

Further Representations in reference to section 10 of the LBTH\_MATTERS\_AND\_ISSUES document

Site: 82 – 84 Rhodeswell Road, Mile End, E14 7TL

Representations by: Mr James Hills

This further representation is in reference to section 10 of Schedule of the Matters and Issues document for the Examination and in response to the LBTH officer's response to my previous representations in the 'Councils response to representations document'.

The LBTH Officer's response seems generic in nature and refers to MOL policy rules and guidelines without considering the specific nature and circumstances of this site. As stated in my previous representations, none of the criteria for classification of this site within MOL are met and what is missing in the officer's response is an evidence based justification as to how LBTH believe the site meets any of the MOL criteria. One of the questions raised in section 10 of the schedule of matters and issues for the examination is: *Is the allocation justified by the evidence base?* Considering the lack of clarity within the LBTH Officer's response in relating the MOL rules and guidelines to this site and the representations specifically, I would have to say no, the allocation is not evidence based for this specific site.

In summary, the site has never been an open space. It has a 2-meter-high fence around it and 2 stacked shipping containers contained within its boundaries. And the site does not meet any of the criteria to be classified as MOL. Considering these facts, I feel that LBTH Council Officers should describe the specific reasons why they believe this site should be included in the MOL classification. It should be evidence based and explain how the site meets the criteria to be included within the MOL classification.

LBTH Response here for reference:

*No change. The London Plan sets out strong support for the current extent of MOL, its extension in appropriate circumstances and its protection from development having an adverse impact on the openness of MOL. It seeks to protect the MOL from inappropriate development, except in very special circumstances, giving the same level of protection as with Green Belt designation. The MOL designation in Tower Hamlets is long established and clearly identified on previous and current plans. In line with the London Plan, any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken by boroughs through the local plan process, in consultation with the Mayor of London and adjoining authorities. The Local Plan's approach to protect and seek to enhance all open spaces (including MOL) is in line with national and regional planning policy and is also justified due to the severity of the open space deficiency in the borough. A recent assessment of Tower Hamlets open spaces identified that the current level of open space provision is 0.89 hectares per 1,000 residents which is less than the borough's open space standard of 1.2 hectares per 1,000 residents. In line with the information and policies outlined above, we do not consider that there is sufficient evidence to justify a review of the existing MOL boundary on an individual site basis. We consider the current policy approach which seeks to protect the existing MOL designation from 'inappropriate development' to be sound. As part of the Local Plan process, we have not undertaken a review of the MOL due to the severity of open space deficiency in the borough as well as the sufficient supply of brownfield development sites.*