

Pre Submission
Site Specific Allocations
Consultation Report

Regulation 24 (2)(a)(iv)
statement

Pre Submission - Site Specific Allocations Consultation Report

Regulation 24 (2)(a)(iv) statement

- (aa) which bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 25;
 - (bb) how those bodies and persons were invited to make such representations;
 - (cc) a summary of the main issues raised by those representations; and
 - (dd) how those main issues have been addressed in the DPD
-

- (aa) which bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 25

In line with regulation 25 (1) and (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008, the Council consulted the specific and general consultation bodies listed in Appendix 1.

- (bb) how those bodies and persons were invited to make such representations

Consultation on the Site Specific Allocations Issues and Options took place from 30th June to 11th August 2008. 885 organisations and individuals were notified by letter about the consultation. This comprised of 26 specific consultees and 859 general consultees (of which 523 were residents). The list of consultees invited to respond is attached in Appendix 1.

Alongside this, a variety of other consultation methods were used in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. These included the following:

- Staffing exhibition stands at the Big Green Borough Day and Dagenham Town Show to advertise the consultation and encourage participation;
- Staffing exhibition stands in Vicarage Field Shopping Centre and Dagenham Mall (which took place for five days throughout the consultation period);

- Carrying out Members Briefings at the Civic Centre and Barking Town Hall;
- Giving presentations at the following Neighbourhood Management Meetings: Village, Gascoigne, Thames, Marks Gate and Heath;
- Giving presentations at the following community meetings: the Faith Forum, Barking and Dagenham Youth Forum, the Allotment Association, Age Concern, the Disability and Equality Forum, Barking and Dagenham Refugee Network, and the Tenants and Residents Association;
- Carrying out three focus groups in order to get the views of a selection of residents from under-represented wards; and
- Informing all organisations on the Council for Voluntary Services (CVS) database of the consultation (through an additional mail out).

These events aimed to raise awareness of the consultation being undertaken, allow any initial queries or comments to be noted, and encourage individuals to fill in the comments form.

To assist with this, and to advertise the consultation itself, the following were used:

- **Press Notices**
The consultation was advertised in the Barking and Dagenham Post, Citizen Magazine (which goes to all homes in the Borough), People Matters (which goes to all Council employees) and Diaspora Magazine (which targets black and ethnic minorities).
- **Website**
Notification of the consultation period was published on the Council's website. The Site Specific Allocations Issues and Options Report, along with accompanying documents and the comments form, were also available online. Comments could also be made interactively through Limehouse.
- **Libraries and Council Buildings**
The Site Specific Allocations Issues and Options Report (and accompanying documents) were made available at the 11 local libraries and the main Council buildings.
- **LDF Hotline**
A LDF hotline was set up to answer any queries from the public.

Whilst arrangements were made to provide the document in alternative formats in accordance with the Council's Equal Opportunities Policy, no such requests were made.

(cc) a summary of the main issues raised by those representations

(dd) how those main issues have been addressed in the DPD

The main issues raised, along with the Council's response to them, are shown in the following appendices:

Appendix 2 – Responses received on proposed sites

Appendix 3 – Responses on additional sites proposed

Appendix 4 – Responses on retail parades

Appendix 5 – Responses on open spaces

Appendix 6 – Responses on additional open spaces proposed

Appendix 7 – General responses

Appendix 8 – The consultees that responded

Appendix 1 – Consultees invited to respond

Specific Consultees

Greater London Authority
Design for London
Government Office for London
London Borough of Bexley
London Borough of Greenwich
London Borough of Havering
London Borough of Newham
London Borough of Redbridge
London Thames Gateway Urban Development Corporation
Environment Agency
Highways Agency
English Heritage
Natural England
Network Rail
London Development Agency
British Telecom
NTL
Telewest Communications
Mobile Operators Association
Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust
NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit
British Gas
Transco North London
Beckton Sewage Treatment Works
Essex & Suffolk Water
Thames Water Property Services Ltd

General Consultees

Home Office
Department for Education and Skills
Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Department for Transport
Department of Trade and Industry
Ministry of Defence
Department of Work and Pensions
Department of Constitutional Affairs
Department of Culture, Media and Sport
Office of Government Commerce
London Councils
Age Concern Barking and Dagenham
AGT Community Development Trust
B.A.D. Youth Forum
Community Empowerment Network
Community Heritage
Barking and Dagenham Council for Voluntary Services
Becontree Residents Association
Dagenham Dock Employers Forum
Dagenham Village Partnership

Forum for the Elderly Barking and Dagenham
Housing Futures
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transsexual Forum
Marks Gate Umbrella Association
New View Steering Group
Reede Road Tenants Association
Tenant Participation Team
Thameside Network Group
Barking & Dagenham Tenants & Residents Federation
Widows and Orphans International
Asian Community Advice Centre and Training Association
Barking & Dagenham Bangladesh Welfare Association
Barking & Dagenham Refugee Network
Empower to Excel
Ethnic Minority Partnership Agency
Regenerasian
Russian Group
Sickle Cell Unit
Sikh Women's Mental Support Group
Somali Women's Association
Barking & Redbridge Chinese Association
Travellers and Gypsies Group
Turkish Women's Association
Disablement Association of Barking & Dagenham
Disability and Equality Forum
Chadwell Heath Historical Society
Al-Madina Mosque
Barking and Dagenham Faith Forum
International Christian Care Foundation
Abundant Grace International
Barking & Dagenham Chamber of Commerce Ltd
Barking and Dagenham RSL Development Sub-Group
Barking and Havering LIFT
Costco Wholesale UK
Charfleets Limited
H.G Rent & Co (Highbury) Ltd
LagMar (Barking) Limited
Lidl UK GmbH
Sainsbury's Supermarket Ltd
The Barking and Dagenham Local Business Partnership
Tesco Stores Ltd
Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC
Supply London/London Value Chain
Age Concern
London City Airport Ltd
British Chemical Distributors and Traders Association
British Geological Survey
National Rivers Authority
British Chamber of Commerce
Confederation of British Industry
East London Chamber
Greater London Enterprise

London First
Work Space Group Plc
Church Commissioners
Civil Aviation Authority
General Aviation Awareness Council
Ancient Monuments Society
British Ceramic Confederation
British Slate Association
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
Council for British Archaeology
English Heritage Archaeology
Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
English Partnerships
Crown Estate Commissioners
Crown Estate Offices
Disability Rights Commission
Access Committee for England
Barking Power Station
Ecotricity
EDF Energy
The British Wind Energy Association
National Power Plc
National Grid UK Transmission
Dialogue
O2
Orange
T-Mobile
Vodafone
Association of National Park Authorities
Becontree Organic Growers
Council for the Protection of Rural England London
Creekmouth Preservation Society
Dagenham Angling Association
Eastbrookend Support Group
Environment People's Organisation
Friends of the Earth
Friends of St Chad's Park
Going For Green
Groundwork East London
Higher Environmental Awareness
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
The Forestry Commission
The Ramblers Association
London Biodiversity Partnership
London Wildlife Trust
National Society for Clean Air and Environmental Protection
Romford Beekeepers Apiary Site
Royal Society for Nature Conservation / Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Thames Chase Community Forest
Thames Estuary Partnership

The National Trust
The Tree Council
UK Noise Association
Wellgate Community Farm
Wildlife and Countryside Link
Equal Opportunities Commission
London Ambulance Service
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
Freight Transport Association
Gypsy Council for Education, Culture, Welfare & Civil Rights
Society of Travelling People
The Romany Guild
Health & Safety Executive
Help the Aged
East Thames Housing Group
Empty Homes Agency
Hanover Housing Association
London & Quadrant Housing Trust
London Office of the Housing Corporation
Metropolitan Housing Trust & Home Ownership
Presentation Housing Association
Tower Housing Association
Southern Housing Group
Ujima Housing Group
Learning and Skills Council
Marks Gate Agenda 21 Partnership
London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies
C2C
Crossrail
The Go-Ahead Group plc
Living Streets
London Underground Ltd
London Walking Forum
Stagecoach – SELKENT
Barking & Dagenham Race Equality Council
National Playing Fields Association
South Eastern Trains
Union Railways (North) Limited
Air Transport Users Council
London Travel Watch
London Transport Users Committee
HM Prison Service
Metropolitan Police Authority
National Offender Management Service
London Port Health Authority
Port of London Authority
Post Office Property Holdings
Royal Mail Group
Royal Mail Property Holdings
Department for Transport RSP
Thames Gateway London Partnership
London Housing Federation

Road Haulage Association
English Sports Council
Sport England London Region
House Builders Federation
Transport for London
British Waterways London Region
Inland Waterways Association
LFCD Water Department East
Women's National Commission
Capitec
SHA Estates
Dagenham Community School
Sheffield Hallam University
University of Westminster
The Theatres Trust
Planning Aid for London
Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust
Havering and Redbridge Hospitals NHS Trust
Havering Primary Care Trust
Redbridge Primary Care Trust
North East London Mental Health NHS Trust
The Becontree Heath Horticultural Allotment Association
Equalities & Diversity
Abbey Network Group
Thameside Network Group
Fusion Online Limited
Wiggles Playgroup
Lifeline
Notting Hill Housing
Barking and Dagenham Volunteer Bureau
Barclays Bank PLC
Environment Agency
North East London NHS Foundation Trust
Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust
Adrian Salt and Pang Development Planning Consultancy Ltd
Albury Hall Limited
Allford Hall Monaghan Morris Architects
Alsop Verrill Town Planning Consultancy
Amist
Anglia Housing Group
Anthony Goss Planning
Atkins
Arup
Auger Contacts Ltd
Sanofi Aventis
AXA Real Estate Investment Managers
Barking Riverside
Bircham Dyson Bell
Bellway Homes
Berkeley Group
Bovis
BPTW

Brixton Plc
Broadway Malyan
Caldecotte Consultants
CgMs Consultants
Chase & Partners
Chris Blandford Associates
Cluttons LLP
Cophorn Homes
Countryside Properties
CPL Architects
Crest Nicholson (South East) Ltd
Cushman & Wakefield, Healey & Baker
Davis Langton
DentonWildeSapte
Development Planning Partnership
Development Plan UK
Durkan Homes New Ltd
DPDS Consulting Group
Drivers Jonas
DTZ
Entec
Environomics Consultants Ltd
Fairview New Homes Ltd
First Plus Planning Limited
Fresh Wharf Estates Ltd
Furlong Homes Ltd
Gerald Eve
Gleeson Homes
GL Hearn
Hammonds
Hampstead Homes
Haskoll Architects and Designers
Higgins Construction PLC
Hepher Dixon Planning & Regeneration
Hollybrook Limited
Humberts Leisure Consulting
Hunter & Partners
Iceni Projects
Indigo Planning
Insite Real Estate
Inventures
JJ Consulting
John Sharkey & Co
JMP Consulting
Jones Lang LaSalle
Knight Frank
LCCI/CBI London Manufacturing Group
LETEC
LEVVEL
Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Lichfield Planning
Local Futures

