance		
		Whole document	The Regulations, NPPF and NPPG provide detail and guidance in relation to SPD preparation, and a number of amendments are required to ensure these are adhered to. Should also refer to these documents in the SPD, in particular within the introduction and Planning Policy Context sections.	See below. The Planning Policy Context section is considered adequate with regard to setting out the role of SPDs. However to further clarify reference can be made to the fact that further information is provided within the Regulations, the NPPF and NPPG.	Insert references to the Regulations, NPPF and NPPG to Planning Policy Context section.
		Whole document	There are a number of references to infrastructure priorities not always clear whether proposed via S106, CIL or non-monetary S106 means. May be some conflicts with planning policies, so suggest also reviewing the SPD to ensure no conflict with CIL Schedule, IDP and Planning Obligations SPD.	There are no specific items on the Legacy Corporations 123 list within the Pudding Mill area. Playspace however in general will be funded through CIL so this will be referenced within SPD to make clear. Amendments can also be made to enhance clarity.	Amend the Infrastructure Funding section to ensure greater clarity regarding the role of CIL and S106 funding.
		Whole document	<p>Policy B.1 tests are referred to a number of times within the SPD. Should be reviewed to ensure correctly refers to the flexibility within the tests, depending on existing and proposed use, site allocation and the number of jobs generated.</p> <p>For the Marshgate scheme with a resolution to grant, this proposes a loss of employment as much of the site was vacant and only a small number of jobs were provided on site. This was considered to meet the Policy B.1 tests due to the considerable uplift in jobs. The SPD loses the policy nuances</p>	The SPD is reflecting the base position of Policy B.1 whereby B2/B8 uses should be maintained or re-provided; and B.1 uses should be maintained or re-provided, or job densities increased. Any proposal which does not follow this approach will be subject to the tests within Policy B.1. It is not considered necessary to repeat the circumstances where flexibility	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>which appears to interpret policy more stringently and therefore should be reviewed.</p> <p>Also note references to 'employment' and 'non-residential' floorspace, where these are referenced these should be done so in context of the site allocation requirement for 25% non-residential floorspace cumulatively across Pudding Mill.</p>	<p>may be appropriate, which will be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Section 6a deals primarily with delivery of non-residential floorspace in general, highlighting potential locations where the non-residential floorspace should be primarily B class employment. The SPD is clear that the Local Centre and the east-west street should focus on a wider range of non-residential uses, and B class employment should be provided at the OIL and Barbers Road West. Alongside the 'residential-focussed locations' this strategy is expected to deliver the 25% non-residential floorspace set out within the Site Allocation.</p>	No change.
		Whole document	SPD typically refers to BN.10 which relates to heights on site outside the Local Centre. Should make some amendments to create a consistent approach across the SPD area in relation to heights.	The site allocation sets out a consistent approach in relation to heights across the area at a 'generally expected' 21m level, which is referenced within the SPD. In accordance with the policy the Local Centre is reflected as a location where some higher elements may be acceptable.	No change.
		Whole document	SPD provides detailed design guidance, but should acknowledge that this is indicative, and is not the only way development can be achieved.	The whole of the SPD is guidance and is not considered to be prescriptive. However as indicated below it is acknowledged that the	Amend text to Townscape and Public Realm section to include an introduction.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				Townscape and Public Realm section could benefit with an introduction, to reference that proposals should be of high quality.	
		Page 3, Paragraph 2	<p>Should include explanation of the weight given to SPDs, referencing the Regulations, NPPF and NPPG. Should include wording stating that although the document provides detailed design guidance it is not intended to be prescriptive and that site specific proposals will be considered against adopted policy and overall planning merits.</p> <p>This should enable SPD to be correctly applied and gives due flexibility.</p>	It is not considered necessary to directly reference the legislative and procedural background to the preparation and status of SPD. However, see below in relation to the Planning Policy Context where it is agreed that some additional wording will be inserted here to reference the NPPF and the NPPG.	Insert references to the Regulations, NPPF and NPPG within Planning Policy Context section.
