

Tower Hamlets Local Plan Examination Hearings Actions and Response Log September – October 2018

<u>Purple text underlined</u>	Main modifications
Purple text	Additional modifications

The following list/log provides a response or reference to the inspector’s questions and actions as raised in the hearings on matters 1 to 11, held from 6 September to 12 October 2018.

Changes proposed will be reflected in the modifications schedules upon completion of all hearings. Any responses requiring further detail are provided as summarised statements in the Post Hearing Clarification Document (LBTH/LP/007). The documents referred to in the table below are referenced under each relevant matter on the examination web page at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan.

Main modifications are those changes which the inspector considers are necessary to make the plan sound and legally compliant.

Additional modifications are minor changes (e.g. factual updates, clarifications, grammar corrections and changes to presentational style).

Ref	Action	Output	Status
Matter 1: General Matters and Legal Requirements (6 September)			
1	London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) to confirm why a referenced consultation meeting was cancelled	Clarification	<p>During the regulation 18 (part 2) consultation, four consultation workshops (on two dates) on the Local Plan’s four sub-areas (City Fringe, Central, Isle of Dogs and South Poplar and Lower Lea Valley) had to be rescheduled following the calling of a council by-election on 1st December 2016.</p> <p>The original dates were Tuesday 22nd November 2016 and Thursday 1st December 2016. The events were rescheduled to Tuesday 13 December 2016 and Monday 19 December 2016 (6pm - 8pm).</p> <p>An email was sent to anyone who had already booked a place and to everyone on the consultation database on 16th November 2016 to inform them of the change in date.</p>
2	LBTH to confirm the date of the Community Engagement Strategy	Clarification	<p>The Tower Hamlets Community Engagement Strategy was published in July 2017 and covered the period 2017 to 2020. This can be viewed on the following link: https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/Documents/Consultation/TH_Engagement_Strategy_Framework.pdf.</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			This document was a tool for consultation and following public response the document has subsequently been updated as the Community Engagement Strategy 2018-2021. This can be found here: https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/Documents/Community-safety-and-emergencies/Community_engagement/TH_Engagement_Strategy.pdf
3	Relevant judgements to provide: 1. People over Wind 2. Persimmon	Website	Relevant judgements have been identified. Copies are available to view online at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/localplan (see examination library webpage).
4	Provide relevant acts	Website	Relevant legalisation has been identified. These are available to view online at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/localplan (see examination library web page).
5	Remove watermark on the Mayor of London Statement of Common Ground (SCG17a)	Website	Document has been amended and posted on our web site at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/localplan (see examination library web page).
6	Appendix 1.1 of the main matters to be reflected in adopted Local Plan as the contents page	Modification	The contents page of the Local Plan will be updated to include relevant policy numbers, figures and associated page numbers.
Matter 2: Basis for the LP and Spatial Strategy (6 September)			
1	Reference to the 'north of the Isle of Dogs' – two references	Modification	The following modification is proposed. Throughout the plan, replace wording 'area in the north of the Isle of Dogs' and 'north of the Isle of Dogs ' with: 'Northern Isle of Dogs'.
2	Separate note on capacity – showing year by year on comparison of the City Fringe and Isle of Dogs	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 2, action 2.
3	Propose wording to show the designation of areas of substandard air quality on the Policies Map	Modification	The following modifications are proposed: Policy D.SG3: Health impact assessments 1. The following developments are required to complete and submit a rapid health impact assessment as part of the planning application.

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>a. Major developments.</p> <p>a. b. New Major development within an area of sub-standard air quality (as <u>designated and</u> shown on the Policies Map).</p> <p>b. e. Developments which contain any of the following uses:</p> <p>i. Education facilities.</p> <p>ii. Health facilities.</p> <p>iii. Leisure or community facilities.</p> <p>iv. A5 uses (hot-food-takeaways).</p> <p>v. Betting shops.</p> <p>vi. Publicly accessible open space.</p> <p>Policy D.ES2: Air quality</p> <p>2. An air quality impact assessment, based on cu best practice, is required as part of the planning application for:</p> <p>a. major developments;</p> <p>b. developments which will require substantial earthworks or demolition;</p> <p>c. developments which include education and health facilities or open space (including child play space); and</p> <p>d. new build developments in areas of sub-standard air quality (as <u>designated and</u> shown on the Policies Map).</p>
4	Cross reference to policy D.SG3 – paragraph 2.24 ('major development')	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>Part 1 refers to <u>major developments</u> in areas of sub-standard air quality: these are areas where nitrogen dioxide levels exceed 40 µg/m³ (the European Union legal limit / <u>national air quality objectives</u>). This includes areas in which fine particulate matter (PM2.5) levels exceed 10 µg/m³ annual mean PM2.5 (World Health Organisation guideline limits). These areas are outlined on the Policies Map.</p>
Matter 3: Deliverability, Infrastructure and Viability (7 September)			
1	Set out the early years provision and how it is to be rolled	See Post Hearing	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 3, action 1.

Ref	Action	Output	Status
	forward in terms of housing delivery. Inspector needs to know requirements are over the plan period, not just to 2019.	Clarification Document	
2	Air quality and schools re: site allocations – how will layout address policy D.ES2	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 3, action 2.
3	Childcare sufficiency assessment	Website	Completed. Document is now online and can be viewed or downloaded from the Local Plan examination library at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan .
4	Catchment area for primary schools – map	Website	A map has been prepared. You can view or download a copy of the map from the Local Plan examination library at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan .
6	Review appendix 5.2 (of the main matters response) (infrastructure phasing plan including secondary school expansion and health)	Appendix update	Completed. Document is now online and can be viewed or downloaded from the Local Plan examination library at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan .
7	Effect of postponed timing regarding the Elizabeth line: 1) Correcting the references to the timing of Crossrail 2) The implications of the delay of Crossrail	Modifications	There are no specific timings provided in relation to the references to the Elizabeth line (Crossrail) in the plan. References are included in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key objective 2 (page 15); ▪ Policy S.H1: Meeting housing needs (page 51); ▪ Policy D.H5: Gypsy and traveller accommodation (page 60); ▪ Policy S.TC1: Supporting the network and hierarchy of centres - supporting text 6.13 (page 79); ▪ Chapter 11: Improving connectivity and travel choice - supporting text at paragraphs 11.1 (page 134) and 11.14 (page 138); ▪ Vision for City Fringe (page 146); ▪ City Fringe sub-area development principle number 23; ▪ 1.4 Whitechapel South Site Allocation (page 158); ▪ Vision for Isle of Dogs and South Poplar (page 179); ▪ Isle of Dogs and South Poplar sub-area development principle number 7 ▪ 4.2 Billingsgate Market site allocation (page 187);