Mason Richards Planning
Miller Developments
Miller Homes
National Federation of Demolition
Ndomahina & Ndomahina Architects
NCA Housing and Regeneration Consultancy
PA Consulting Group
Peacocks
Persimmon Homes (Essex) Ltd.
Planning Potential
Rapeleys LLP
Robert Brett & Sons Ltd
Roger Tym & Partners
Stewart Ross Associates
Redrow Homes Eastern Ltd
RPS
Sambey Land Developments
Sanofi-Aventis
Savills
Singleton Clamp & Partners
Stock Woolstencroft
Sustrans
Temple Group
Tetlow King Planning
Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design
Tilfen Land
TRAK
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Turley Associates
URS Corporation Ltd
Wardell Armstrong LLP
Waterman Environmental, Consulting Engineers & Scientists
White Young Green
Brett Aggregates
Cemex UK Materials Ltd
Parsons Brinkerhoff
Sustrans
Alliance Environment
Barton Willmore
The Planning Bureau Limited
SHS & Company
Cluttons
Parsons Brinkerhoff
Express Legal Services
Shire Consulting
Bennett Urban Planning
DPDS Consulting Group
Smart Planning Ltd
Planning Potential
Jacobs
Savills Plc
Lynne Evans Planning

The JTS Partnership LLP
Jones Lang LaSalle
Tribal MJP
Drivers Jonas

Residents

All 523 residents on the consultation database were invited to respond.

Responses on Proposed Sites

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:	1	The Lawns
RES584	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	<p>I believe this particular site should be used for sheltered housing (bungalows) and perhaps one community shp or tea room for residents.</p> <p>These bungalows should be built to a decent size and spec. Carefully thought out would be an ideal retirement complex and would free up a lot of social housing to re-let.</p>	<p>This site has not been included because it is in the Green Belt</p>
Residential		

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
OTH164	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust	On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		This area is currently least well served with primary care facilities. We would be interested in exploring the potential of using part of this site for primary care facilities.	This need is now addressed in the Sanofi Site 2 allocation
	Health Services		
Partially			

Map Reference Number:

4

Manning Road allotments

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

ANON13

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Keep current use

Provided that it is in use leave this for allotments.

This is now
designated as a
protected allotment

Partially

RES577

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Agree with protecting site as allotment land.

This is now
designated as a
protected allotment

Partially

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES582

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Keep current use

This should remain as allotment as it is one of the
very few left in the area.

This is now
designated as a
protected allotment

Agree

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA002 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Greater London Authority	<p>On behalf of (where applicable):</p> <p>To be in accordance with London Plan policy, the Council should demonstrate that the above sites are surplus for not only allotments but with all land functions related to open spaces.</p> <p>The Council needs to show genuinely what encouragement and initiatives have been used to engage the community in allotment activities, for example such as those being used by the London Borough of Harrow.</p>	This is now designated as a protected allotment
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>			
Map Reference Number:	5	Chequers Parade	

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
ANON14		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Offices	General Industrial	The Core Strategy highlights the importance of Dagenham Dock and identifies it as a Sustainable Industrial Park
	Residential	Retail	
	Open Spaces	Other Community Services	
	Other	Leisure and Entertainment	
	Refurbishing the Hatfield Hall, Hatfield Road		
Partially		The biggest problem you are going to face is that as far as local residents are concerned is housing. Around here we have been ripped off big time from the Council. These just took the money and run. Trust will take a long time.	
		The most important thing for the Chequers site is for big businesses to move in on the Dag. Dock area because this area is still suffering from Fords going. At its height, Fords employed 25,000 workers.	
		Get businesses moving into the area then we can start thinking about everything else.	

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES580

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

This site as a whole need major regeneration. As a result of the current tired and run down appearance, retailers will suffer due to lack of footflow.

Noted

More emphasis needs to be placed on private landlords and their responsibilities for upkeep.

Agree

RES581

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

I would recommend the construction of more family homes. Chequer's Parade is in great need of regeneration.

Noted

Agree

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:	6	Cadiz Court
ANON8	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Concerned about the lorries obstructing the road during the development. Would like to see more housing. Borough needs more housing, not flats.	This site is under construction and has not been included
Residential		
Partially		
Map Reference Number:	7	Padnall Court and Reynolds Court

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES140		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Open Spaces	Enclosed and play space. There is a lot of wasted ground in the middle and surrounding it. You can pull this down and make more use of this site for housing. they are becoming a bit of an eyesore.	The allocation proposes to regenerate the housing here
	Residential		
Partially			
Map Reference Number:		9	Beacontree Heath

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

DEV160

Peacock and Smith
Limited

On behalf of (where applicable): Wm Morrisons Supermarket Plc

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

It is suggested that the existing Morrisons stores
and its car park be included within this mixed-use
allocation, which may allow for the future
expansion of the existing store as part of the wider
mixed use proposals.

The Morrison store
and car park is
now included
within the
Becontree Heath
Wide Site allocation

Partially

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES191

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

This site has been
removed

Agree

STA013

English Heritage

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

The potential site adjacent to the listed Valence House is extremely sensitive and we are concerned this is included.

This site has been
removed

We believe LBC and Planning Permission may have been given for a sensitive scheme which includes improvements to the principal listed building and the former depot buildings.

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:	11	Groveyay Allotments

RES563

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Keep current use

If these are current working allotments then they should be kept, but if no-one is looking after them, then I agree with the change.

This is now designated as a protected allotment

Agree

RES567

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Education Services
Health Services

Leisure and Entertainment

Open spaces are difficult to maintain. They are subject to vandalism.

This is now designated as a protected allotment

Agree

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES569

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Keep current use

Disagree

I have said no to the potential uses if the allotment
is actually used by residents as a working
allotment.

This is now
designated as a
protected allotment

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA002 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Greater London Authority	<p>On behalf of (where applicable:)</p> <p>To be in accordance with London Plan policy, the Council should demonstrate that the above sites are surplus for not only allotments but with all land functions related to open spaces.</p> <p>The Council needs to show genuinely what encouragement and initiatives have been used to engage the community in allotment activities, for example such as those being used by the London Borough of Harrow.</p>	This is now designated as a protected allotment

Map Reference Number:	12	Fanshawe College	

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES174

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Other Community
Services

Education Services

The college should mostly be used for education
purposes - it is important to have enough education
facilities for all rather than even more housing

This has not been
included as it is
likely to remain in
its current use for
the foreseeable
future

Partially

RES563

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Keep current use

This has not been
included as it is
likely to remain in
its current use for
the foreseeable
future

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

Council's Response

RES567

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Other Community Services

Leisure and Entertainment

Strongly recommend retention of the present facility. In addition to add other facilities as indicated e.g. leisure and entertainment.

This has not been included as it is likely to remain in its current use for the foreseeable future

Education Services

Keep current use

RES569

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Partially

The potential uses would only work if there is good infrastructure.

Also serious consideration as to what facilities for youth in the borough would be looked into as there is already a high % of youth in this borough.

More housing would only add to the social problems this borough is already experiencing with anti social behaviour.

This has not been included as it is likely to remain in its current use for the foreseeable future

Acceptable Uses	14	Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		Barking Hospital	
ANON5		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	<p>There is quite enough housing on the site. It is beginning to look cramped ad local schools are full. We need more health services on the site. The hospital should never have been partially closed.</p> <p>The local population is bigger than ever and it is quite obvious that King Georges and Queens are failing to cope.</p>	<p>The allocation allows health facilities here but also recognises that residential may be appropriate if the existina</p>
Disagree			

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

DEV144

Drivers Jonas

On behalf of (where applicable:)

North East London Foundation Trust

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

This has not been
included as it is
likely to remain in
its current use for
the foreseeable
future

Acceptable Uses		Commentary		Council's Response
DEV144	Tribal MJP	On behalf of (where applicable):		North East London Foundation Trust
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	Other Community Services	Residential development is the most suitable use on the site. It is suitable for medium density residential development which is supported through PPS3.	The allocation allows health facilities here but also recognises that residential may be appropriate if the existing
Agree	Residential		<p>The site is considered suitable for the provision of dwellings of a variety of sizes including larger family accommodation.</p> <p>NELFT does not consider that there will be an adverse impact of the Hedgecock Centre not being reprovided as a healthcare facility.</p> <p>It is intended, as part of the NELFT and B&D PCT collaboration for health improvement, that the mental health facilities currently located here will be reprovided primarily in the adjacent B&D PCT Barking Hospital development.</p>	

Acceptable Uses		Commentary		Council's Response
DEV144	Drivers Jonas	On behalf of (where applicable): North East London Foundation Trust		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	Other Community Services	Residential development is the most suitable use on the site. It is suitable for medium density residential development which is supported through PPS3.	The allocation allows health facilities here but also recognises that residential may be appropriate if the existing
Agree	Residential		<p>The site is considered suitable for the provision of dwellings of a variety of sizes including larger family accommodation.</p> <p>NELFT does not consider that there will be an adverse impact of the Hedgecock Centre not being reprovided as a healthcare facility.</p> <p>It is intended, as part of the NELFT and B&D PCT collaboration for health improvement, that the mental health facilities currently located here will be reprovided primarily in the adjacent B&D PCT Barking Hospital development.</p>	

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
DEV144	Tribal MJP	On behalf of (where applicable): North East London Foundation Trust	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The site description provided on page 80 of the site allocations is also incorrect.	The allocation allows health facilities here but also recognises that residential may be appropriate if the existing
DEV144	Drivers Jonas	On behalf of (where applicable): North East London Foundation Trust	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The site description provided on page 80 of the site allocations is also incorrect.	The allocation allows health facilities here but also recognises that residential may be appropriate if the existing

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
DEV144	Tribal MJP	On behalf of (where applicable): North East London Foundation Trust	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		Site should be renamed the Hedgecock Centre site	Name has been changed

DEV144	Drivers Jonas	On behalf of (where applicable): North East London Foundation Trust	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		Site should be renamed the Hedgecock Centre site	Name has been changed

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

DEV144

Tribal MJP

On behalf of (where applicable:)

North East London Foundation Trust

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

This has not been
included as it is
likely to remain in
its current use for
the foreseeable
future

MEM1

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

I feel the area is already dense with housing
developments and what the borough needs is
community facilities.