		Page 4, Purpose of the SPD	Generally support these bullet points, but should expand the final bullet to ensure in line with NPPF which states SPDs should be used where aids applicants in making successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery, and not financial burdens. Therefore should identify new or improved infrastructure necessary to support development within Pudding Mill, as set out in the CIL Charging Schedule, Planning Obligations SPD and IDP.	The Purpose of the SPD sets out the high level aims of the document and therefore the level of detail suggested in relation to reference to the CIL Charging Schedule, Planning Obligations SPD and IDP is not necessary.	No change.
		Page 5, paragraph 3	<p>Welcome inclusion of existing consents in the area including the resolution to grant at Marshgate Lane. However following paragraph states that this relates to re-provision of approximately 56% of employment floorspace and that future proposals should continue to re-provide employment floorspace to provide the policy aspiration of re-provision subject to B.1, SA4.3 and SPD guidance.</p> <p>Guidance incorrectly interprets SA4.3 which states that cumulative across the site 25% of floorspace</p>	Policy B.1 requires that B2/B8 uses should be maintained or re-provided; and B.1 uses should be maintained or re-provided, or job densities increased. The SPD is reflecting this position in relation to the amount of existing employment floorspace which is largely within B2/B8 use. As highlighted above, this is the base position, and any proposal not	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>should be non-residential with a predominantly employment mix to the west of the site- and does not require that all floorspace is re-provided. Policy B.1 sets out flexibility in terms of the re-provision of employment floorspace, depending on the existing and proposed use, site allocation and the jobs being generated.</p> <p>Therefore text should be amended to ensure it does not misinterpret adopted policy and that it is in accordance with the Regulations.</p>	<p>meeting this policy requirement will need to go through the tests within policy B.1.</p> <p>The text within this section is merely a statement of fact in relation to current consents and the policy considerations for proposals within the site.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>Page 5, paragraph 6</p>	<p>Evidence base of the 56% of employment floorspace is not provided. Only reference to existing employment floorspace by square metres is in the Land Use and Design Framework, 2014 which underpins the 25% policy. This in turn references the Employment Land Review, 2014, which highlights 7,000sqm of land that is least suited to residential uses. This is the land identified as the OIL. It proposes that the remainder of the site can provide non-residential development across 25% of the buildings.</p> <p>Reoccupation and development of sites on this basis should provide 17,500sqm of B1 and B2 (suitable for residential adjacency) uses, and 3,000 sqm of current B2 floorspace suitable for residential adjacency.</p>	<p>The Pudding Mill Land Use and Design Framework and the Employment Land Review were conducted by the same consultants whom as a result have a wealth of data behind these studies. The floorspace information relates to their work. Table 1 can be amended to confirm that this figure does not sit directly within the study but the data behind this.</p> <p>There are two policy considerations in relation to this: re-provision of employment floorspace required by Policy B.1, and provision of 25% non-residential floorspace across the whole of the site allocation. The SPD provides guidance in relation to how this can be provided through employment, non-</p>	<p>Amend note to Table 1 to highlight the source of the information.</p> <p>No change.</p>



No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>Should delete text relating to replacement of 56% employment floorspace. Should amend text as suggested:</p> <p><del>In policy terms this relates to replacement of approximately 56% of existing employment floorspace. Therefore</del> Future proposals within the site should continue to provide employment floorspace to meet the overall <u>indicative</u> policy requirement of <u>25% cumulative non-residential floorspace, including where appropriate the</u> re-provision of employment floorspace subject to considerations identified within Policy B.1, Site Allocation SA4.3 and guidance within this SPD.</p>	<p>residential and residential-focussed areas within the site.</p> <p>Reference to the proportion of the existing floorspace to be re-provided through the permissions granted is a statement of fact. However the wording will be amended to confirm this. The 25% non-residential is required by policy within SA4.3, however the wording can be amended to better reflect the wording of this by insertion 'cumulative' floorspace.</p>	<p>Amend introduction to 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph to confirm that the 56% is a factual statement and insert 'cumulative' floorspace to better reflect the wording of SA4.3.</p>