Ref	Action	Output	Status												
			<p data-bbox="958 204 2056 304"> ▪ 4.9 North Quay site allocation (page 201) In undertaking a review a small number of inconsistent references were however highlighted and the following modifications are proposed: </p> <table border="1" data-bbox="969 336 1980 491"> <tr> <td data-bbox="969 336 1167 491">Whitechapel South site allocation (1.4)</td> <td data-bbox="1167 336 1357 491">Public transport accessibility levels</td> <td data-bbox="1357 336 1980 491">*the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of Crossrailthe Elizabeth line at Whitechapel</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="969 523 1980 699"> <tr> <td data-bbox="969 523 1167 699">Aspen Way site allocation (4.1)</td> <td data-bbox="1167 523 1357 699">Public transport accessibility levels</td> <td data-bbox="1357 523 1980 699"> 3-5 (2015) 3-6a (2021)* *the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of the Elizabeth line at Canary Wharf </td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="969 730 1980 885"> <tr> <td data-bbox="969 730 1167 885">Billingsgate Market site allocation (4.2)</td> <td data-bbox="1167 730 1357 885">Public transport accessibility levels</td> <td data-bbox="1357 730 1980 885"> 3-5 (2015) 4-6a (2021)* *the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of the Elizabeth line at Canary Wharf </td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="969 885 1980 1246"> <tr> <td data-bbox="969 885 1167 1246">Billingsgate Market site allocation (4.2)</td> <td data-bbox="1167 885 1357 1246">Design Principles</td> <td data-bbox="1357 885 1980 1246"> <ul data-bbox="1368 895 1968 1238" style="list-style-type: none"> • improve walking and cycling connections to, from and within the site, particularly with a new east to west cycle route through the site. Walking and cycling routes should specifically address the barrier of Aspen Way and integrate the site with Poplar to the north; North Quay and Canary Wharf Elizabeth line Crossrailstation; and to the wider area. These routes should align with the existing urban grain to support permeability and legibility; </td> </tr> </table>	Whitechapel South site allocation (1.4)	Public transport accessibility levels	*the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of Crossrail the Elizabeth line at Whitechapel	Aspen Way site allocation (4.1)	Public transport accessibility levels	3-5 (2015) 3-6a (2021)* *the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of the Elizabeth line at Canary Wharf	Billingsgate Market site allocation (4.2)	Public transport accessibility levels	3-5 (2015) 4-6a (2021)* *the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of the Elizabeth line at Canary Wharf	Billingsgate Market site allocation (4.2)	Design Principles	<ul data-bbox="1368 895 1968 1238" style="list-style-type: none"> • improve walking and cycling connections to, from and within the site, particularly with a new east to west cycle route through the site. Walking and cycling routes should specifically address the barrier of Aspen Way and integrate the site with Poplar to the north; North Quay and Canary Wharf Elizabeth line Crossrailstation; and to the wider area. These routes should align with the existing urban grain to support permeability and legibility;
Whitechapel South site allocation (1.4)	Public transport accessibility levels	*the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of Crossrail the Elizabeth line at Whitechapel													
Aspen Way site allocation (4.1)	Public transport accessibility levels	3-5 (2015) 3-6a (2021)* *the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of the Elizabeth line at Canary Wharf													
Billingsgate Market site allocation (4.2)	Public transport accessibility levels	3-5 (2015) 4-6a (2021)* *the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of the Elizabeth line at Canary Wharf													
Billingsgate Market site allocation (4.2)	Design Principles	<ul data-bbox="1368 895 1968 1238" style="list-style-type: none"> • improve walking and cycling connections to, from and within the site, particularly with a new east to west cycle route through the site. Walking and cycling routes should specifically address the barrier of Aspen Way and integrate the site with Poplar to the north; North Quay and Canary Wharf Elizabeth line Crossrailstation; and to the wider area. These routes should align with the existing urban grain to support permeability and legibility; 													

Ref	Action	Output	Status			
			<table border="1" data-bbox="974 199 1982 343"> <tr> <td data-bbox="974 199 1176 343">North Quay site allocation (4.9)</td> <td data-bbox="1176 199 1355 343">Public transport accessibility levels</td> <td data-bbox="1355 199 1982 343"> 5-6a (2015) 5-6a (2021)* *the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of the Elizabeth line at Canary Wharf </td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="952 343 2056 502">There are no implications for the delivery of the plan’s objectives or sites due to the delay in the Elizabeth line’s opening. All four of the sites most directly connected to Elizabeth line stations (Whitechapel South, Billingsgate, North Quay and Aspen Way) are only due to be delivered after 2019 (the delayed delivery date).</p> <p data-bbox="952 502 2056 742">Consideration of the land adjacent to the existing gypsy and traveller site for the delivery of further pitches is not time sensitive and discussions with Crossrail regarding the return of this land to LBTH have already commenced. A modification to the policies map has been proposed (modifications table and attached maps) to ensure it reflects the latest boundaries between the current site and the land adjacent to it (where we will deliver any further pitches, following completion of the Elizabeth line works).</p>	North Quay site allocation (4.9)	Public transport accessibility levels	5-6a (2015) 5-6a (2021)* *the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of the Elizabeth line at Canary Wharf
North Quay site allocation (4.9)	Public transport accessibility levels	5-6a (2015) 5-6a (2021)* *the year 2021 has been used due to the arrival of the Elizabeth line at Canary Wharf				
8	<p data-bbox="324 742 723 885">Consider how to include infrastructure monitoring in the Local Plan’s monitoring framework (table 7).</p> <p data-bbox="324 957 723 1061">Policy S.SG1 – provide clarity in the supporting text. Embedding into monitoring framework.</p>	Modification	<p data-bbox="952 742 2056 774">The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p data-bbox="952 813 2056 957">Section 3, paragraph 2.16: “Further details (including the mechanisms through which developers will be expected to contribute towards infrastructure provision) are outlined in policy D.SG5 and, section 4 (relating to site allocations) and section 5 (relating to the monitoring and delivery framework).”</p> <p data-bbox="952 997 2056 1061">Section 5, table 7 - add new indicators after KMI1 and renumber subsequent indicators accordingly:</p> <p data-bbox="952 1101 2056 1173">KMI2: Delivery of housing and key infrastructure requirements through site allocations (not including school sites).</p> <p data-bbox="952 1173 2056 1204">Target: As set out in site allocations.</p> <p data-bbox="952 1204 2056 1244">KMI3: Delivery of primary and secondary schools through site allocations.</p> <p data-bbox="952 1244 2056 1348">Target: Primary and secondary schools associated with site allocations shall be delivered at a rate which keeps pace with the levels of need identified in the most recent Planning for School Places document.</p>			
Matter 4: Energy, Air Quality, Waste, Water and Open Space (7 September)						

Ref	Action	Output	Status
1	Confirm what the 2010 Open Space Strategy said in terms of specific requirements – 1 ha	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 4, action 1.
2	Biodiversity officer to confirm the status of Mr James Hill's site (82/84 Rhodeswell Road)	Direct response / modification	The boundary has been amended accordingly and will be reflected on the Policies Map. See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 4, action 3.
3	How have we considered the evidence base for MOL? Set out LBTH's overall approach. Detailed note needed on our interpretation of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in relation to the MOL and how this impacts in relation to the mapping error. Confirm how our evidence base addresses the changes in paragraph 4.4.8. Very clear explanation required that sets out how the approach we are proposing with the identified site is justified and consistent with the NPPF	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	See the note set out in Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 4, action 3.
4	Amend dot in figure 13 (An enhanced network of open spaces and water spaces) Update figure in final LP	Modification	The following modifications are proposed: Amend the figure map as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a new number in the location of the new pedestrian footbridge linking Billingsgate Market and Aspen Way site allocations and label it 20. Amend the figure key:

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the wording as follows: New potential Ppedestrian footbridge required to deliver the green grid Add a new number 20: 20. Billingsgate Market and Aspen Way Re-number 20-27 to 21-28
5	Consider adding linear open space definition to be in paragraph 8.12	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 4, action 5.</p>
6	Consider wording change on Canary Wharf water space in relation to policy D.OWS4	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	<p>No change proposed (see Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 4, action 6).</p> <p>The following modifications are proposed to provide clarity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Development within or adjacent to the borough’s water spaces is required to demonstrate that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> it does not result in loss or covering of the water space, unless it is a water-related or water dependent use at appropriate locations and of appropriate scale; there are no adverse impacts on the existing water spaces network, including navigation, biodiversity, water quality, visual amenity, openness and the character and heritage value of the water space, taking into consideration the adjacent land and the amenity of existing surrounding development; there are no unacceptable impacts on the openness of the water space; <p>A new paragraph 8.48 is proposed:</p> <p>The sense of openness greatly contributes to a person’s perception and enjoyment of water spaces. This is of particular importance in a borough like Tower Hamlets where there is a high deficiency of open space. When assessing planning applications, consideration will be given to the water coverage and human experience of the openness of water space in terms of water body’s visibility and visual connections across the water from the surrounding public realm.</p>
Matter 5: Housing (11 September)			