The allocation
allows health
facilities here but
also recognises
that residential
may be appropriate
if the existing

Disagree

Acceptable Uses			Commentary	Council's Response
RES174			On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Keep current use	Other	Should definitely only be used for health facilities as it was first designated to be. A little while ago we were told a new maternity/birthing unit was to be there. Associated parking is necessary.	This has not been included as it is likely to remain in its current use for the foreseeable future
	Health Services			
Disagree				
RES401			On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services			The allocation allows health facilities here but also recognises that residential may be appropriate if the existing
Disagree				

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES562	On behalf of (where applicable:)		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	Education Services	The area in Longbridge wards bordered by London Road, Salisbury Avenue, Upney Lane, there is a dearth of nursery/reception/infant places. They travel to Northbury/Eastbury etc. The Barking Hospital site presents the ideal spot for an educational facility.
	Residential		
Partially			This site is not considered appropriate for a education facility.

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES564		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Open Spaces	Health Services	This site together with Champness Road sites are very close together. The proposal for a combined total of 130 dwelling is a lot when you add over 1000 planned for the university site. We need to be sure that there is sufficient infrastructure to support it. Schools, medical facilities, open spaces etc etc.
	Residential		
Partially			The allocation allows health facilities here but also recognises that residential may be appropriate if the existing
RES568		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Education Services	Other Community Services	This piece of land has been left derelict for far too long already.
	Health Services		
Partially			The allocation allows health facilities here but also recognises that residential may be appropriate if the existing
	Health clinic with primary school. Youth Club		

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		15	Julia Engwell Clinic
ANON11		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Other Community Services	Hall for old people. The elderly cannot get down to Hedgemans Road Community Hall	This site is designated for a new healthcare facility with a small element of housing
Partially			

OTH164		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust Health Services	This site should ebe explicitly designated as suitable for health facilities.	This site is designated for a new healthcare facility with a small element of housing
Disagree			

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES174

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Keep current use

In the past when I had to visit this clinic I found it very useful & helpful. We don't have enough health facilities locally and GPs are very overworked with a big population. Surely it should be kept as a health facility

This site is designated for a new healthcare facility with a small element of housing

Health Services

Disagree

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES566

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Education Services

Leisure and
Entertainment

I am concerned about infant schools in my area. I think more infant schools should be built or improved on the existing ones in Mayesbrook Ward.

This site is designated for a new healthcare facility with a small element of housing

Residential

The Woodward Hall, Julia Engwell Clinic and library can be moved or merged with other existing facilities.

Agree

I agreed with this site being considered as residential area. The Julia Engwell clinic could be moved in the now incomplected clinic by Porters Avenue

This site can also be considered for youth community services because this borough lacks youth recreational facilities.

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

Council's Response

RES570

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Education Services

Other Community Services

As long as they demolish the clinic and make some new development, I would suggest that it is better to keep it as a health centre.

This site is designated for a new healthcare facility with a small element of housing

Health Services

Julia Engwell can be improved and make a big swimming pool so that kids can have something to do. And the swimming should be free or affordable.

Julia Engwell Clinic is an old clinic which need some improvements. Better improve it

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES581		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Keep current use	I believe the Julia Engwell Clinic is very needed in the area. Removing the clinic would mean that people would find it even more difficult to get a Dr's appointment.	This site is designated for a new healthcare facility with a small element of housing
	Health Services	As the population grows, there will be a need for more housing, no doubt, but also to good health facilities. Community services are required especially for the adolescent groups.	
Partially			

Map Reference Number: 16 Goresbrook Leisure Centre

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES174		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Leisure and Entertainment Open Spaces	Keep current use	It is vitally important that this site is kept as a leisure centre with pool and gym and for any other leisure facilities - we don't have enough for all the people in the borough.
Disagree			The allocation recognises that new and improved facilities Barking Riverside will replace this facility

Map Reference Number: 17 **Dagenham Leisure Park**

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES580		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Offices	Food and Drink	The site allows residential provided that the existing leisure facilities are reprovided at Cheauers Lane
	Residential	Leisure and Entertainment	
Partially		<p>The site car park is never fully utilised and is wasted from a developmen perspective.</p> <p>Two of the larger food outlets appear to be regularly closed due to lack of interest.</p> <p>Aside from the bingo hall and bowling alley, the remaining retail food outlets could occupy similar sites as part of now mixed use development consisting of residential, retail, office, community facilities.</p> <p>The site has massive potential as a decent size shopping centre with residential above.</p>	
RES581		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		It would be nice if the flats/if that is what is going to be built were not high rise. More family homes are required.	The Core Strategy requires 40% of new homes to be family housing
Agree			

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:	18	South Dagenham West and Chequers
COMG2	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	The Asdas can be better used.	The site allocation seeks to focus new retail at Merriellands and create a more intimate pedestrian friendly layout
DEV012	AXA Real Estate Investment Managers	On behalf of (where applicable:) AXA Real Estate Investment Managers
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	The site boundary should be amended to reflect the landowners interest, on which a Masterplan would be developed.	The site boundary has been changed accordingly

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
DEV012 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	AXA Real Estate Investment Managers	<p>On behalf of (where applicable): AXA Real Estate Investment Managers</p> <p>Provision should be made for an increase in retail floorspace of around 12,000 sq m.</p> <p>Retail development should be distributed throughout the site, with more traditional high street convenience and comparison goods stores delivered.</p> <p>It is considered that a small amount of local convenience type retail floor space would be appropriate at the southern end of the South Dagenham site, as local stores related to the DLR station.</p>	<p>AXA Real Estate Investment Managers</p> <p>New retail would need to satisfy sequential test and not harm viability and vitality of Dagenham Heathway</p>

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

DEV012

AXA Real Estate
Investment Managers

On behalf of (where applicable): AXA Real Estate Investment Managers

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Re existing PTAL, Axa commissioned an assessment by Steer Davies Gleave of the PTAL level on the site.

This assessment confirmed that the current rating of the site is an average of Levels 2 and 3 with the highest PTAL recorded around Chequers Corner where existing bus routes are concentrated.

The PTAL rating would increase to Level 4 following the delivery of the East London Transit Phase 1b to Dagenham Dock station which is already committed; and any extensions/improvements to local bus routes or further extensions to the East London Transit

The allocation ensure that densities reflect future PTALs but that housing must be phased accordingly

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
DEV012 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	AXA Real Estate Investment Managers	On behalf of (where applicable): AXA Real Estate Investment Managers The list of Potential Uses for each of the Sites identified in Appendix 1 conflicts with those set out in Appendix 2.	AXA Real Estate Investment Managers This has been resolved

	Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
DEV012	AXA Real Estate Investment Managers		On behalf of (where applicable): AXA Real Estate Investment Managers	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Retail	Light Industrial	The range of examples of possible land uses for the site is too narrow. It should be widened to enable a commercially viable scheme to come forward.	The Council considers that the allocation is now sufficiently flexible
Partially	Residential	General Industrial	Axa seeks alterations to the list of 'potential uses' to not only incorporate those land uses set out above but also to include flexibility in the range and quantum of uses that may be acceptable.	
	Visitor Housing	Storage or Distribution	This will enable changing conditions to be responded to as the Masterplan evolves, and ultimately through its delivery.	
	Health Services	Other Community Services		
	Medical, Places of Worship & Sui Generis including retail warehousing, car parking)			

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
OTH164	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	Health facilities should be included in the list of potential uses in addition to proposed uses.	Health facilities now included
Partially			
RES091	Ramblers Association	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		Regarding riverside paths, continue Beam Riverside path down to A13 then west to Dagenham Breach and Breach Lane.	Noted

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES576		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Other	Need facilities for teenagers	Allocation enables community and leisure uses to be provided
Partially			
RES582		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Retail	Open Spaces	The allocation requires implementation of Green Grid. The Council will continue to lobby for ELT Phase 3
	Residential	Health Services	
Partially		There is a need for some open spaces and health services also bus routes are a must as this is an out of way site. A medical centre should also be considered as the site is boarded by an industrial site and an employment site.	

Acceptable Uses**Commentary****Council's Response**

RES583

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Residential

Retain and redevelop as sheltered accommodation.

Sheltered accommodation is not included

STA007

London Borough of Havering

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Partially

The I & O report gives no description to the proposed use of the Chequer's Corner part of the site. ELT is proposed to run along the A1306 and this will be an important project to improve public transport provision.

If ELT is ultimately to be routed along the A1306, then it would be sensible for the Chequer's Corner site to be used for housing.

The allocation encourages a landmark building at Chequers Corner to reinforce the Dagenham Heathway/Chequer

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

STA011

The Environment
Agency

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

The site contains the Gores Brook. In addition to the application of the sequential test, any proposed development should be set back to provide an eight metre buffer zone measures from bank top along the Goresbrook.