		Map 4, Pages 9 and 10	<p>Noted text refers to contributions towards housing and infrastructure delivery. Should reference the CIL Charging Schedule, Planning Obligations SPD and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to ensure consistency.</p> <p>Should state diagram is indicative and further assessment of site specific opportunities and constraints will be required on a site by site basis.</p>	<p>This diagram sets out the development context with regard to the opportunities and constraints. Detailed information on funding and delivery is provided in Chapter 9: Delivery and Implementation. Therefore additional reference to the Charging Schedule, Planning Obligations SPD and the IDP is not required here.</p> <p>This diagram sets out the factual context to the site and does not form any part of any proposal; therefore it is not necessary to state that the map is indicative. It is however correct that further</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Include text stating that there may be other site-specific opportunities and constraints which should be assessed within any proposal.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				assessment of site specific opportunities and constraints will be required on a site by site basis, therefore this will be added to the text to state that these constraints and opportunities are not exhaustive.	
		Page 11	Bullet 7 relates to building heights. In accordance with the Regulations, NPPF and PPG, the SPD should provide further guidance and should not restrict development or be a development management tool. Should amend to “generally need to be lower” and further wording in relation to the need for detailed site by site analysis to review the capacity for height, including assessment against BN.10 criteria.	This section is again setting out the context and is not intended to set out what will be required of developers on a site by site basis. This guidance in relation to height is provided within Chapter 7. However the text will be amended to ensure that this is not misinterpreted to ensure this information is purely contextual.	Seventh bullet point will be amended to clarify that the due to heights along Stratford High Street the prevention of canyon effects is a key influence on the site.
		Page 15	<p>To better equip officers, Members and others to interpret the guidance the introduction would benefit from explanation of the weight given to SPDs. To ensure flexibility and not constraint development should remove sentence relating to the role of the SPD and replace with references to NPPF, NPPG and Regulations. These should state that SPDs do not form part of the development plan, form new policies, identify areas of significant change or add unnecessary financial burdens. They should be prepared where necessary, provide guidance to build upon the development plan, be used to help make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery.</p> <p>Should remove ‘notwithstanding’ at beginning of second paragraph.</p>	The paragraph is considered adequate with regard to setting out the role of SPDs. However to further clarify reference can be made to the fact that further information is provided within the Regulations, the NPPF and NPPG.	Insert references to the Regulations, NPPF and NPPG within Planning Policy Context section.
		Page 18	Table 1 should be removed as explicit figures on	Table 1 has been included as it	Reword the ‘Applying

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>existing floorspace cannot be found within the Pudding Mill Land Use Design Framework.</p> <p>Should clarify that the 25% non-residential requirement is a cumulative target across the whole of the site.</p> <p>Section misinterprets the site allocation which does not require the re-provision of existing employment floorspace. Policy B.1 tests allow for flexibility on the quantum of replacement floorspace, depending on the existing and proposed use, the site allocation and the number of jobs. Therefore section needs to be redrafted to ensure it provides guidance building upon development plan. This should include reference to cumulative floorspace, removal of the table and reference to quantum of re-provision and inclusion of text to state guidance is indicative and should be assessed on case by case basis.</p>	<p>shows the policy distinction between existing industrial and office uses. However to aid in the usefulness of this table and the interpretation of policy, the table will be amended to further breakdown the existing industrial floorspace into vacant and non-vacant uses. Further clarification regarding the source of the existing floorspace figures can also be provided.</p> <p>It is not intended to replicate all relevant information within these policies, however for the purposes of clarification reference to the requirement relating to cumulative, rather than total, floorspace will be included.