Ref	Action	Output	Status
1	Cross check housing trajectory figures in appendix 5.2 (of the main matter response). Check sites and cross references.	In preparation for site allocations hearings	Housing trajectory figures within appendix 5.2 were reviewed to ensure alignment to appendix 7 of the Local Plan. This resulted in some minor amendments to site figures within the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar.
2	Rename appendix 5.2 (of the main matter response) to make it easier to clarify what is public information and what is confidential	Clarification	Changes included an amendment to the document title to clarify that the capacity figures are 'indicative', given that different sources are used for different sites depending on whether information is publically available.
3	Paragraph 4.10 - clarify commitment from LBTH to review the plan. Timescale within 10 years	Modification	The following modifications are proposed: 4.10 If our targets are not being met, we will undertake an update review of the Local Plan to explore ways of addressing this unmet need, taking into account the outcomes of future revisions to the London Plan and opportunities to increase the supply of housing as detailed in section 5 below . Triggers and timescales for an update are outlined in section 5 (see paragraph 6.1)
4	Clarify how housing zones are reflected in policy S.SG1 and on the policies maps in relation to policy S.H1	Modification (as in matter 8)	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 5, action 4. The following modifications are proposed: Policy S.SG1: Areas of housing growth and opportunity within Tower Hamlets: 3. The majority of new housing and employment provision within the borough will be focussed within the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar opportunity area, principally within Canary Wharf and the area in the north of the Northern Isle of Dogs. Significant amounts of new housing will also be delivered in the City Fringe and Lower Lea Valley (including those sites which form part of the Poplar Riverside Housing Zone programme) opportunity areas. Policy S.H1: Meeting housing needs. Supporting text (paragraph 4.14): 4.14 Housing growth will be primarily delivered in the locations specified in part 1 (a) via a number of different mechanisms: the regeneration of previously developed land, intensification of the built form in opportunity areas, and in highly accessible locations along transport corridors, and the delivery of site allocations. Sites which form part of the

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>Poplar Riverside Housing Zone programme are also expected to support the delivery of new homes. A smaller proportion of housing will be delivered through town centre intensification, estate regeneration and infill development, bringing back long term vacant properties into residential use and the development of windfall sites. Further details can be found in sections 4 and 5.</p> <p>Glossary (page 222) - housing zone: An initiative of the Mayor of London funding programme and initiative to accelerate new housing development in specific areas of London, including Poplar Riverside in Tower Hamlets.</p>
5	Update the tables in appendix 7 of the Local Plan (Housing trajectory)	Modification	The modification is reflected in the final plan and the minor modifications table.
6	Be more explicit about the commitment to updating the Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Chapter 4: Infrastructure delivery.	Modification	<p>The following modification is proposed:</p> <p>Section 5, paragraph 4.1: “It is not an exhaustive list and other items will be required, as appropriate, in response to new development in the borough. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will therefore be updated on an annual basis.”</p>
7	Refer paragraph 2.37 to update the Infrastructure Delivery Plan annually	Modification	<p>The following modification is proposed:</p> <p>Section 3, paragraph 2.37: “The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be reviewed regularly, and where necessary, updated annually in consultation with both internal and external stakeholders, such as other service areas and infrastructure providers</p>
8	Site allocations definition. Ensure consistency	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>Footnote 22: Opportunity areas are designated in the London Plan (GLA, 2016) and are considered to be London’s main opportunities for accommodating large-scale new development to provide substantial numbers of new employment and housing, due to transport connectivity, land availability and deliverability. Site allocations are sites in the borough which have been identified as able to accommodate new homes and or jobs alongside necessary infrastructure such as open space, health and education facilities. Further information</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>about opportunity areas and site allocations in are provided in policy S.SG.1.</p> <p>The definition of sites allocations in the glossary: A parcel of land which has been set aside in the plan to accommodate strategic housing or employment developments (i.e. sites that can provide over 500 new net additional homes) and other uses such as employment and retail space. These sites are expected to deliver significant infrastructure with capacity to accommodate future growth and development.</p>
9	Refine definition of windfall sites	Modification	<p>The following modification is proposed:</p> <p>Windfall site: Sites which have not been specifically identified as available in the Local Plan process which normally comprise previously developed sites that have unexpectedly become available. In the housing trajectory, set out in appendix 7, we include a 'small sites windfall allowance'. In Tower Hamlets, we define small sites as sites that contain fewer than 10 housing units.</p>
10	Add GLA funding prospectus for delivery of council housing, June 2018 to the evidence base	Website	Completed. Document is now online and can be viewed or downloaded from the Local Plan examination library at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan .
Matter 6: Local Housing Need – including Affordable Housing and Student Housing (12 September)			
1	Review the “exceptional circumstances” reference regarding less than 35%	Modification	<p>The following modification is proposed:</p> <p>4.18 Part 2 sets a target of achieving 50% affordable homes through private development as well as council-led initiatives. This target is considered to best reflect local housing need¹. On developments that yield 10 11 or more net additional residential units, at least 35% affordable housing is expected. Developments are expected to maximise the provision of affordable housing, having regard to availability of public subsidy, implications of phased development (including provision for re-appraising scheme viability at different stages of development) as well as financial viability which should, in particular, take account of prevailing local and regional viability guidance. Applicants are strongly encouraged to meet or exceed the delivery of 35% affordable housing. Lower levels will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances where robustly justified through viability</p>

¹ This need is established in the Tower Hamlets Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014 and 2017).

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			evidence and where it is demonstrated that there are clear barriers to delivery. Applications that do not meet policy requirements will be subject to viability re-appraisals. Further guidance is provided in the Development Viability Supplementary Planning Document and the Viability and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (GLA, 2017). The borough's guidance will take precedence.
2	Look at London Plan reference in relation to calculations (units v habitable rooms). Review paragraph 4.37 (red text).	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 6, action 2.
3	Rename policy D.H2 but include affordable housing reference	Modification	The following modification is proposed: Suggested name: Policy D.H2: Affordable housing and housing mix
4	Check if spatial policies should be referenced within detail – policy D.H2 does not have a link to policy S.H1	Clarification	As a consistent approach taken on all policy areas in the plan, no spatial policies (as indicated by the prefix “S”) are referenced in the policy link boxes within their own chapter. It is considered that including a link back to the spatial policy would be unnecessarily repetitive, as it links to all the other policies in that chapter.
5	Speak with Ballymore representatives in relation to the incremental development / addition of new units and policy D.H2	Modification	The following modifications (as set in the statement of common ground with Ballymore, October 2018) are proposed to policy D.H2 and the supporting text (paragraph 4.36): d. Where a housing development has been permitted and the permission is either subsequently amended (e.g. by means of a variation) to provide more units, or the existing development is extended to provide more units by the granting of a new permission
6	Revisit “functionally linked” in policy D.H2	Modification	Development which provides further housing units either through an amendment to a current permission or an application to extend an existing development on the same or an adjoining site which is physically or functionally linked; (where the extension is reliant on the existing permission or development to function or to meet policy requirements or standards required elsewhere in the plan); the new units will be considered as part of the existing development and the affordable housing calculation for the new units will reflect the whole development be based on the combined number of units.