This has been
included

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA029	London Development Agency	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The site boundary should be amended to accurately reflect land ownership in this location, which will be subject to a comprehensive masterplan.	Has been amended accordingly
<hr/>			
STA029	London Development Agency	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		PTAL levels have been assessed by consultants on behalf of Axa. The assessment indicates that current PTAL levels for the site are 2-3. Planned public transport improvements (DLR and East London Transit) has the potential to rise to Level 4.	Noted
Partially			
	The potential use should reflect the site's role as a residential-led development		

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The proposals will support the regeneration of the Merrielands Retail Park and a new residential-led mixed use quarter and is thus supported by LTGDC. However, consideration should be given to non-noise sensitive uses being located close to the elevated A13.	Allocation recognises need to mitigate noise along the A13 through appropriate design solutions
Agree			
<hr/>			
Map Reference Number:	19	Kuehne and Nagel Site	

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA002 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Greater London Authority	On behalf of (where applicable): Although site 19 could have freight uses; these are not likely to be associated with a rail-connected logistics site, as rail connections are poor.	This site is now zoned as Strategic Industrial Land

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
<p>STA002</p> <p>Does consultee agree with proposed use?</p>	<p>Greater London Authority</p>	<p>On behalf of (where applicable:)</p> <p>This site has been excluded from the SIL framework as having potential for employment/mixed use/transport uses. It is also flagged as a potential housing site.</p> <p>The GLA would like to see further evidence/justification for this change in terms of potential employment land loss, particularly land suitable for logistics.</p> <p>The GLA would like to have further discussions on this.</p>	<p>This site is now zoned as Strategic Industrial Land</p>

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA002	Greater London Authority	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		A key strategic issue regarding this SIL is its potential us for freight interchange. Site 100 (which encompasses sites 113, 24 and 19) identifies its potential as a strategic rail freight interchange. This strategic potential should be more explicitly in the potential uses for Sites 114, 24 and 19	The proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange excludes site 19
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The designation should specify what 'mixed uses' would be acceptable.	This site is now zoned as Strategic Industrial Land
Agree			

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		20	South Dagenham East
OTH164	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	Health facilities should be included in the list of potential uses in addition to proposed uses.	Health facilities are now included
Partially			

RES091	Ramblers Association	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		Regarding riverside paths, continue Beam Riverside path down to A13 then west to Dagenham Breach and Breach Lane.	Noted

27 March 2009		Page 50 of 170	

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES576		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Other	Need facilities for teenagers	This will be dealt with in the detailed masterplanning of the site
Partially			
RES578		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Retail	Open Spaces	Noted
	Residential	Food and Drink	
Partially	Leisure and Entertainment		

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES582

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Noted

Agree

STA007

London Borough of
Havering

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

This site adjoins the Havering boundary and the Beam Park site which is identified SSA11 in our adopted Site Specific Allocations DPD.
SSA11 states that residential and ancillary education, community, leisure, recreation and retail uses will be allowed within the Beam Park site.
SSA11 also proposes a new station to be created on the c2c line at Beam Park.

Allocation now recognises the importance of relationship to sites in Havering

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA029	London Development Agency	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		In addition to the uses stated in the details to Site 20, the car parking for the Ford pressing plant should be included. This is an important element, and will ensure the Ford plant is adequately supported. The transport improvements tested by TfL suggest that the site has the potential to reach a PTAL Level 4.	Car parking now included. Reference is made to future PTALs
Partially			
<hr/>			
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		LTGDC supports the designation	Support welcomed
Agree			

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		23	Lyon Business Park
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		LTGDC supports the designation	Support welcomed
Agree			
Map Reference Number:		24	Rippleside Commercial Estate

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
DEV154	Jacobs	On behalf of (where applicable): Transport for London	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		We request that the site boundary is revised to exclude land required to deliver the proposed A13 RR scheme, or LBBD formulate policies as part of the proposed Commercial Estate allocation which would specifically safeguard the required land.	The Renwick Road land is covered by SSA SM34 which identifies need to provided link road to Lodge Avenue
	Other		
Partially			

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA002	Greater London Authority	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		A key strategic issue regarding this SIL is its potential us for freight interchange. Site 100 (which encompasses sites 113, 24 and 19) identifies its potential as a strategic rail freight interchange. This strategic potential should be more explicitly in the potential uses for Sites 114, 24 and 19	There is now a dedicated allocation for the freight interchange
STA002	Greater London Authority	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		This site could be used for activities to support a rail freight terminal.	As above
Disagree			

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		LTGDC supports the designation. There should also be a 'Barking Reach Gateway Site'.	The freight interchange allocation recognise the need for attractive frontage along Renwick Road as it
Agree			

Map Reference Number: 25 Eastern End Thames View

STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		LTGDC supports the designation	Support welcomed
Agree			

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		26	River Road/Cash & Carry Warehouse
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		LTGDC supports the designation	Support welcomed
Agree			
Map Reference Number:		27	Lymington Fields

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
DEV157	Savills	On behalf of (where applicable): English Partnerships	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The emphasis should be made that the predominant land use will be residential, which will more closely reflect the proposed development scheme that the Council has resolved to permit. We therefore object to the wording as proposed.	Allocation has been amended
Disagree			
<hr/>			
OTH164	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust	On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		This site is not identified as having potential for health facilities. A broader discussion about health facilities in this area is important.	This has since been resolved. Health facilities are not included.
Disagree	Health Services		
<hr/>			
27 March 2009			Page 59 of 170

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES191	On behalf of (where applicable:)		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Open Spaces	Health Services	Access to Lymington Fields will be taken from Whalebone Lane
	Residential	Education Services	
Partially	Other Community Services	I live in Lymington Road and believe that the proposed development has a flawed aspect. Because of the adjoining industrial estates, little or no consideration has been allowed for new roads that will take away the constant stream of heavy traffic that uses the existing domestic streets. The new development offers the perfect opportunity to include a new and carefully designed traffic management system in and out of area directly from and to Whalebone Lane.	
	Youth Centres. Centres for other community activities incl. art groups.		

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES585		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Open Spaces	Health Services	National policy directs retail to town centres. Whalebone Lane has been designated for local community
	Residential	Education Services	
	Other Community Services		
Partially	Adult education. Youth Club/organised activity centre for 12 - 18 yr olds. This end		
Map Reference Number:		28	Sanofi Site Two

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

DEV143

Jones Lang LaSalle

On behalf of (where applicable:) Sanofi Aventis

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

The site is an existing industrial use which is now vacant (former pharmaceutical use).

Sanofi Aventis agrees that the site should not continue to be allocated as an Employment Area due to employment uses ceasing.

It is suggested the site should be allocated suitable for a "mixed use development, including employment (B1, B2, B8), retail, community and other ancillary facilities.

Allocation addresses this subject to a number of criteria

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
OTH164	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		This area is currently least well served by primary care facilities. Site is identified as acceptable to use for employment land. A mix of employment and healthcare would bring benefits to the local community.	Allocations includes healthcare and employment
	Health Services	We propose this site has potential for health care facilities.	
Partially			

	Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
OTH164	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			This site is too small to support a modern primary healthcare facility so we suggest this designation is removed.	This site has been removed because it is too small to warrant inclusion
Disagree				
<hr/>				
RES191			On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	Other Community Services	This area must be retained in Council ownership and developed for the benefit of the immediate residents. This area should not be considered in any land disposals programmes.	This disposal involves the selling of disused toilets
	Residential			
Partially				
	Childrens designated and safe play areas.			

Acceptable Uses		Commentary		Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		30	Champness Road	
DEV144	Drivers Jonas	On behalf of (where applicable):		Barking, Havering and Redbridge NHS Tru
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	Other Community Services	Site is suitable for family housing. It is suitable for medium density residential development which is supported through PPS3.	Site is identified for residential and community facilities
	Residential		BHRT does not consider that there is an undue adverse impact if the Upney Lane Centre is not provided as a healthcare facility.	
Agree			As part of wider improvements in healthcare in LBBD and beyond, an application was submitted in March 2008 for the upgrading of facilities at the main Barking Hospital site.	
			Upney Lane Centre may in the future be identified as being surplus to present healthcare requirements.	

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
DEV144	Tribal MJP	On behalf of (where applicable): Barking, Havering and Redbridge NHS Tru	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		Site should be renamed the "Upney Lane Centre"	Name has been changed

DEV144	Tribal MJP	On behalf of (where applicable): Barking, Havering and Redbridge NHS Tru	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The site description provided is incorrect.	Site description amended

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

DEV144

Drivers Jonas

On behalf of (where applicable:) Barking, Havering and Redbridge NHS Tru

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Site should be renamed the "Upney Lane Centre"

Name has been
changed

	Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
DEV144	Tribal MJP		On behalf of (where applicable): Barking, Havering and Redbridge NHS Tru	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	Other Community Services	Site is suitable for family housing. It is suitable for medium density residential development which is supported through PPS3.	Site is identified for residential and community facilities
	Residential		BHRT does not consider that there is an undue adverse impact if the Upney Lane Centre is not provided as a healthcare facility.	
Agree			As part of wider improvements in healthcare in LBBB and beyond, an application was submitted in March 2008 for the upgrading of facilities at the main Barking Hospital site.	
			Upney Lane Centre may in the future be identified as being surplus to present healthcare requirements.	

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
<p>DEV144</p> <p>Does consultee agree with proposed use?</p>	<p>Drivers Jonas</p>	<p>On behalf of (where applicable): Barking, Havering and Redbridge NHS Tru</p> <p>The site description provided is incorrect.</p>	<p>Site description amended</p>
<p>MEM1</p> <p>Does consultee agree with proposed use?</p> <p>Disagree</p>		<p>On behalf of (where applicable):</p> <p>I would like the minor injuries unit at Upney Lane to be used for children's centre/nursery for Longbridge ward as we are in desperate need for such facilities.</p>	<p>Site allocation enables site to be used for community facilities</p>

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES564		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Education Services	I do not see why we would want to demolish an existing medical centre which is of great benefit to the community.	Improvements at Barking Hospital will compensate for loss of this facility.
	Health Services	The area already been built heavily upon.	
Disagree		It also states the flood risk is at high level 3a.	
RES568		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Residential	I am in agreement that this site should be housing if the Barking Hospital site replaces it.	Noted
		The problem is that it is a waste of money to demolish one and rebuild a new one a 1/4 of a mile down the road especially when the one already there is not old.	
Agree			

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		31	Bromhall Road Surgery
OTH164	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		We do not need this site identified as available for health facilities	Site is allocated for housing
Partially			

RES570		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Leisure and Entertainment Other Community Services	Education Services	Bromhall Road Depot should be demolished and build something for the kids which can make them busy. This help to keep them out from streets.
			Site is allocated for housing

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES583	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	General Industrial	Noted
Agree		

RES584	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Leisure and Entertainment Light Industrial	Keep current use
Agree		Noted

Map Reference Number:	32	Alderman Avenue Garages

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			Noted
No comment			

Map Reference Number:	33	Beamway Garages
------------------------------	-----------	------------------------

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
ANON2		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Other Community Uses	The site could have a workshop uses perhaps to fix pedal cycles, motorbikes - to have a music workshop. Somewhere for the young to learn something useful and in which they have an interest.	Site is not considered appropriate for these uses to the close proximity to houses
	Open Spaces		
Partially			

Map Reference Number: **35** **Burford Close Garages**

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES174

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Keep current use

As parking is such a problem and will get worse, all
garages should be use for that specific purpose or
for storage.