</p> <p>One of the main purposes of the SPD is to provide some guidance on the interpretation of Local Plan policies in relation to this site, in particular the site allocation and policy B.1. Although the site allocation does not specifically require the re-provision of employment floorspace, Policy B.1 does specifically require the re-provision of equivalent employment floorspace where the existing use is within B2 or B8 classes. The supporting text to Policy B.1 does indeed set out</p>	<p>Local Plan policies section' and include a breakdown of vacant floorspace within Table 1.</p> <p>Amend text to include 'cumulative'.</p> <p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				<p>where some flexibility in this approach lies, however this will be dealt with on a case by case basis and the policy position remains re-provision. This section will be amended to clarify the nuances of the approach.</p>	
		Table 1, Page 18	<p>The Pudding Mill Land Use and Design Framework does not specifically reference the floorspace information. The SPD should not contain floorspace targets, this would be within the role of a development management policy. Therefore proposals should not be measured against this table.</p> <p>Number of references within the SPD to fact that consents will deliver 56% of existing employment floorspace. Table misinterprets policy approach and should reference cumulative floorspace from site allocation. Policy within Table 1 is more stringent than that set out in Policy B.1 i.e. flexibility on the quantum of replacement floorspace, depending on the existing and proposed use, the site allocation and the number of jobs.</p>	<p>An SPD cannot set new policy and Table 1 does not attempt to do this. As above, this table was included to provide some information on the existing uses on the site and policy distinctions between existing uses.</p> <p>It is currently entitled 'Existing employment and infrastructure floorspace' therefore it is not intended that proposals be measured against this table. However a note will be added to the table to confirm this.</p>	Add table note to confirm that the table is indicative and proposals will not be judged against the table.
		Map 8, Pages 19-20	<p>It is not the purpose of an SPD to set specific floorspace targets, this can only be done through development management policies.</p> <p>Should amend title and paragraph to show that the land uses are indicative. Some additional text should also be included to state that this is only one representation of delivery and will be assessed against adopted plan policies and planning merits.</p>	<p>The land uses identified on Map 8 stem directly from the site allocation and other adopted policies. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Centre- "a new Local Centre adjacent to Pudding Mill Lane DLR Station and Pudding Mill Lane"; Policy B.2</li> <li>• East West Street- "Non-residential uses should be</li> </ul>	Include reference within the text to highlight that the delineations stem from the policy requirements within the site allocation and notably Policy B.1. Include reference to the flexibility.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				<p>focused along a new central east-west street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barbers Road West- “Regard will need to be had to not prejudicing the operation of the safeguarded rail freight site to the west (for example by ensuring that noise sensitive uses are located away from the site).”</li> <li>• OIL- “a predominantly industrial floorspace use mix in the area to the west of Cooks Road and around the Crossrail portal”; Policy B.1</li> </ul> <p>The guidance within the SPD does recognise that there is some flexibility in how this could be achieved, for example, page 23 in relation to Cook’s Road. However a note can also be added to confirm that delineations stem from policy and guidance is provided in relation to flexibility in achieving the vision.</p>	
		Page 21	Text within 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraphs should be updated to ensure meets requirements of the NPPF, NPPG and Regulations i.e. that SPDs do not form part of the development plan, form new policies, identify areas of significant change or add unnecessary financial burdens. They should be prepared where necessary, provide guidance to build upon the development plan, be used to help make successful applications or aid infrastructure	The wording states that sites should contribute towards delivery of non-residential floorspace in accordance with the policies of the plan and location within the site, therefore there is flexibility in the wording and it is not necessary to introduce additional wording to highlight the differing	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>delivery.