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>Part 2 (d) refers to incremental development. This is housing development where permission is subsequently amended (e.g. by means of a variation of the extant planning permission) to the extent that the amended development would provide new units or the existing development is extended <u>to provide new units</u> by the granting of a new permission on <u>the same or</u> an adjoining site where the units would <u>be</u> physically or functionally <u>linked-extend the existing development</u> (e.g. <u>sharing-by relying on</u> a common access core <u>or on the existing</u> amenity space or other communal facilities <u>in order to meet the policy requirements or standards required elsewhere in the plan</u>) and the linked development would provide new units. In these circumstances, we consider the new units to be part of the existing development and the affordable housing requirements will be calculated accordingly, <u>taking into account the affordable housing already delivered or secured</u>. In both cases, where the amended or linked development would provide <u>11 10</u> units or more in aggregate, affordable housing should be provided, <u>as per in accordance with policy S.H1 (part 2 aiii) and parts 1 and 2</u> (a to c) above. If it would result in less than <u>11 10</u> new units in aggregate, policy S.H1 (<u>part 2 aii</u>) will apply. <u>If lower than policy compliant levels of affordable housing for the total scheme, as amended or extended are proposed, this will only be accepted where robustly justified through</u> The recalculation will be undertaken via a financial viability assessment, in line with <u>the our</u> latest guidance (<u>as outlined in paragraph 4.18</u>). <u>The financial viability information should be proportionate to the scale of change and time elapsed between the existing approval or development and the proposed amendment or extension.</u></p>
7	Consider revising threshold levels in light of new NPPF - policy SH1 in 2a	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed (x2):</p> <p>Policy S.H1: Meeting housing needs. Part 2a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) requiring the provision of affordable housing contributions on sites providing 2 to <u>9 10</u> new residential units against a sliding-scale target (subject to viability); iii) requiring the provision of a minimum of 35% affordable housing on sites providing <u>10 11</u> or more new residential units (subject to viability); and <p>Policy S.H1: Meeting housing needs. Supporting text:</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>4.20 Given the extent of local need, it is considered necessary and appropriate to seek financial contributions towards the provision of affordable housing from sites of less than 10 units. Financial contributions will be calculated using our preferred methodology as set out in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Over the plan period, developments on small sites have the potential to contribute over 3,000 new homes and could make a significant contribution towards meeting local affordable housing need (see appendix 7). Financial contributions will be calculated using a sliding-scale target starting at 3.5% across the whole site and increasing to 3.5% for each additional home, reaching 35% for sites of 10 <u>11</u> units or <u>or</u> more. Further detail (including on financial viability assessments) is provided in the developer contributions policy (D.SG5) and in the latest Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
8	Policy D.H6 (1d) – amend wheelchair accessibility from 10 to 5%. Adjust text / supporting text. Tidy up numbering and references.	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed (x3):</p> <p>d. provide 10% of student rooms which are easily adaptable for occupation by wheelchair users. <u>5% of student rooms which are wheelchair accessible, including access to a wheelchair-accessible shower room for independent use.</u></p> <p>New supporting text (to be inserted between paragraphs 4.63 and 4.64):</p> <p><u>In order to meet the needs of students with physical disabilities, 5% of student rooms must be wheelchair accessible (capable of being independently accessed and used). To meet this requirement, rooms and bathrooms must meet the requirements outlined in figure 30 and figure 52 in the British Standard BS8300: Design of an accessible and inclusive built environment.</u></p> <p>Add to “Evidence links”: - <u>British Standard BS8300: Design of an accessible and inclusive built environment</u></p>
9	Policy D.H6 - review approach to /criteria for student housing and compare with approach taken to specialist housing and HMOs.	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 6, action 9.
10	Policy D.DH7 (p 64) – revisit parts (a) and (b)	Modification	The following modifications are proposed:

Ref	Action	Output	Status
	Swap paragraphs 3.78 and 3.77 text to be tightened up. Provide additional wording.		<p>1 Where residential development exceeds the density levels should be consistent with the guidelines set out in the London Plan where higher density is proposed, it must demonstrate that the cumulative impacts of the proposed development have been considered (including its potential to undermine the ability of neighbouring sites to optimise densities) and any negative impacts can be mitigated as far as possible it does not result in over-development and that suitable mitigation measures in relation to design and infrastructure have been identified; and b. the site does not compromise the development potential of neighbouring sites</p> <p>In addition, additional wording is set out in appendix 6.1 of the main matter response. This should have been included in the tracked change version and the schedule of modifications. We propose to include this wording in the updated post hearing schedule of modifications under paragraph 3.78.</p> <p>'In particular, it seeks to optimise the use of land in the wider area and ensure that development takes place in a coordinated manner with surrounding sites, as part of a wider masterplanning exercise to prevent it from constraining the ability of neighbouring sites to optimise densities'.</p> <p>3.80 Where the London Plan density levels guidelines are exceeded, schemes must be of exemplary design quality and must address the cumulative impacts that can be associated with high density development, such as noise, disturbance, highways implications, loss of outlook and overlooking. In addition, developers should consider the existing and planned capacity of infrastructure and services to accommodate the development, including potential mitigation measures to provide additional capacity and unlock any identified constraints.</p> <p>As parts (a) and (b) have been combined, paragraphs 3.78 and 3.79 of the supporting text should be retained, as per the tracked change version.</p>
11	Include GLA's monitoring report on cumulative impact	Website	Completed. Document is now online and can be viewed or downloaded from the Local Plan examination library at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan .
12	Monitoring student and specialist housing (app)	Modification	The following modification is proposed:

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			Section 5, table 7: “ KMI12: Net additional non-conventional homes (including <u>outlining numbers of student beds and specialised housing</u>)”; add new target “ <u>70 units of specialist housing for older people per year</u> ”
13	Look at whether the overseas buyer issue should be supporting text rather than a policy objective	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	<p>See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 6, action 13. The following modification options are proposed:</p> <p>Preferred modification (paragraph 4.27): Part 5 aims to encourage new residential developments to meet local and strategic housing market needs. There is a concern at a regional level that a portion of new build homes in London are not being used in a way which meets housing need and GLA-commissioned research indicates that Tower Hamlets has the second highest percentage of overseas sales in London³⁰. Developers are encouraged to <u>make a voluntary ‘first dibs’ offer to the Mayor of London sign up to the Mayor of London’s ‘First Dibs’ scheme</u> or <u>participate in</u> any replacement <u>initiative scheme</u> which encourages the marketing of new homes for sale to Londoners in the first instance <u>and/or provides Londoners with an opportunity to purchase new homes before they are marketed overseas – particularly lower cost homes.</u></p> <p>Alternative modification: Delete part 5: <u>5. Residential development should encourage increased housing sales to Londoners, preferably for owner occupation.</u></p> <p>Delete paragraph 4.27 and replace with the following (to be inserted between paragraphs 4.17 and 4.18):</p> <p><u>Part 2 requires development to respond to local and strategic market housing need. There is a concern at a regional level that a portion of new build homes in London are not being used in a way which meets housing need and GLA-commissioned research indicates that Tower Hamlets has the second highest percentage of overseas sales in London³⁰. Developers are encouraged to make a voluntary ‘first dibs’ offer to the Mayor of London or participate in any replacement initiative which encourages the marketing of new homes</u></p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			for sale to Londoners in the first instance and/or provides Londoners with an opportunity to purchase new homes before they are marketed overseas – particularly lower cost homes.
Matter 7: Employment and Economic Growth (13 September)			
1	7.1.2 of the main matter responses references evidence base that should be added - London Office Policy Review and industrial benchmark study	Web	Completed. Document is now online and can be viewed or downloaded from the Local Plan examination library at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan .
2	Revisit monitoring indicators for employment. Particularly supply of future employment capacity.	Modification	<p>For the borough as a whole, we propose to monitor total job creation, using official statistics, and compare this against the GLA's borough wide job projection. This shows 125,000 jobs for the borough as a whole, which provides consistency with the GLA's published borough job projections over the plan period. As noted elsewhere in evidence, the GLA does not provide a sector breakdown for this figure.</p> <p>However for the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar opportunity area, following discussions with the GLA, we consider a different approach is warranted. Here, the GLA are working to facilitate the delivery of 1,450,000 square metres of new office floorspace (2017 - 2041). This is the quantum of floorspace the GLA, through conjoined transport and infrastructure investment, are looking to enable.</p> <p>As the GLA is seeking to provide the infrastructure to facilitate delivery of this quantum of floorspace, it is prudent to incorporate the same target in the Local Plan for employment schemes in the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar opportunity area. This is so that investment in infrastructure is not wasted.</p> <p>Although this is a different approach to the borough as whole, it recognises the long term and strategic importance of the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar opportunity area to London. The approach has also been confirmed with the GLA as suitable.</p> <p>The following modifications are proposed:</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>KMI 165: Net additional jobs by type Progression towards the aspirational target of 125,000 additional jobs to 2031. Annual monitoring against this borough-wide job target will include data from official statistics (the UK business register and employment survey) as well as information from London GLA Economics.</p> <p>Within the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar sub-area, where most of our new employment floorspace will be concentrated, we will monitor employment floorspace provision against the GLA's Isle of Dogs and South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework target of 1,450,000 square metres of new employment floorspace to 2041 (base date 2017).</p>
3	Mention that LELs and LILs are shown on the Policies Map + typo in SIL – should say 'this', not 'these'	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>Local Employment Locations (LEL) Third column after descriptions: These are illustrated on the Policies Map.</p> <p>Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) Second column: This designation plays an important sub-regional industrial, warehousing and waste management role serving not just the borough but other parts of central London. Housing is not suitable in these this locations due to potential conflict with existing and future industrial uses.</p> <p>Third column: Empson Street (as illustrated on the Policies Map). This should be safeguarded in accordance with London Plan policies.</p> <p>Local Industrial Locations (LIL) Third column after descriptions: These are illustrated on the Policies Map.</p>
4	Look at colours on maps, might be a clash.	Modification	No change. It is not considered that there is a clash of colours.
5	Check consistency around terminology of centres – page 68 (track change).	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>Tower Hamlets Activity Areas & Major, District & Local Neighbourhood Centres designated town centres These are illustrated on the Policies Map.</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
	Local Centre reference in policy EMP.1 – should be Neighbourhood Centres.		Terminology of town centres reviewed throughout plan to ensure consistency.
6	Consider rewording of policy D.EMP2 to include greater flexibility for single occupier buildings	Modification	The following modifications are proposed: <u>5.25 In exceptional cases, where an occupier requires exclusive use of a single office property, such as a global headquarters building, we may consider implementing the development with alternative affordable workspace provision. Any alternative provision should in the first instance be provided as part of the same development scheme or secondly within the same sub area (as defined in policy S.SG1). But where this is not possible, or in our view not desirable, then provision elsewhere in the borough may be considered. Any alternative provision should be of equivalent value which may translate into greater floorspace than the original proposal if an alternative location is considered.</u>
7	Delete paragraph 5.28	Modification	The following modifications are proposed: 5.28 This policy also covers vacant sites within the POLs, SIL and LILs – protecting them from loss to other non-employment uses will ensure the supply of future employment land to meet projections (not just within the plan period but beyond) is not undermined.
8	Add Cambridge Heath LEL map to the examination library.	Website	Document is now online and can be viewed or downloaded from the Local Plan examination library at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan .
9	Table 2, page 65 – small typo on industrial floorspace. Was 293,912 should be 273,912. Update.	Modification	The following modification is proposed: Table 2: Industrial gross demand - 293,912
10	Agree wording with St William on how gasholder floorspace will be considered in relation to employment before the site allocation discussion.	Modification Refer to S.A. action (in matter 10, LLV)	The following modifications are proposed: <u>The gasholders do not accommodate any employment floorspace and therefore this floorspace does not need to be re-provided as part of any new scheme.</u>
11	Look at wording in relation to the 'North of the Isle of Dogs' and ensure consistent across all	Modification	The following modifications are proposed: Throughout the plan, replace wording 'area in the north of the Isle of Dogs' and 'north of

Ref	Action	Output	Status
	policies. Either use own terminology or London Plan.		the Isle of Dogs' with: 'Northern Isle of Dogs'.
Matter 8: Heritage, Design and Tall Buildings (18 Sept ember)			
1	Policy D.DH6 – consider adding wording in the policy (part 3) to link to figure 9 (Principles of tall buildings)	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>Development of tall buildings proposed outside of these zones must:</p> <p>a. significantly strengthen the legibility of a town centre or mark the location of a transport interchange or other location of civic or visual significance within the area;</p> <p>b. provide sufficient distance from other landmark buildings or clusters to create a landmark in the townscape;</p> <p>c. unlock significant infrastructure constraints.</p> <p><u>3. Outside these zones, tall building proposals (including those on site allocations) will be supported provided they meet the criteria set out in part 1 and can demonstrate how they will:</u></p> <p><u>a. be located in areas with high levels of public transport accessibility within town centres and/or opportunity areas;</u></p> <p><u>b. address deficiencies in the provision of strategic infrastructure;</u></p> <p><u>c. significantly strengthen the legibility of a Major, District or neighbourhood Centre, or mark the location of a transport interchange or other location of civic or visual significance within the area; and</u></p> <p><u>d. not undermine the prominence and/or integrity of existing landmark buildings and tall building zone (taking account of the principles set out in figure 8).</u></p> <p>Figure 9: Principles of tall building clusters (this has been renumbered as figure 8).</p>
2	<p>Policy D.DH6 – revisit multiple clauses in part 1</p> <p>– a: ‘take account of character’ – needs to</p>	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>1. Developments with tall buildings must be of exceptional architectural quality. To achieve this, proposals must:</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
	<p>recognise change as well as existing character</p> <p>– c: use the word ‘designated’ instead of ‘valued’</p> <p>– i: make clear the policy is directed toward residents of the building in question, but that ground floor facilities should be shared where possible – add in supporting text</p> <p>– j/k/l: consider consistency</p>	<p>Modification</p> <p>Modification</p> <p>Modification</p>	<p>a. be of a height and scale, mass and volume that are proportionate to their role, function and importance of the location in the local, borough-wide and London context; and take account of the existing character of the immediate context and of their surroundings;</p> <p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>c. enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area without adversely affecting established designated valued townscapes and landscapes (including building/roof lines) or detracting from important landmarks, heritage assets, key views and other historic skylines, and their settings</p> <p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>i. provide high quality private and communal open space and play areas (where residential uses are proposed for which local occupants residents of the building can use and where appropriate provide shared facilities at the ground floor level to encourage social cohesion;</p> <p>The following addition is proposed to the supporting text: New paragraph between 3.68 and 3.69</p> <p>Tall buildings, by default, house large numbers of people and can support a range of activities, including the provision of amenity areas (e.g. private, communal and public spaces) and active uses. In the majority of cases, tall buildings are communities in their own right. Tall buildings should deliver appropriate quantities of high quality amenity and play space (where residential uses are proposed) which is exclusive to tenants and occupants. Communal spaces should establish platforms for interactions between users to support a sense of belonging. Ground floors of tall buildings, where possible, should introduce uses which would benefit the wider neighbourhood. Tall buildings should also foster social cohesion and support integration between local communities.</p> <p>The following modifications are proposed:</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - make clear that Millwall Inner Dock is subservient to Canary Wharf, and clarify the required step down for this cluster; - review the terms 'step down' and 'drop away' ensuring clarity and consistency in use 	<p>Modification</p> <p>Modification</p>	<p>policy D.DH4 identified in the London Views Management Framework.</p> <p>The following modifications are proposed: Building heights in the Millwall Inner Dock cluster should significantly drop away step down from the Canary Wharf cluster to support its central emphasis and should be subservient to it.</p> <p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>Insert after paragraph 3.71: In the context of this policy, step down sets out how the transition in height take places both in character and physical form.</p> <p>Policy D.DH6: Principles Canary Wharf (Isle of Dogs) - bullet 3</p> <p>Building heights within the Canary Wharf cluster should drop away step down from the central location at One Canada Square</p> <p>Millwall Inner Dock (Isle of Dogs) - bullet 1</p> <p>Building heights in the Millwall Inner Dock cluster should significantly drop away step down from the Canary Wharf cluster to support its central emphasis....</p>
4	Policy D.DH6 - Update monitoring framework around the content of the Tall Buildings Study (SED10)	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>1.7 Alongside the policies set out in the Local Plan, we will also take account of supplementary planning documents and other relevant guidance when determining planning applications. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Quay Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (2015); • Whitechapel Vision Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (2013); • Fish Island Area Action Plan (2012). • Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (2012);