This is likely to be
added to nearby
public open space

Disagree

STA030

London Thames
Gateway Urban

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

No comment

Noted

Map Reference Number:

38

Chelmer Cresenct Garages

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES174	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	As parking is such a problem and will get worse, all garages should be use for that specific purpose or for storage.	Allocation makes clear that any development would need to demonstrate that there is no longer a requirement for
Keep current use		
Disagree		

STA030	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
London Thames Gateway Urban		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		Noted
No comment		

Map Reference Number:	39	Curzon Crescent Garages

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES174		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Keep current use	As parking is such a problem and will get worse, all garages should be use for that specific purpose or for storage.	Allocation makes clear that any development would need to demonstrate that there is no longer a requirement for
Disagree			
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			Noted
No comment			
Map Reference Number:	40	Earl's Walk Car Park	

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES584	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	I believe this site would be perfect for sheltered bungalow style housing for the elderly or possibly disabled. It already has a natural barrier around the area and the entrance could be gated for security. Elderly people need to feel secure and protected and if designed correctly would be ideal for this use.	This site has not been included
Residential		
Partially		

Map Reference Number:	42	Maplestead Road Car Park

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

Council's Response

RES561

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Other Community Services
Offices

Keep current use

Agree

Any development proposals would need to demonstrate that any impact on on street parking can be managed as

RES562

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Agree

Any development proposals would need to demonstrate that any impact on on street parking can be managed as

Map Reference Number:

43

52 Markyate Depot

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES566		On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Leisure and Entertainment Other Community Services	This site can be used for youth community services with recreational facilities available.	Is identified for a Children's Centre
No comment			

Map Reference Number: 45 Rogers Road Depot

MEM3		On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		Residents are concerned that this site is being targeted by local youths. Need for more security. It is important something is done with this site.	Is identified for housing

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		47	Garage Site Roycraft Avenue
RES174		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Keep current use	As parking is such a problem and will get worse, all garages should be use for that specific purpose or for storage.	Any development proposals would need to demonstrate that any impact on on street parking can be managed as
Disagree			

STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			Noted
No comment			

27 March 2009			Page 84 of 170

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:	49	Stansgate Road Garages
NMP2	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	All you need to do is provide lighting, CCTV and tidy it up and then it is good to keep it in garage use.	Site is allocated for housing
Disagree		

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

Council's Response

NMP2

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

This site is being used by jobs. One resident used to have a garage here but gave it up as it was too dangerous. Others agreed they were a problem.

Allocation seeks to maintain and enhance the retail parade

Map Reference Number:

50

Garage site - Thornhill Gardens

RES564

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Residential

Support welcomed

Agree

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES568		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Residential	Out of the way site not suitable for anything other than housing.	Support welcomed
Partially			

Map Reference Number: 51 Waterbeach Gardens

ANON10		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Leisure and Entertainment	Sports centre, leisure centre	Site is to small for a sports centre
Partially			

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		55	Rear of Heathway Shops
ANON12		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Open Spaces	Health Services	Site already has permission for residential
	Offices	Education Services	
Partially	Other Community Services		

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
ANON2		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Other Community Uses Open Spaces	Leisure and Entertainment	Site already has permission for residential
Partially			

Map Reference Number: 56 Rear of 293 - 331 Barnstable Avenue

STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			Noted
No comment			

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		57	Garage site rear of Wivenhoe Road Si
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			Noted
No comment			
Map Reference Number:		58	Garage site rear of Wivenhoe Road

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			Noted
No comment			

	Map Reference Number:	59	Stebbing Way Garage Site	
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?				Noted
No comment				

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		60	Garage site - rear of 13 -15 Highland
RES583		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Other Community Services Residential		Site is identified as having potential for residential
Agree			

RES584		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Open Spaces	I believe this site should be used as amenity green with childrens and adult play facilities (see Upminster Park (corbets tey road) for ideas). Knock down the ugly concrete walls surrounding the area to open it up and look better.	Site is adjacent to central park and eastbrook end country park
Partially			

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		61	Brockelbank Lodge
OTH164	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	Health facilities should be explicitly designated under community facilities.	Site is identified for healthcare
Partially			

RES191		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Keep current use		Site is identified for healthcare
Disagree			

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES561	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Keep current use Other Community Services	Noted
Agree		
RES562	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Already built on.	Site is identified for sheltered housing
Partially		
Map Reference Number:	64	Lambourne Gardens

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES561	On behalf of (where applicable:)		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services	Education Services	Site is considered too small to warrant inclusion
	Light Industrial	Keep current use	
Agree			
Map Reference Number:		68	St George's Centre

	Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
ANON4		On behalf of (where applicable:)		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Offices	Health Services	This site could also be used for housing. There would be no problem with access to the area. This is a prime location.	Site is identified for new primary school
	Residential	Other Community Uses	This was Halbutt Street School. It is grossly underused and should be redeveloped for optimum use of the land.	
Partially				
	Rental: Housing for public sector workers i.e. nurses etc. or low cost shared			
OTH164	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust	On behalf of (where applicable:)		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			We would like this to be designated as suitable for health facilities.	Site is identified for new primary school
	Health Services			
Partially				

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES563

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Education Services

Site is identified for
new primary school

Partially

Map Reference Number:

71

High Road Car Sale Land (site 1 of 2)

RES585

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Site not included
as likely to remain
in existing use

Agree

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:	72	High Road Car Sale Lane (site 2 of 2)
RES585	On behalf of (where applicable:)	Site not included as likely to remain in existing use
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		
Agree		
Map Reference Number:	74	UEL

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
ANON9		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Other Community Services Education Services	Leisure and Entertainment	Needs nursery, primary, secondary schools. 2 schools in total. Needs car park and play space/sports pitch. Keep education in the site. Difficulty getting children in school.
Disagree			Allocation reflects existing planning permission
RES559		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Offices Residential	Light Industrial Storage or Distribution	Allocation reflects existing planning permission
Agree	Retail Food and Drink	Health Services Education Services	

Acceptable Uses		Commentary		Council's Response
RES560		On behalf of (where applicable:)		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Health Services Residential	Education Services	Bus route 87 was taken away so there is less transport available. The developer has been asked to pay towards transport. Why should they pay? Transport is very bad at the moment. We cannot get on the buses now. It will get even worse when and if this development is built.	Allocation reflects existing planning permission
Partially				

STA013	English Heritage	On behalf of (where applicable:)		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			The main building on this site is very impressive and we have strongly supported retention of the main building.	The main university building will be retained

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		78	58 - 62 Church Street
RES576		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Other	Parking	Site is identified as having potential for housing
Partially			
Map Reference Number:		79	Former Garage Site, Blake Avenue

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES562

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Residential

This is a site of
importance for
nature conservation

Partially

Map Reference Number:

80

245A High Road

RES585

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Agree

Site is identified as
having potential for
hosing

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		81	Goresbrook Fields
DEV154	Jacobs	On behalf of (where applicable:) Transport for London	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		We request that the site boundary is revised to exclude land required to deliver the bus link for the A13 RR scheme, or LBBD formulate policies as part of the Goresbrook allocations which would specifically safeguard the required land. Under 'other relevant information' please make reference to the A13 RR scheme	Other relevant information changed
Partially			
Map Reference Number:		82	Goresbrook Village

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
DEV154	Jacobs	On behalf of (where applicable): Transport for London	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		We request that the site boundary is revised to exclude land required to deliver the bus link for the A13 RR scheme, or LBBD formulate policies as part of the Goresbrook allocations which would specifically safeguard the required land. Under 'other relevant information' please make reference to the A13 RR scheme	Other relevant information changed
Partially			
Map Reference Number:		83	Freshwater Road

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
DEV157	Savills	<p>On behalf of (where applicable): English Partnerships</p>	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		<p>In acknowledging the employment stauts of the site, we would like to ensure that any future developments will have regard to the residential scheme being undertaken at Lymington Fields.</p>	<p>This is a locally significant industrial site and therefore the acceptable uses are covered by the Core Strategy.</p>
Disagree		<p>We request that there be no further intensifying of the site, particularly to the southern boundary, and that the uses are carefully controlled so as to protect the residential amenity of the devleopment on EP's land.</p>	
		<p>We therefore object to the wording proposed.</p>	

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES091

Ramblers Association

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

The site does not show Public Right of Way fp
no.10 to fp over railway.

This is shown in
Council's draft
Rights of Way
Improvement Plan

Acceptable Uses			Commentary	Council's Response
RES191	On behalf of (where applicable:)			
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Light Industrial	Storage or Distribution	Large unoccupied area in Freshwater Road/Selinas cane adjacent to hoo hong sites is an unsightly rubbish dump. This industrial site badly needs a multi-storey parking complex for workers on the site.	Access to Lymington Fields will be gained from Whalebone Lane
	Offices	Retail	Parking in the only access road is not controlled and the scene of many road accidents.	
Partially	Open Spaces	Health Services	Traffic management in, out and through this site is totally insufficient. A new road system is essential and should be linked with a new access road for the proposed Lymington Fields development.	
		Other	If this were planned properly it could encompass a bus route serving the estate and connecting to local railway stations.	
Map Reference Number:		84	Sanofi Site Three and Four	

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES091	Ramblers Association	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The map should show the the permissive path northwards from path no. 21 to Foxland Crescent and further north the path NE through the playing fields.	This is shown in Council's draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan
<hr/>			
RES583		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Leisure and Entertainment Open Spaces	It would be useful to retain the football and rugby and cricket pitches as these are dwindling in this part of London	Not included. Future uses will need to satisfy Green Belt policy

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES584		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Leisure and Entertainment Open Spaces	Ideal use to continue for football pitches, basket ball courts, cricket, rugby, tennis and possibly go carts etc. Open air swimming pool or paddling pool for children privately run.	Not included. Future uses will need to satisfy Green Belt policy

Map Reference Number: 86 Barking Riverside

COMG3		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		Increasing amounts of sewage will be produced from the new housing. Need to address the stench. Where will the new roads go.	This will be addressed

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

COMG3

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

100 seater religious meeting place is not big enough on this site.

Faith groups moving into the areas is costly. 3 Faith groups are thinking of working together to be able to fund this in Barking Riverside.

Council has allocated Whalebone Lane for local community uses

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

DEV154

Jacobs

On behalf of (where applicable): Transport for London

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

We request that a reference is made in the table, under 'other relevant information' to highlight the gateway into Barking Riverside which will be created by the A13 Renwick Road junction improvement (A13 RR Scheme).

This scheme is fundamental to the delivery of Barking Riverside in accordance with the Section 106 Agreement.