</p> <p>Should amend the section to state that proposals should contribute towards the re-provision of employment floorspace “where appropriate”, reference the site allocation regarding the ‘cumulative’ requirement, amend reference from policy “requirement” to “target”, references from ‘should’ to ‘may’ in relation to focusses of non-residential, and that the uses on the map are ‘indicative’.</p> <p>Text within ‘non-residential focussed locations’ section should be updated to ensure it meets guidance and legislation to not constrain development and be consistent with the Local Plan. In particular should review site by site provision of local centre uses over the plan period.</p>	<p>circumstances.</p> <p>To ensure consistency with the wording of the site allocation reference will be made to the cumulative requirement across the site allocation. Policies within the Adopted Local Plan require particular uses to be focussed within particular locations (i.e. Local Centre, OIL) therefore it is appropriate to reference this within the paragraph.</p> <p>The London Plan sets the maximum retail and service floorspace figures. The suggested text would cloud this non-negotiable requirement so will not be included.</p>	<p>Include reference to the ‘cumulative’ requirement for 25% non-residential floorspace.</p> <p>No change.</p>
		Page 22	<p>Source of the 56% floorspace figures within the current position section has not been identified. Re-provision of employment floorspace assumption does not reflect the flexibility within Policy B.1 or the cumulative 25% requirement within the site allocation. As above needs amending to reflect the guidance and legislation.</p> <p>Should amend the section to state that it may be appropriate to re-provide this floorspace, subject to a site by site assessment against B.1. Should also reference that the figures are indicative.</p>	<p>The source of the 56% figure will be identified with a link to Table 1. Policy B.1 does specifically require the re-provision of equivalent employment floorspace where the existing use is within B2 or B8 classes, and a job density approach can also be applied where the existing use is within B1. The supporting text to Policy B.1 does indeed set out where some flexibility in this approach lies, however this will be dealt with on a case by case basis and the policy position remains re-provision. However, the</p>	<p>Amend first paragraph to reference Table 1 as the source of the floorspace information and to set out that this relates to the current position, rather than policy requirements.</p> <p>Amend second paragraph to reflect that the 33,000sqm requirement is approximate. Amend wording to aid clarity.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				wording will be amended to “approximately 33,000sqm” to reflect this. Further amendments will be made to the wording to aid clarity, and other comments made.	
		Page 26	<p>Should amend the delivery principles to ensure it meets guidance and legislation to not constrain development and be consistent with the Local Plan. Should amend to reference that other parts of the site may be suitable for higher densities, subject to the tests within Policy BN.10.</p> <p>Should amend the housing mix section to ensure it meets guidance and legislation to not constrain development and be consistent with the Local Plan. Should remove reference to the 35% as the ‘significant proportion’ of family units.</p> <p>Should amend the residential focussed locations to ensure it meets guidance and legislation to not constrain development and be consistent with the Local Plan. Should remove reference to 35% family housing and replace with significant.</p>	<p>As a town centre the Local Centre has rightly been identified as the location where higher densities may be appropriate, however the wording will be amended to take account of the fact that proposals will be assessed on a case by case basis and to better relate to the wording within the rest of the sections.</p> <p>It is appropriate that ‘significant’ be over 35% as a balanced mix equates to 33.33%.</p> <p>As above.</p>	<p>Amend wording to aid clarity and reference to “..particularly within the Local Centre.”</p> <p>Amend wording to state that the section sets out the appropriate densities within the site, including where higher and lower densities may be most appropriate.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
		Page 29	An introductory sentence should be added to ensure the guidance is not interpreted as overly prescriptive or restrictive. This should state that it is guidance only and is not intended to be	The SPD as a whole is planning policy guidance therefore it is not necessary to repeat this at the beginning of a section relating to	Amend text to include an introduction.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			prescriptive. It should also include text suggesting that proposals should be of high quality meeting the Local Plan tests and be dealt with on a site by site basis.	townscape and public realm. However it is acknowledged that this section could benefit with an introduction, to reference that proposals should be of high quality.	