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whitechapel Vision Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document; • South Quay Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document; • Tall Buildings Study; • Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (2016) • Development Viability Supplementary Planning Document (2017/2018).
5	Policy D.DH6 – consider whether to provide further clarity on the word ‘exceptional’	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 8, action 5.</p>
6	Policy D.DH6, part 3a – consider including reference to housing zones	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 8, action 6.</p>
7	Policy D.DH6, part 3c – remove ‘designated’	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed to replace part 3. This is an amendment to post submission modification (MJM5) which referred to the word “designated” in relation to part c below.</p> <p>Development of tall buildings proposed outside of these zones must:</p> <p>d. significantly strengthen the legibility of a town centre or mark the location of a transport interchange or other location of civic or visual significance within the area;</p> <p>e. provide sufficient distance from other landmark buildings or clusters to create a landmark in the townscape;</p> <p>f. unlock significant infrastructure constraints.</p> <p><u>Outside these zones, tall building proposals (including those on site allocations) will be supported provided they meet the criteria set out in part 1 and can demonstrate how they will:</u></p> <p><u>a. be located in areas with high levels of public transport accessibility within town centres and/or opportunity areas;</u></p> <p><u>b. address deficiencies in the provision of strategic infrastructure;</u></p> <p><u>c. significantly strengthen the legibility of a Major, District or Neighbourhood Centre or</u></p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p><u>mark the location of a transport interchange or other location of civic or visual significance within the area; and</u> <u>d. not undermine the prominence and/or integrity of existing landmark buildings and tall building zones (taking account of the principles set out in figure 8).</u></p>
8	Paragraph 3.75 – change ‘in particular’ to ‘specific examples include’, and ‘b and c’ to ‘a to d’	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>In relation to part 3 (a-d b-e), tall building proposals outside of the zones will be subject to additional criteria to <u>make sure they are focussed in appropriate locations, (e.g. areas of high public transport accessibility) and contribute positively to the character of the site and surrounding area</u> ensure they do not have an adverse impact on the setting or character of the borough. In such locations, tall buildings will be expected to serve as landmarks and unlock strategic infrastructure provision (<u>specific examples include in particular</u> in particular publically accessible open space, new transport interchanges, river crossings and educational and health facilities serving more than the immediate local area) to address existing deficiencies and future needs (as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the Regulation 123 List and other relevant strategies) and <u>address</u> address in the requirements set out in section 4).</p>
9	Policy D.DH1 – look at wording of clauses b and c around ‘architectural language’ – needs clarification of the difference between the clauses	Modification	<p>In responding, officers have considered the content of parts b and c and how they related to this meaning. Modifications to both parts were considered necessary to address the point and provide clarity and provide a clear distinction between the urban design and architectural qualities. The definition of architectural language is now embedded into the policy. Also replaced word ‘reflects’ to ‘complements and enhances’ in order to address the comment about the plan embracing change.</p> <p>b. <u>represent good urban design</u>: provide coherent building lines, <u>roof lines</u> and setbacks; roof lines and roof forms, <u>complement</u> street scape rhythm and associated landscapes (including boundary treatment); and other street scape elements as well as <u>ensure</u> optimal plot coverages to avoid over-development;</p> <p>c. ensure the architectural language: <u>scale, composition and articulation of a building form</u>, design of detailing, elements and materials applied on elevations; roof forms and landscapes (including boundary treatment) <u>reflects</u> complements and enhances their immediate and wider surroundings;</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>The following changes to the supporting text are proposed:</p> <p>3.6 Parts a to c provide detailed guidance to ensure that the design, siting and layout of new development is considered in the wider context and is sensitive to the existing character and identity of the area, taking account of the opportunities to improve health and well-being.</p>
10	Policy D.DH2 – revisit wording on gated communities, balconies above schools, and adding servicing to the refuse and recycling section	Modification	<p>LBTH considered the reports associated with the inquiries referenced at the hearings.</p> <p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>2. Development is also required to positively contribute to the public realm through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. ensuring balconies do not over-hang on the public highway or onto neighbouring properties, civic spaces and public buildings, such as schools; f. resisting the creation of gated communities which do not promote socially inclusive and cohesive neighbourhoods or connectivity between places; <p>3.23 Gated communities which do not contribute to a well-connected, accessible and permeable public realm and socially inclusive and cohesive neighbourhoods will be resisted (in line with the London Plan). They may also have a negative impact on sustainable communities and social cohesion.</p> <p>3.24 Balconies overhanging the public footway/or highway or onto neighbouring properties and buildings and spaces of civic importance have the potential to harm the safety and amenity of local occupiers, residents and the public highway as well as cause overlooking into neighbouring properties or on to the highway, especially at the ground floor level.</p> <p>However, it is not considered necessary to refer to servicing under part g. Servicing is adequately covered under the following policies:</p> <p>Policy D.MW3: Waste collection facilities in new development Policy D.TR2: Impacts on the transport network Policy D.TR3: Parking and permit-free</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>Policy D.TR4: Sustainable delivery and servicing</p> <p>Transport statements or assessments will be expected to include a delivery and servicing plan. Development will need to provide adequate delivery and servicing facilities within the site curtilage and off the public highway as well as encouraging shared servicing arrangements and timing of deliveries.</p>
11	Policy D.DH4 – ensure consistency in references to skyline of strategic importance	Modification	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>Terminology is consistent.</p>
12	Policy D.DH4 – delete figure 6 and remove references to it (and presumably renumber the following figures)	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>Remove figure 6 and references to it</p> <p>Figure numbers to be updated accordingly.</p>
13	Policy D.DH4 – revisit wording of clause f – add to supporting text. Reference Conservation Strategy	Modification	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>The policy sets out the requirement clearly.</p>
14	<p>Policy D.DH3 – use ‘preserve’ instead of ‘conserve’</p> <p>Consistent implementation on policy</p>	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposals must conserve preserve or where appropriate enhance the borough’s designated and non-designated heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance as key and distinctive elements of the borough’s 24 places. 2. Proposals to alter, extend or change the use of a heritage asset or proposals that would affect the setting of a heritage asset will only be permitted where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. they safeguard the significance of the heritage asset, including its setting, character, fabric or identity; b. they are appropriate in terms of design, height, scale, form, detailing and materials in their local context; c. they enhance or better reveal the significance of assets or their settings; d. they preserve strategic and locally important views and landmarks, as defined in