Renwick Road Improvement scheme is highlighted

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
OTH170	The Highways Agency	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		<p>Given the scale of the Barking Riverside dev and its close proximity to Barking's SILs, the HA is concerned that their combined travel demand will have an adverse impact on the SRN.</p> <p>The existing PTAL is low and the developments are in close proximity to TfL's A13 junctions with River Road and Renwick Road.</p> <p>Any long distance car trips commuting to the east are likely to use this route, which leads directly to the HA's section of the A13 (between the A1306 and the M25) and the already severely congested M25 junction 30.</p>	Development of site is tied to Renwick Road improvement scheme

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
OTH172	National Grid	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		<p>The site surrounds Barking substation, which is owned and operated by National Grid, but the substation is not included within the red line boundary.</p> <p>The site is 'operational land' and there may be a need for further essential utility development at the site, and this issue should be acknowledged in later stages of the SSA DPD.</p> <p>National Grid's high voltage overhead electricity transmission lines which are routed via Barking substation are located within the Barking Riverside Site.</p> <p>Potential developers on the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to seek to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ, because of the strategic nature of our national network.</p>	This is highlighted in the allocation

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES091

Ramblers Association

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

The site does not show public rights of way No. 47 overlooking the River Thames and north alongside the Goresbrook. Please verify the legal route ast my copy of the definitive map (dwg. TP.17.75.B of March 1976).

the current O.S Explorer sheet 162 of 2006, shows it as being on the east side.

This is covered in the Council's draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA027 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Thames Water Property Services Ltd	<p>On behalf of (where applicable):</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the River Thames. The area is drained via Gascoigne Road Pumping Station to Beckton STW. The sewers are combined. It is not known how much of the existing surface water drains to Beckton</p> <p>Therefore the net increase of the development cannot be defined. It is assumed that surface water will go to the adjacent River Thames.</p> <p>The foul system has been checked but a further impact study will be required to check the system baed on additional growth proposed in the borough; pumping station and network improvements may be necessary.</p>	Noted

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		LTGDC supports the designation	Support welcomed
Agree			

Map Reference Number:	90	Alfreds Gardens Gardens	
RES174		On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		This should be kept as it is for the use of grages as if they are demolished parking will become an even greater problem in the area than it already is.	Allocation makes clear that any development would need to demonstrate that there is no longer a requirement for
Disagree	Keep current use		

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES579	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	As these garages are all in use and in a reasonable state of repair the impact on parking space in the local area will compound the extremely important issue of parking that already exists	Allocation makes clear that any development would need to demonstrate that there is no longer a requirement for
Keep current use	I also strongly feel that this will apply to every other garage site in the borough that has been included in this proposal, most of which have been wrongly described as disused when they are very clearly not.	
Disagree	I also feel that if the local authority had properly maintained the garage areas in the borough rather than deliberately allow them to fall into disrepair more revenue would have been received by the authority in many previous years and this situation would not be apparent.	

Map Reference Number:	94	Land at Margaret Bondfield Avenue

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES561	On behalf of (where applicable:)		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Offices	Keep current use	This site has not been included
	Residential		
Agree			

Map Reference Number: 96 Robin Hood pub

COMG2	On behalf of (where applicable:)		
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		This site can be better used than just being disused.	Site is identified for mixed use residential/retail

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES559			
On behalf of (where applicable:)			
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Offices	Food and Drink	Site is identified for mixed use residential/retail
	Residential	Leisure and Entertainment	
Agree			

RES560			
On behalf of (where applicable:)			
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			Site is identified for mixed use residential/retail
	Retail	Why has the site been left for a long time if planning permission has already been granted. Too many plans for flats/accommodation been given locally.	
Partially			

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		Site 96 is identified as 75 on the plan.	Noted

Map Reference Number: **98** **Renwich Road Junction Improvement**

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
DEV154	Jacobs	On behalf of (where applicable): Transport for London	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		<p>We request that the following is included in the site boundary: the steel approach road works which provide linkage to between Renwick Road and Lodge Avenue roundabout</p> <p>2. the highways works required for the grade separation of RR at the A13 junction including westbound off slip road, eastbound on slip road, bus link and bridge over the A13.</p> <p>We also request the boundaries of proposed allocations Sites 24, 81, 82, 100, 114 are reviewed to exclude areas required to deliver the A13 RR improvement.</p>	Site boundary has been amended accordingly

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
DEV154	Jacobs	On behalf of (where applicable): Transport for London	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		<p>The area on the map does not include all of the land required for the necessary improvements.</p> <p>Please extend the site to include all the additional land required for delivery of the A13/Renwick Road junction improvement scheme.</p> <p>Please revise other site allocations boundaries to remove overlapping land use designations.</p>	This is covered by SM34
<hr/>			
OTH170	The Highways Agency	On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			Noted
<hr/>			
It is suggested that the evaluation should take into account any modelling work			

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		This site is not identified on the main plan but is shown within the schedule of sites; it would be useful if this were shown on the main plan to provide context with other major development sites which surround it.	This will be shown on the proposals map

Map Reference Number:	99	A13 Pedestrian/public transport north
------------------------------	-----------	--

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
OTH170	The Highways Agency	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		This is likely to improve the north-south accessibility in the area and encourage sustainable transport which is in line with PPS13.	The suitability of the location for this interchange has been confirmed by the PBA Logistic studies which was commissioned by
Agree			
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		This site is not identified on the main plan but is shown within the schedule of sites; it would be useful if this were shown on the main plan to provide context with other major development sites which surround it.	This will be shown on the proposals map

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		100	Freight Infrastructure at RR/Ripple R
DEV154	Jacobs	On behalf of (where applicable): Transport for London	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		We request that the boundary of the proposed site is revised to exclude land required to deliver the A13 RR Junction Improvement Scheme or formulate policies as part of the proposed freight infrastructure allocation to specifically safeguard the land.	Noted
Partially	Other	It is important to the functionality of the proposed junction improvements that associated works to RR and the westward extension of Steel Approach are not compromised by site allocation 100. These works are an integral apart of the overall transport solution to regenerate the area and provide safe and efficient access into Barking Riverside (as well as provision of a north/south bus link).	

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

OTH170

The Highways Agency

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Partially

The suitability of the location for this interchange should be clearly explained, and the impacts of the proposed freight infrastructure at Renwick Road/Ripple Road must be fully assessed.

The HA would like to see how the proposed freight interchange at Renwick Road might be achieved, and mitigation measures considered.

Support welcomed

While the HA is supportive of a SRFI which
might assist in minimising long distance

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES091

Ramblers Association

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Public Right of Way FP no. 47 should be shown on the base map as although it is not Definitive within the site boundary, a proposal was made some years ago that a link to Dagenham Dock Station by following the Gores Brook from Choats Road up to the

This is covered by the Council's draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA002 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Greater London Authority	On behalf of (where applicable:) It will be more appropriate to designate the site's potential uses for 'rail freight terminal(s) and ancillary manufacturing/logistics uses'	This has been addressed

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA007 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	London Borough of Havering	<p>On behalf of (where applicable):</p> <p>The site description does not refer to a new passenger rail station at Renwick Road despite the fact that it is referred to in paragraph 6.6. of the report.</p> <p>The LBH does not support the location of a new station on the C2C line at Renwick Road and is committed to a new station at Beam Park to support the development at South Dagenham and Rainham sites.</p> <p>The area around Renwick Road will be well served by public transport and existing and new communities are likely to find better stations for short journeys (DLR and ELT) for medium journeys (District Line), and long journeys (Barking).</p> <p>By contrast, Beam Park is not served by high volume public transport so Beam Park would be the only station within its catchment and therefore the only public transport option for the new and existing community in the area.</p>	<p>The Council recognises these findings but given that the LDF covers a fifteen year period and given the current</p>

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
<p>STA007</p> <p>Does consultee agree with proposed use?</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>London Borough of Havering</p>	<p>On behalf of (where applicable:)</p> <p>LBH strongly supports the option of a rail freight interchange being located on the site.</p> <p>It is considered that the substantial size of the Ripple Lane rail site contained within this location and its established historical rail use offers significant potential for development of enhanced or new intermodal facilities.</p> <p>While it is recognised that there are appreciable road access difficulties at present, it is understood that these are being addressed through a phased programme associated with development at Barking Riverside.</p> <p>The availability of sapce for rail-served warehousing and the potential ability, with infrastructure improvements, to accommodate UIC-garage wagons in future - and therefore maximise possible usage of the HS1 link - underlines the site's appeal this use.</p>	<p>Site is allocated as a freight interchange</p>

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
<p>STA030</p> <p>Does consultee agree with proposed use?</p>	<p>London Thames Gateway Urban</p>	<p>On behalf of (where applicable:)</p> <p>Site 100 is correctly identified as the site for rail freight interchange. However the site boundary also includes a significant housing area around Julia Gardens; this appears to be a drafting error.</p> <p>Site 100 also subsumes Site 114 which identifies much of the same land for employment purposes. It may be appropriate to cluster these plans together in a single drawing showing the infrastructure, freight and employment uses and their relationships.</p> <p>LTGDC supports the designation and have commissioned a logistics freight study to further project development.</p>	<p>This has been addressed</p>

Map Reference Number:	102	Frizlands Business Centre	

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA002 Does consultee agree with proposed use? Disagree	Greater London Authority	On behalf of (where applicable): In line with London Plan policy 4A.22, DPD policies should safeguard all existing waste management sites (unless appropriate compensatory provision is made). The Frizlands site should therefore be safeguarded.	This allocation has been removed due to the progress with the business centre
<hr/> <p>Map Reference Number: 103 Westbury Arms</p> <hr/>			

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES568

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Education Services

Health Services

This property has stood empty for many years and
is a blot on the landscape in the borough, on the
main thoroughfare.

Now allocated for
healthcare

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES575		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Light Industrial	Open Spaces	Now allocated for healthcare
	Residential	Health Services	
	Other Community Uses	Leisure and Entertainment	
Partially			
Map Reference Number:		104	Wood Lane Sports Centre

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

Council's Response

NMP2

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Comments: should just do what we have; increase the driving range. Can the air cadets use it?

Not included as in Green Belt

RES585

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Keep current use

Disagree

This site currently provides essential services for children and youth groups. Care needs to be taken to ensure that this is totally considered in the new Becontree Heath development.

'Kids Kingdom' for instance is a very important resource for local childrens parties.