		Page 30	Should amend the residential focussed locations to ensure it meets guidance and legislation and be consistent with the Local Plan. Should label Map 9 and 'indicative', including within a footnote which also states that teller proposals will be assessed against adopted policies and planning merits.	Map 9 is a representation The accompanying text to Map 9 provides additional explanation of what is required by policy in relation to heights, including the 'generally expected' height of 21m above ground. It also references that any proposal above 21m will be assessed against BN.10. It is considered that this is sufficient, and no amendments are required in relation to the map.	No change.
		Page 33, Map 10	Should amend the text to ensure it meets guidance and legislation and be consistent with the Local Plan. Should label open space map as 'indicative' and include a note to state that proposals considered on site by site basis against adopted policies and planning merits.	Map 10 is a representation of how open space could be provided across the site, with the guidance provided within the accompanying text.	No change.
		Page 34	Should amend the text to ensure it meets guidance and legislation and be consistent with the Local Plan. Should state that Map 10 information is indicative.	The wording already states that Map 10 provides an overview, therefore does not state that this is the only way of providing open space across the site.	No change.
		Page 40, Map 12	Should amend the text to ensure it meets guidance and legislation and be consistent with the Local Plan. Should re-word to ensure guidance is not interpreted as being overly prescriptive or restrictive. Should label waterways map as 'indicative' and include a note to state that	Map 12 shows the different parts of the waterways identified within the text the guidance is provided within the accompanying text.	No change.



No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			proposals considered on site by site basis against adopted policies and planning merits.		
		Page 40	Should amend text to ensure it meets guidance and legislation and be consistent with the Local Plan. Should re-word to ensure guidance is not interpreted as being overly prescriptive or restrictive. Should change heading to read: Indicative Opportunities by Location	The SPD provides guidance and is not intended to be prescriptive. This has been set out within the beginning sections therefore it is not necessary to state this at every section.	No change.
		Page 42	Should include an introduction to the Street Design and Guidance section ensure guidance is not interpreted as being overly prescriptive or restrictive. It should also include text suggesting that proposals should be of high quality meeting the Local Plan tests and be dealt with on a site by site basis.  Should amend text to add additional flexibility in accordance with guidance and legislation to include reference to the guidance within the previous chapter being indicative.	The SPD as a whole is planning policy guidance therefore it is not necessary to repeat this at the beginning of a section relating to street design and guidance.  The SPD provides guidance therefore it is not necessary to include reference to the guidance being indicative.	No change.  No change.
		Page 47	Should remove reference to policy within the text to make clear it is guidance.  Text identifies that Marshgate Lane site will be within the first phase of development and that these sites will set the tone for the area. It should be noted that the development of this site is dependent on planning consent so suggest additional wording referencing that Map 13 is indicative.  Text needs updating to ensure flexibility in delivery including viability and land assembly, including	The wording correctly states that the SPD is policy guidance and does not form new policy.  It is acknowledged within the text that the phasing needs careful consideration. However, it is recognised that that this will be determined through time and may be subject to change, therefore it is appropriate to amend this title to include indicative floorspace.  Although viability can often be a planning consideration the	No change.  Amend wording to state that the 'indicative' phasing is set out within Map 13. The title to Map 13 will also be amended as such.  Amend paragraph relating to the Legacy

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			<p>insertion of viability and cash flow considerations.</p> <p>Should also add additional information in relation to land assembly including how the land authority can work with landowners to enable the release of sites for development where comprehensive delivery is problematic.</p>	<p>phasing considerations set out within this section are necessary to ensure that the site is brought forward in an appropriate manner. It is not appropriate that cash flow be considered.</p> <p>The SPD does set out what powers the Legacy Corporation has as the local planning authority to assist in land assembly. Further detail will be added to the Delivery Roles and Responsibilities section on page 52 to set out how Legacy Corporation can use its powers.</p>	<p>Corporation's roles and responsibilities to include information on land assembly.</p>