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>policy D.DH4; and</p> <p>e. in the case of a change of use from a use for which the building was originally designed, a thorough assessment of the practicability of retaining its existing use has been carried out outlining the wider public benefits of the proposed alternative use....</p> <p>5. Alterations, extensions or changes of use, or development in the vicinity of listed buildings (as shown on the Policies Map) will be expected to have no adverse impact on those elements which contribute to their special architectural or historic interest, including their settings.</p> <p>6. Significant weight will be given to the protection and enhancement of the borough's conservation areas (as shown on the Policies Map), including their setting. Development within a conservation area will be expected to preserve or, where appropriate, enhance those elements which contribute to their special character or appearance. There will be a presumption in favour of the retention of unlisted buildings that make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of a conservation area. Planning applications should explore opportunities from new development within conservation areas and their setting to enhance or better reveal their significance.</p> <p>7. Significant weight will be given to the protection and enhancement of scheduled monuments (as shown on the Policies Map) and other non-designated archaeological sites of equivalent importance. Any harm to their significance must be justified having regard to the public benefits of the proposal: whether it has been demonstrated that all reasonable efforts have been made to mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; and whether the works proposed are the minimum required to sustain the asset.</p> <p>9. Development that lies in or adjacent to archaeological priority areas (as shown on the Policies Map) will be required to include an archaeological evaluation report and will require any nationally important remains to be preserved conserved permanently in situ, subject to consultation with Historic England.</p> <p>10. We will seek to ensure the protection and appropriate enhancement of the borough's historic parks and gardens (as shown on the Policies Map). Development proposals should</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>therefore safeguard those features which form an integral part of the special character or appearance of the park or garden and ensure they do not detract from the enjoyment, layout, design, character, appearance or setting of the park or garden, key views into and out of the park, or prejudice its future restoration. Where development is likely to affect a historic park and garden or its setting, applications should include a heritage impact assessment setting out the likely impact which it would have upon its significance and the means by which any harm might be mitigated.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.36: We have prepared a series of conservation area appraisals and management plans that assess and evaluate the character and appearance of each of our conservation areas and set out how we consider they can be preserved conserved or enhanced. We will take these into account when assessing planning applications for development in conservation areas. We will seek to manage change in a way that retains the distinctive character and appearance of our conservation areas and will expect new development to contribute positively to this.</p>
15	<p>Paragraph 3.38 – clarify the language in the list as to the difference between views and heritage assets.</p> <p>Ensure consistency</p>	Modification	<p>The following modifications are proposed:</p> <p>3.38 The Policies Map shows the location of the borough’s heritage designations including, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • world heritage sites; • statutory listed buildings; • conservation areas; • London squares; • registered parks and gardens; • scheduled monuments; and • archaeological priority areas; and strategic and local designated views
Matter 9: Retail markets and community facilities (19 September)			
1	Hot food takeaways – replicate the mapping that was done for the existing schools for the proposed schools	<p>Revised map</p> <p>Website</p>	<p>Completed. Document is now online and can be viewed or downloaded from the Local Plan examination library at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan.</p> <p>The new London Plan topic paper for hot food takeaways has also been added to the</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			examination website as cited at the hearing.
2	Hot food takeaways – look at how clause (d) can be monitored	Modification	<p>The following modification is proposed:</p> <p>Section 5, table 7: Insert new indicator after KMI21 – KMI22: Proportion of A5 uses within town centres, and the number of existing and permitted A5 uses within 200 metres walking distance of an existing or proposed school. Monitoring will be supplemented by an annual public health analysis of childhood obesity in Tower Hamlets.</p> <p>Insert new target: In District and Neighbourhood Centres, not more than 5% of all town centre uses to be A5 uses. No new A5 uses permitted within 200 metres walking distance of an existing or proposed school.</p> <p>Renumber subsequent indicators accordingly.</p>
3	Retail provision – specify in the retail need tables that the numbers apply for the whole plan period	Modification	<p>The following modification is proposed:</p> <p>Table 34: Proportion of new retail floorspace required to 2031</p>
4	Frontages – revisit designations in the major centre, prepare paper setting out justification for approach	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 9, action 4.
5	Frontages – make clear which elements of the town centre hierarchy the policy applies to	Modification	Terminology reviewed throughout plan to ensure consistency. No changes necessary for policy D.TC2, but other modifications are proposed in relation to this issue as set out in action 7, matter 9.
6	Markets – confirm how/if this policy applies to Billingsgate and Crisp Street site allocations. Supporting text to define ‘local’ vs ‘strategic’.	Modification	<p>The following modification is proposed:</p> <p>Insert new paragraph after 6.51</p> <p>Part 1 of this policy refers to our existing street markets at Bethnal Green, Brick Lane, Crisp Street, Columbia Road, Petticoat Lane, Roman Road, Roman Road Square, Stroudley Walk, Watney Street and Whitechapel.</p>
7	General – check the whole chapter for consistent usage of	Modification	The terminology for town centres has been reviewed throughout plan to ensure consistency and clarity. The term ‘town centres’ is appropriate as a ‘catch all’ reference for

Ref	Action	Output	Status
	town centre terminology		<p>all centres in the hierarchy, but when the policy and/or supporting text is referring only to Major, District or Neighbourhood Centres, this will be specified through modifications. Proposed modifications include:</p> <p>6.20 Where comprehensive redevelopment alters the layout of existing Major, District or Neighbourhood town Centres, proposals to change the use of a retail unit within the redeveloped town centre will be assessed based on the character and mix of uses of the surroundings within the redeveloped site.</p> <p>Policy D.TC3: Retail outside our town centres Outside of the borough's Major, District and Neighbourhood Centres town centre hierarchy, new retail development will be subject to:</p> <p>Policy D.TC4: Financial and professional services Part 1: Outside of the borough's town-Major, District and Neighbourhood Centres, financial and professional services uses will be supported where they are local in scale and there is a reasonable prospect of the unit being occupied.</p> <p>Policy D.TC7: Markets Part 3: Proposals for new markets, including farmers markets and 'street-food' markets, will be encouraged. They will be directed to Major, District or Neighbourhood town Centres and should enhance the centre's existing offer and contribute to vitality and cohesion.</p> <p>Part 4: Proposals for new markets outside of Major, District or Neighbourhood town Centres will only be supported where they:</p> <p>6.51 While new markets within Major, District or Neighbourhood town Centres are favoured, this policy also recognises that there may be opportunities for markets outside of these town centres where they activate vacant spaces.</p> <p>6.53 Where proposals seek to re-activate vacant spaces or empty shops, temporary permissions will be favoured. Applicants should demonstrate that the proposed market</p>

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			will have a different offer to nearby town Major, District or Neighbourhood Centres to avoid undermining them.
Matter 10 Site Allocations: Lower Lea Valley (19 September)			
1	Leven Road – agree gasholder wording, consider identifying the specific employment policy that it relates to	Modification	The following modifications are proposed: <u>Prior to demolition, the gasholders do not accommodate any employment floorspace and therefore this floorspace does not need to be re-provided as part of any new scheme.</u>
2	Leven Road – explore the consistency of approach in relation to the site area of schools	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 10, action 2.
Matter 10 Site Allocations: Isle of Dogs (20 September)			
1	Aspen Way – revisit quantum of delivery with TfL Commercial Developments Ltd and the college – need to show deliverability	Modification	The following modifications (as set in the statement of common ground) are proposed. Infrastructure requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic open space (minimum of 1 hectare) • College (re-provision) • Community centre and associated football pitches (re-provision) • <u>Re-provision of DLR depot (Transport for London)</u> • <u>Improvement and enhancement of existing pedestrian bridge over Aspen Way and routes to it</u> Design principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • respond positively to the existing historic character, scale, height, massing and urban grain of the surrounding built environment including the St. Matthias Church conservation area. The setting of adjacent housing should also be protected through appropriate screening and landscaping; Delivery considerations: Development should not undermine the delivery of the long term support aspirations for enhanced and/or new bridge(s) over Aspen Way to better connect Poplar and Canary Wharf.