Not included as in Green Belt

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA002 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Greater London Authority	<p>On behalf of (where applicable:)</p> <p>This site is a designated Green Belt. Policy 3D.9 of the London Plan and PPG2 clearly indicated that Boroughs should maintain the protection of London's green belt.</p> <p>Proposals for alterations to green belt boundaries should be considered through the DPD process in accordance with Government guidance in PPG2.</p> <p>The GLA understand this stite was not identified in the 2004 housing capacity study for housing purposes.</p> <p>Therefore the Council needs to demonstrate what exceptional circumstances justify its redesignation as a housing site.</p>	Not included as in Green Belt
<hr/>			
Map Reference Number:	105	Whalebone Lane South Retail Park	

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
DEV157	Savills	On behalf of (where applicable): English Partnerships	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		We note that retail has been dropped as a potential use. It has not been explained why this is the case and given that it is unlikely retail will be lost from the site in the foreseeable future, we consider retail could be added to potential uses. We therefore object to the wording as proposed.	Retail which satisfies PPS6 tests would be allowed
Disagree			
<hr/>			
RES140		On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Other Community Uses Retail	Community hall/shops	Site is identified for local community facilities as well as retail
Partially			

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
RES576		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Leisure and Entertainment	Sports centre for young people e.g. football, billiards, table tennis.	Site is identified at nearby Becontree Heath for a leisure centre
Partially			
RES585		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Retail Residential	Other Community Services Leisure and Entertainment	See comment for site 27
Partially	Other		Site is identified for local community facilities as well as retail
Map Reference Number:		108	Sanofi Site One

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
DEV143	Jones Lang LaSalle	On behalf of (where applicable): Sanofi Aventis	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		<p>For the foreseeable future, sanofi aventis considers that this site will remain in industrial use and therefore agrees with the allocation as a locally significant industrial location.</p> <p>However, it is considered the site is not a suitable location for the installation of a wind turbine.</p>	Site is retained for employment uses
Partially		<p>The site description is incorrect. The site is in fact currently used for pharmaceutical industrial uses.</p>	

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
<p>DEV143</p> <p>Does consultee agree with proposed use?</p> <p>Partially</p>	<p>Jones Lang LaSalle</p>	<p>On behalf of (where applicable): Sanofi Aventis</p> <p>Sanofi Aventis would like to see the removal of the suggestion of wind turbines on this site. Primarily this is due to sanofi aventis business requirements to retain all of th land at site 108 in industrial/employment use for the foreseeable future. Therefore, an allocation for wind turbines would not be suitable in this location and most importantly is not in line with PPS22, which indicates at para. 6 that LPAs should only allocated sites in plans where developer has indicated interest.</p>	<p>Site is retained for employment uses</p>

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
OTH164	Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		This area is currently least well served by primary care facilities. Site is identified as acceptable to use for employment land. A mix of employment and healthcare would bring benefits to the local community.	Adjacent site has been identified as suitable for healthcare
	Health Services	We propose this site has potential for health care facilities.	
Partially			

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES091	Ramblers Association	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The map should show the the permissive path northwards from path no. 21 to Foxland Crescent and further north the path NE through the playing fields.	This is covered by Draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan
RES583		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	General Industrial	Site should be retained as general industrial. But I would be opposed to the use of a wind turbines in a residential area.	Site is retained for employment uses
Partially			

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES584	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	100% no wind turbines. Definitely wrong area. Need to be near river and Fords etc. Light industrial or new swimming pool. Health centre complex and gymnasium	Site is retained for employment uses
Disagree		

Map Reference Number:	109	Chadwell Heath Industrial Land

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
DEV157	Savills	<p>On behalf of (where applicable): English Partnerships</p>	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		<p>We object to the designation for the site as a locally significant industrial site. The reasons for our objections are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the site has poor road access, which inappropriately passes through predominantly residential streets; its use conflict with the surrounding residential properties in the area; and the site is predominantly made of small unit that are often in temporary use, are unregulated and do not generate high levels of employment. <p>We propose that the site is redesignated for a mixed use scheme that would be more sympathetic and compatible with the surrounding residential properties.</p>	<p>Site remains designated as a locally significant industrial site. It provides low cost employment space for SMEs</p>

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES191

On behalf of (where applicable):

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Access to this site is totally insufficient through Kemp Road residential. This access should be redesigned through a new road into Whalebone Lane and in construction with the Lymington Fields development.

The Council is seeking to improve access arrangements in connection with new developments

Agree

Map Reference Number:

110

Ford Stamping Plant

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES582

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Noted

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Agree

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
<p>STA002</p> <p>Does consultee agree with proposed use?</p> <p>Partially</p>	<p>Greater London Authority</p>	<p>On behalf of (where applicable:)</p> <p>This site should also be included within the wider Dagenham Dock SIL. It has been considered as a Locally Significant Site in the document.</p> <p>However, given its size, proximity and relationship with the Dagenham Dock/Ford's sites, merits strategic status, especially when considered against the criteria in paras 4.11 - 4.13 of the Industrial Capacity SPG.</p> <p>The GLA would need to see evidence to the contrary to consider this site as lying outside the SIL framework.</p>	<p>Consistent with the approach along this corridor (including Having) this land is designated as locally significant</p>

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA029	London Development Agency	On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The transport improvement scenarios tested by TfL suggest the site has the potential to achieve a Level 4 rating.	Noted

Map Reference Number: **111** **Dagenham Dock**

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

DEV159

Drivers Jonas LLP

On behalf of (where applicable): CEMEX

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Agree

CEMEX wishes to ensure that their site in this location is preserved for the processing and manufacture of primary and secondary aggregates and associated uses as stated in the Dagenham Dock - SIP IPG (April 2003).

The SSA should identify that a large proportion of the Dagenham Dock area is identified as a Safeguarded Wharf.

This has implications for the area in terms of the suitability of the site for cargo-handling uses, such as inter-port or transshipment movements and freight-related purposes and the transport of waste.

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
OTH172 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	National Grid	<p>On behalf of (where applicable):</p> <p>National Grid's high voltage overhead electricity transmission lines which are routed via Barking substation are located within the Dagenham Dock site,</p> <p>Potential developers on the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to seek to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ, because of the strategic nature of our national network.</p> <p>National grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. For amenity purposes and also for access and maintenance purposes.</p> <p>Where changes to ground levels are proposed beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed.</p>	Dagenham Dock is covered by Core Strategy Policy CE4

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES091

Ramblers Association

On behalf of (where applicable):

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Public Right of Way FP No. 47 not shown. Needs to have a link through Breach Lane to green area on east side of rail tracks (a tunnel under?). Or riverside path or alongside Thunderer Road.

This is covered by Draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan

RES582

On behalf of (where applicable):

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Agree

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

STA002

Greater London
Authority

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

The map on page 13 identifies only Dagenham Dock itself in the SIL, the SIL should from a strategic point of view include also Fords to the east of Dorset Way across to the boundary with Havering up to the railway line.

The pre-submission proposals map shows the correct extent of the SIL at Dagenham Dock

Agree

The site description should also refer to the presence of Safeguarded Wharves on the River Thames.

To avoid confusion, site 111 on page 13 ought to appear after page 15 as it is a SIL.

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA011	The Environment Agency	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The site contains the Buzzards Mouth Sewer and Barking Creek and adjoins the Thames. In addition to the application of the sequential tet, any proposed development should be set back to provide an eight metre buffer zone measured from bank top along the above watercourses and 16 metres from the Thames.	Dagenham Dock is covered by CE4
<hr/>			
STA013	English Heritage	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		NB: jetty no. 4 is statutorily listed.	Noted

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA030 Does consultee agree with proposed use?	London Thames Gateway Urban	<p>On behalf of (where applicable:)</p> <p>There is a discrepancy in the boundary of the site with the adjacent site 133 compared to that indicated on the main plan.</p> <p>LTGDC supports the designation. In addition to industrial use some ancillary office linked to industrial uses could be allocated in order to facilitate the agglomeration of environmental businesses and the development of the Sustainable Industries Park.</p>	Dagenham Dock is covered by CE4

Map Reference Number:	112	River Road/Thames Road Creek Road	

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
OTH172	National Grid	On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		<p>National Grid's high voltage overhead electricity transmission lines which are routed via Barking substation are located within the River Road/Thames Road Creek Road site,</p> <p>Potential developers on the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to seek to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ, because of the strategic nature of our national network.</p> <p>National grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. For amenity purposes and also for access and maintenance purposes.</p> <p>Where changes to ground levels are proposed beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed.</p>	Noted

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES091

Ramblers Association

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Public Right of Way fp no. 161 is not shown and this and fp no. 47 need to be connected as part of the Thames Path. There will also be a need to provide a crossing of the Roding (Barking Creek).
Will the DLR tunnel have a parallel emergency escape route tunnel which might provide a link?

This is covered by draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

STA002

Greater London
Authority

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

The industrial sites accessed from Kingsbridge Road south of the A13, have not been identified at all in the document. The GLA considers these sites as currently lying within River Road SIL

The site description should also refer to the presence of Safeguarded Wharves on the River Thames/Barking Creek.

These sites have been added through the pre-submission Core Strategy

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
<p>STA002</p> <p>Does consultee agree with proposed use?</p>	<p>Greater London Authority</p>	<p>On behalf of (where applicable):</p> <p>There is an unexplained gap between the SIL south of Long Reach Road and Site 86 Barking Riverside. This gap appears more clearly between sites 112 and 86 on the fold-out map.</p> <p>Unless there is evidence to the contrary the GLA would suggest that the SIL boundary is drawn to include this part of the site.</p> <p>Site 23 has been excluded from the SIL framework as having potential for employment/community uses. It is also flagged as a potential housing capacity site.</p> <p>The GLA would like to see further evidence/justification for this change in terms of potential employment land loss, need for new community facilities to help regenerate the local area and potential for housing.</p>	<p>This areas has been added to the SIL</p>

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

STA011

The Environment
Agency

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

The site contains the Buzzard Mouth Sewer, In addition to the application of the sequential test, any proposed development should be set back to provide an eight metre buffer zone measured from bank top along the watercourse.

This is covered by
Borough Wide
Development
Policy BR3
Greening the
Urban Environment

STA030

London Thames
Gateway Urban

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

LTGDC supports the designation

Agree

Acceptable Uses		Commentary	Council's Response
Map Reference Number:		114	Rippleside Industrial Estate Location
DEV154	Jacobs	On behalf of (where applicable): Transport for London	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		We request the boundary of the proposed site is revised to exclude land required to deliver the A13 Renwick Road Junction Improvement scheme, or LBBDD formulate policies that would specially safeguard the required land	This is covered by SM34
Partially	Other	Another affected area within this allocation under consideration by the A13 RR Project Team is the Network Rail bridge immediately south of the scheme. As part of the A13 RR Scheme, Steel Approach would be extended to provide a direct link between Lodge Avenue roundabout and Renwick Road. This requires safeguarding It is important the functionality of the proposed junction improvements that the associated works are not compromised by site 114.	