		Page 51	<p>This section relates to infrastructure funding, in particular S106 funding and should be amended to reflect the CIL Regulations, NPPF and NPPG, in particular in relation to pooled contributions and the consideration of payments in kind on a site by site basis.</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary to repeat the regulations and guidance in relation to S106 and pooled funds.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to include references to payments in kind.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		Page 53, Table A.1	<p>Should amend wording to add flexibility in accordance with legislation, NPPF and NPPG. The wording should be amended to state that any other typologies should be justified through the development management processes.</p>	<p>Any proposal for workspace would be addressed through the development management processes; therefore it is not necessary to add reference to this within the Appendix.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		Page 53, Table A.2	<p>Should amend wording to add flexibility in accordance with legislation, NPPF and NPPG. The wording should be amended to state that compatibility would be addressed through the development management processes.</p>	<p>Any compatibility issues associated with proposals for workspace would be addressed through the development management processes; therefore it is not necessary to add reference to this within the</p>	<p>No change.</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
		Page 55, Appendix B	<p>It is noted that a number of buildings set to be demolished through the Marshgate Lane scheme have been highlighted as precedents, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bricked-up window- Page 60</li> <li>• Marshgate Business Centre- Page 67</li> <li>• Waterway Edge- Page 71.</li> </ul> <p>It should be made clear how the Industrial Heritage Study relates to the existing buildings referenced and how this should be taken forward within each site. Should add an additional sentence:</p> <p><u>It should be noted that the potential "likely locations" are a guide only and are provided as cues to the previous character of the area, and do not hold any status that might be associated with their retention or re-provision. Each development will be considered on its own merits as part of the development management process, in the context of adopted policy and the overall planning merits of any particular proposal.</u></p>	<p>Appendix.</p> <p>The study references typologies of industrial heritage within the site which can be taken forward as cues for new development- this should not be interpreted as meaning that these markers require or are worthy of particular protection. This will be made clearer within and introduction to the Appendix.</p> <p>The likely locations are purely factual and relate to the part of the site where the feature was/is located. As above additional wording will be added as an introduction to the Appendix to take account of the comments made and be made clear that these do not do not hold status indicating that they should be preserved.</p>	Amend text to include an introduction to the Appendix to confirm that the markers identified should not be interpreted as being highlighted for preservation.
032	Terunesh McKoy, LB Tower Hamlets	Whole document	Officers are keen to cooperate to ensure that the Pudding Mill area integrates well with Tower Hamlets, the community and opportunities to improve lives. Welcome the SPD and support principles to guide mixed use development including housing, employment space and Local Centre, supported by connections, schools, community facilities and open space. Improved connectivity to the borough and population growth should maximise opportunities for improved connections, access to new homes, jobs,	Noted.	No change.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			infrastructure and services for LBTH residents.		
		Map 8	<p>Balance of uses should be managed to deliver sustainable communities. Should test future uses to ensure are deliverable. Should publish supporting evidence alongside next iteration.</p> <p>Grey areas in this map require clarification</p>	<p>The site is allocated within the Local Plan which was subject to high level Local Plan viability testing. Some initial testing also took place in 2014 alongside the Pudding Mill Land Use Design Framework.</p> <p>The grey areas of map 8 are highlighting the presence of infrastructure which will need to remain throughout the course of development. Further clarity can be provided by stating this on Map 8.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Amend Map 8 to highlight that the electricity substation and Crossrail site will be maintained.</p>
		Chapter 7	More detailed design principles around the electricity substation.	It is considered that more direct and specific guidance can be provided in relation to the electricity sub-station (and the Crossrail depot as another major infrastructure location remaining), Amendments will also be made within the Street Design and Guidance section which is more area-specific.	Amend Chapter 7 and 8 to include enhance detail in relation to the electricity sub-station and Crossrail depot.