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>New bullet: Landowners in the site allocations for Aspen Way, North Quay and Billingsgate are strongly encouraged to work together (ideally through a masterplan) to better connect Poplar and Canary Wharf and positively address the social, economic and environmental disparities between the areas.</p> <p>New bullet: Development of the site allocations provides a unique opportunity to positively address the social, economic and environmental disparities between Canary Wharf and Poplar.</p> <p>Further modifications have been agreed in relation to matter 8. These are set out in the statement of common ground (see www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan).</p> <p>There are outstanding matters that TfL (Commercial Development Ltd) and New City College will have the option to respond to as part of the consultation.</p>
2	Crossharbour – amend the community policy’s supporting text, or the wording of the allocation regarding reprovision of health and community facilities	Modification	<p>The following modification is proposed:</p> <p>7.16 Part 2 seeks to ensure that new development facilitates and promotes greater public access through good and inclusive design and signage.</p> <p>7.17 Where practicable, the replacement facility should be provided before the existing one stops operating to ensure a continued service for local people.</p>
3	Wood Wharf – updating housing numbers in line with Canary Wharf new figures	Modification	Amendments incorporated into appendix 5.2D (from the main matter response) and appendix 7 of the Local Plan (Housing trajectory).
4	Wood Wharf – revisit the diagram around green grid and the sliver of Canal and River Trust land	Modification	Modifications have been made to figure 52 accordingly.
5	Millharbour South – check the current status of the various plots and applications on this site – need to show deliverability	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 10: Isle of Dogs and South Poplar sub-area, action 5.

Ref	Action	Output	Status
6	Millharbour – investigate what’s happening with the college on this application	See Post Hearing Clarification Document	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 10: Isle of Dogs and South Poplar sub-area, action 6.
7	North Quay – consider taking out cycle path reference	Modification	The following modification is proposed: a. accommodate a new east-to-west pedestrian/ cycle route through the site which facilitates connections to the wider movement network, including cycling , and the DLR and underground stations adjoining the site.
8	North Quay – changes to paragraph 1.6 of the overall chapter – change ‘maps’ to ‘figures’, delete word ‘indicative’	Modification	The following modification is proposed: All of the sub-areas and site allocations are shown in figure 19. This section also contains maps figures illustrating each sub-area and the site allocations within them. These maps figures are indicative and illustrate illustrative and show how the principles and requirements set out in this section should could be implemented.
9	Reuters Ltd – check what was assessed for viability and what is actually deliverable on the site if Reuters aren’t moving	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - viability	See Post Hearing Clarification Document - Matter 10: Isle of Dogs and South Poplar sub-area, action 9.
10	Riverside South – look again at the size of the open space on the diagram	Modification	Modifications have been made to figure 5 accordingly.
11	Westferry Printworks – amend site boundary to exclude the leisure centre, and amend appendix 5.2 (of the main matter response) accordingly	Modification	Modifications have been made to figure 51 accordingly. Appendix 5.2 has now been updated showing Westferry leisure centre as an ‘other project’ outside of the site allocation.
Matter 10 Site Allocations: Central (11 October)			
1	Bow Common – check consistency of references to town centres (as per previous		No change proposed.

Ref	Action	Output	Status
	action)		
2	Flexibility wording (paragraph 1.8) – consider being more specific and make reference to land use and infrastructure requirements – NB St William raised concerns in relation to making this more specific.	Modification	No change proposed. A level of flexibility on the site allocation requirements exists.
3	Bow Common: Remove local pedestrian and cycle routes from the key. Figure 31	Modification	The following has been included in the modifications table Remove the following from the key: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic pedestrian/cycling routes • Local pedestrian/cycling routes
4	Chrip Street: Remove local pedestrian and cycle routes from the key. Figure 32: Character places in Lower Lea Valley	Modification	The following has been included in the modifications table Remove the following from the key: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local pedestrian/cycling routes
5	Ensure there is consistency in approach in our approach to heritage assets on all site allocations.	See Post Hearing Clarification Document / modification	No changes proposed. A consistent approach has been applied.
Matter 10 Site Allocations: City Fringe (11 October)			
1	Bishopsgate Goodyard: consider amendment: ‘take into account cross-boundary issues’, as opposed to ‘meaningful consultation’.	Modification	The following modification is proposed: Development should carry out meaningful consultation with a wide range of residents and local organisations. Development should coordinate consultation across planning authorities and address cross-boundary issues.
2	Remove wording regarding	Modification	The following modification will be made:

Ref	Action	Output	Status
	community and social uses		<u>Other: Compatible community and social uses, including nurseries</u>
3	Put LBTH public health's statement on the Whitechapel's sexual health facility on the examination website.	Website	Completed. Document is now online and can be viewed or downloaded from the Local Plan examination library at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan .
4	Check application reference numbers on appendix 5.2C (of the main matter response) for Whitechapel South	Modification / revised 5.2C	Include the following planning application references to table 5.2: PA/15/02959 (Whitechapel Estate) PA/15/01789 (Safestore)
5	Put the green spine map on the examination website	Website	Completed. Document is now online and can be viewed or downloaded from the Local Plan examination library at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/localplan .
6	Modification in relation to the district heating system	Modification / revised appendix 5.2D	The reference to the district heating facility in the infrastructure requirements column will be deleted in section 4. A new delivery consideration will be added as follows: <u>Developers should explore the option of delivering a district heating facility within the vicinity of the development.</u>
Matter 11: Transport, Monitoring & Other Matters (12 October)			
1	Include an infrastructure indicator that also takes account of the overprovision of schools in the plan	Modification	The following modification is proposed (see also matter 3, action 8): Section 5, table 7, add new indicators after KMI1, renumber subsequent indicators accordingly: <u>KMI2: Delivery of housing and key infrastructure requirements through site allocations (not including school sites).</u> <u>Target: As set out in site allocations.</u> <u>KMI3: Delivery of primary and secondary schools through site allocations.</u> <u>Target: Primary and secondary schools associated with site allocations shall be delivered at a rate which keeps pace with the levels of need identified in the most recent Planning for School Places document.</u>
2	Include a transport crowding indicator	Modification	The following modification is proposed:

Ref	Action	Output	Status
			<p>Section 5, table 7, add new indicator after track changes version KMI43, and renumber subsequent indicators accordingly:</p> <p><u>KMI44: Level of crowding on Jubilee line, Elizabeth line and DLR trains within the borough.</u> <u>Target: N/A – monitoring will feed into discussions on strategic transport infrastructure with TfL and other partners.</u></p>
3	Explain the CLOCS and FORS acronyms in paragraph 11.42	Modification	<p>The following modification is proposed:</p> <p>Section 3, paragraph 11.42: Construction management plans and/or delivery and servicing plans are required to show how the <u>Construction Logistics and Community Safety (CLOCS)</u> standard has been incorporated and that fleets serving the site have <u>Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS)</u> silver accreditation.</p>
4	Include a reference in the monitoring section to the need to review the plan within five years due to the publication of the new National Planning Policy Framework	Modification	<p>The following modification is proposed:</p> <p>Section 5, paragraph 6.1: Regular monitoring will allow us to assess the impact of changing circumstances on policy effectiveness. This will be crucial in understanding when the need arises to undertake a full or partial update of the Local Plan to ensure it remains <u>up to date and consistent with national and regional planning guidance.</u> <u>The Local Plan will need to be reviewed once every five years (from adoption) to consider whether it requires updating.</u> Some <u>examples of the potential triggers for a full or partial update of the Local Plan</u> include the following.</p>