		Chapter 7	Greater emphasis on the need and importance of carefully considered ground floor uses along the waterway, buildings and spaces in between.	The SPD already covers where non-residential uses may be appropriate along the waterway in relation to the Local Centre and OIL, however it is also recognised there may be other locations where careful siting of such uses may be appropriate. Therefore further guidance will be provided	Amend text on pages 23 and 40 in relation to siting of non-residential uses along the waterway.

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
				in relation to the opening out of the waterway to commercial uses on page 40 and, for consistency, within the 'remainder of site' section on page 23.	
		Whole document	Clarification in relation to the maintenance of the proposed bridge connections.	Bridges would normally be maintained as part of the local highway network. It is not considered necessary to add this to the SPD.	No change.
		Whole document	Welcome further engagement prior to next iteration of the document.	Noted. The Legacy Corporation frequently engages with the boroughs, and further amendments to the SPD will be discussed further in these meetings.	No change.
033	Keira Murphy, Environment Agency	Whole document	<p>The SPDs include positive key principles to reduce and mitigate flood risk, improve open space and biodiversity. However lacks emphasis on creation of new habitats for wildlife in design principles, and balance between access for people and wildlife.</p> <p>The SPDs do not recognise that the River Lea or Lee Navigation is classified under the Water Framework Directive as a heavily modified waterbody (also in Thames River Basin Management Plan).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The waterway management section on page 39 can be amended to reflect the classification within the Thames River Basin Management Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Amend page 39 to reflect the Thames River Basin Management Plan classification.</p>
		Page 32	<p>Welcome reference to area being characterised by Lower Lea Valley with its rivers, streams, wet woodlands.</p> <p>Should reference sustainable drainage measures and native planting which is linked to the River Lea ecology and Thames River Basin Management Plan measures.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Further reference to native planting and sustainable drainage systems linked to the River Lea ecology measures identified in the</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Amend to include native planting and sustainable drainage system references in line with</p>

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/ issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			Given development should be set back from the waterway should include an aspiration for a continuous canalside corridor along edge of site which can incorporate towpaths, tree planting and green landscaping including habitat areas.	Thames River Basin Management Plan will be made.  This aspiration for connectivity enhancements including continuous canalside route is entrenched within the SPD, within Section 4: Connectivity. The soft landscaping and biodiversity section deals with these issues in general which will be applied along across the site as a whole.	Thames River Basin Management Plan measures.  No change.
		Page 38	Support key flooding principles; recommend these are reviewed in line with the LLDC Flood Risk Review. Should include the following principle:  <u>For any new footprint in the 1 in 100 year plus climate change flood outline, floodplain compensation will be required on a volume for volume, level for level basis.</u>  Should be more specific regarding setbacks from the watercourse, with a minimum requirement from 8m.	The wording of the whole flooding section will be reviewed in the context of the LLDC Flood Risk Review. This will include the suggested amended text.  As above the wording will be amended in relation to set backs.	Amend Flooding and Surface Water Management section in context of the LLDC Flood Risk Review.  Amend information on setbacks.
		Page 40	Should incorporate the principles of replacing hard banks with softer solutions for banks, introducing marginal planting including reedbeds, minimising overshadowing and impacts of lighting, and maximising the use of SuDs where possible.	The Waterway Management section will be amended to reflect the Water Framework Directive, including ecology, SuDS, overshadowing and light, setbacks and planting.	Amend Waterway Management section in relation to Water Framework Directive.
034	Local Resident	Map 4	Should not allow for heavy industries (e.g., concrete, asphalt producing facilities) causing noise and air pollution.	The SIL is safeguarded for industrial and rail freight uses as set out within Table 2 of the Local	As above, the Opportunities and Constraints section will

No.	Name & Organisation	SPD section/issue	Summary of consultation comment/issue	Response to comment	Changes proposed to SPD
			The SIL may benefit from light industrial units supporting high tech, research, design and such other industries building on the nearby presence of UCL East, Loughborough University, Here East, the IQ, University of the Arts, etc.	Plan. This includes what is referred to as heavy industries.	be amended to include further reference to the SIL.