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES091

Ramblers Association

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee agree with proposed use?

Public Right of Way FP no. 47 should be shown on the base map as although it is not Definitive within the site boundary, a proposal was made some years ago that a link to Dagenham Dock Station by following the Gores Brook from Choats Road up to the

Railway then east to Chequers Lane this was not implemented. This could have replaced the length of the FB illegally obstructed.

This is covered by draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan

Acceptable Uses

Commentary

**Council's
Response**

RES561

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Storage or Distribution

Education Services

General Industrial

Other Community
Services

Agree

Keep current use

Site is identified
principally for
logistics/rail freight
uses

RES562

On behalf of (where applicable:)

Does consultee
agree with
proposed use?

Noted

Agree

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA002	Greater London Authority	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		<p>Only part of the industrial site in the triangle north of the A13 and south of Ripple Road, have been identified in far west of the SIL.</p> <p>The GLA would consider the entire triangle as currently lying within the Rippleside SIL. This should be queried.</p>	Site boundary has been amended accordingly
STA002	Greater London Authority	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		<p>A key strategic issue regarding this SIL is its potential use for freight interchange. Site 100 (which encompasses sites 113, 24 and 19) identifies its potential as a strategic rail freight interchange.</p> <p>This strategic potential should be more explicitly in the potential uses for Sites 114, 24 and 19</p>	Site is identified for this use in SM35

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
<p>STA002</p> <p>Does consultee agree with proposed use?</p>	<p>Greater London Authority</p>	<p>On behalf of (where applicable):</p> <p>Site 24 Rippleside Commercial Estate has been excluded from the SIL framework as having potential for employment/community uses.</p> <p>The East London SRDF indicated that part of the SIL at Renwick Road might be suitable for consolidation as part of a gateway to the Barking Reach regeneration site.</p> <p>This is in principle acceptable, the questions is whether the amount of land removed from the SIL is acceptable and whether this has been subject of much discussion with the GLA</p>	<p>This land is now included as part of Strategic Industrial Land</p>

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA002	Greater London Authority	On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		4 of the 5 sites, all south of the A13 have potential for use as sites for rail-connected logistics or associated activities.	Noted
<hr/>			
STA011	The Environment Agency	On behalf of (where applicable):	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		The site contains the Gores Brook. In addition to the application of the sequential test, any proposed development should be set back to provide an eight metre buffer zone measures from bank top along the watercourse	This is covered by Borough Wide Development Policy BR3 Greening the Urban Environment

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?		LTGDC supports the designation.	Noted
Agree			

Map Reference Number: 115 Garages nr Dagenham East

RES583		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Residential		This site is covered within SM5 Sanofi Aventis 2
Agree			

Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES584	On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Something quaint and quirky. Covered little retail units, nicely done, gated at night and the whole area smartened and public toilets at the station. Would go with section 2 of Sanofi.	This site is covered within SM5 Sanofi Aventis 2
Retail		
Disagree		

Map Reference Number:	116	Strip of Land north of A12

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
RES140		On behalf of (where applicable:)	
Does consultee agree with proposed use?	Residential	Low rise flats up to the lake with landscaping to provide noise barrier	This site has been designated protected open space
Partially			

	Map Reference Number:	125	Farr Avenue Shops
STA030	London Thames Gateway Urban		On behalf of (where applicable:)
Does consultee agree with proposed use?			Site 125 is identified as 107 on the main plan. Noted

	Acceptable Uses	Commentary	Council's Response
STA030 Does consultee agree with proposed use? Agree	London Thames Gateway Urban	On behalf of (where applicable): LTGDC supports the designation	Noted

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
Site behind Andres Avenue nr Tatony Green. It comes out and turns out into shops. Quite a bit of ground in the middle.	0	RES140	Residential	Open Spaces			Ideal for bungalows and play space for children	Noted
Housing Association land/gardens attached to Bagley Springs and Roms Grove	0	RES140	Residential				Enough land for bungalows	This will be addressed in Marks Gate Masterplan
Padnall Hall	-1	RES140	Other Community Uses				Another community hall. Mark's Gate community centre is very booked up	This will be addressed in Marks Gate Masterplan
Gardens/land not being used	0	RES140	Other Community				Recreation land for children or housing	Noted

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
off Limbourne Avenue (off Whaleboe Avenue/High Road)			Uses					
Unkept gardens round Kingsley Hill Avenue	0	RES140	Open Spaces	Residential			Space could be utilised better	Noted
Back of Grantham Court Gardens off Whalebone Lane/High Road	0	RES140					This is an underutilised site. Housing spent £3,000 to keep gardens 3to4 yrs but now looks very tatty.	Noted
Mark's Gate	-1	RES140					There is a general need for more facilities for young people	This will be addressed in Marks Gate Masterplan
Heathway Precinct	-1	ANON1	Retail	Other Community	Leisure and Entertainment	Other	Fully operational supermarket e.g.	Council has no

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
				Uses			sainsburys. Community Hall	immediate plans for this site
							Have a community hall for Parsloes/Becontree residents and upgrade the existing community centre. It is a disgrace.	
							A place for the elderly population to meet and enjoy entertainment	
Fanshawe Library, Fanshawe Hall	-1	ANON1					More large supermarket 'chains' for food suppliers (bringing competition). Bus inlet lanes within the Heathway to prevent traffic build	Council will seek to direct retail to the Heathway

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							ups and delays.	
Somewhere on Thames View/Great Fleets	0	ANON5	Education Services				The Thames View/Great Fleets area of Barking desparately needs its own secondary school. At the moment many children fail to get a place at Jo Richardson as it is on the Dagenham side of the A13.	A secondary school will be provided as part of Barking Riverside
							So at best they journey into Barking Town Centre then out to Eastbury. IF they don't get Eastbury they could be looking at even further afield - Sydney Russell or	

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							Dagenham Park. This is a daunting journey for a year 7 child.	
							Also a lot of people moved onto these estates believing they would get their own secondary school.	
Disused garages behind shops. Church elm Lane/Charlotte Road (side of new xxx behind Richardson Gardens	0	RES576	Residential					Noted
Wilberry Park - Green Belt. Back of	0	RES576	Open Spaces				Was going to be an open space. What happened?	Is covered by Green Belt policy

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
Roosevelt Way (down to under xxx Beam)								
Borough	-1	ANON6					There is a general need for more residential homes in the borough.	Core Strategy has a target of 1190 new homes a year
							There is a need for more activiites for the elderly	
							There is a need for more activities for children e.g. youth centres, play centres	
East Dagenham area north of the railway	-1	OTH164	Health Services				This area is the least well served by primary care facilities. We are	Sanofi Site 2 identified for healthcare

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
line							likely to be needing a suitable site in the area in the medium term future.	
							Could be achieved through Sterling Industrial Site or Sanofi.	
Renwick Road, Steel Approach and Lodge Avenue Roundabout	-1	DEV154	Other				The following sites should be included in the site boundary. 1. the Steel Approach Road works which provide a linkage to between RR and Lodge Avenue roundabout and. The highways works required for the grade separation of RR at	Site is designated as a freight interchange

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							the A13 junction including the westbound off slip road, eastbound on slip road , bus links and bridge over the A13.	
							These schemes are fundamental to implementation of junction improvement and to Barking Riverside.	
Land north of the Sustainable Industrial Plark	-1	STA002	Other				The proposed Sustainable Industrial Park could be compatible with rail freight connection that would require sustainble access via both road and	Rippleside is designated as a freight interchange

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							water to be provided to the site.	
							This would require designating some land to the north of the SIP as for rail freight use.	
Existing rail freight use	-1	STA002	Other				Existing rail freight sites, such as the Freightliner sidings, to have policy designation to protect that use.	This area is within Strategic Industrial Land
Bell Farm Avenue	-1	DEV159	Residential				Due to the accessible nature of this site, CEMEX urges the Council to consider the site as a natural small-scale extension to Bell Farm Avenue.	Designated as green belt.
							The site would	

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							provide a sustainable location for residential infill of one or two dwellings.	
							The site is located close to existing transport network, close to existing residential areas and services and employment	
							The small site relates more closely to the built environment of Bell Farm Avenue, and should therefore be removed from the conseration designations	
							Cemex	

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							understands there is currently no public access to this small triangular piece of land and therefore it is not serving a purpose as public open space.	
Police Shop, Barking Town Centre	-1	DEV161					The MPA suggest that a location for the new Barking 'police shop' be outlined within this document within the primary retail frontage.	Document does not cover Barking Town Centre
Land to the east of Gascoigne Road Pumping Station	-1	STA027	Light Industrial	General Industrial	Storage or Distribution		The site is vacant and is surrounded by light industrial & warehousing.	This is a SINC within a Strategic Industrial Location

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							Development of the site would support Government, regional (metropolitan) and borough planning policies in developing vacant sites to create employment opportunities in the borough.	
Marks Warren Farm Quarry	-1	DEV092					We request that Marks Warren Farm is identified as safeguarded mineral extraction and processing area on the Proposals Map.	This is covered by the Core Strategy
							There exists at present, a well screened, enclosed	

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							aggregate bagging plant on site and this forms part of the infrastructure that should be safeguarded in accor. with MPS1	
							This site should also be allocated as a site suitable for Construction and Demolition Waste which gives rise to recycled aggregate and soils - recycling and other associated use in accordance with MPS1.	
							Whilst the future extension area for land won aggregate to	

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							supply the quarry is nearby at Crown Farm, the mineral from Crown Farm would need to be processed at Marks Warren Farm Quarry.	
							The London Plan requires East London Boroughs to plan and provide for at least a 7 yr land bank of land won minerals at a rate of 0.5mpta. As the site is one of the very few remaining quarries in East London, safeguarding it is essential.. In view of its location close	

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							to the main road	
Barking College	-1	DEV162	Education Services	Other Community Services	Keep current use	Other	Other Uses: we would wish to see education specifically featured as a development sector in the borough and the ongoing needs of the sector recognized	Noted
							Futher, we would wish to see some acknowledgement that the FE Sector has a key contributory role in the enhancement of services to the community.	
							Although their primary function is to deliver further	

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							education, colleges have a unique opportunity to provide a service to the community and whilst this is ongoing it can be enhanced through developer opportunities.	
							We consider that the whole of the site within the college demise should be designated for further education and associated community use.	
							Although part of the site is green belt within the green belt there are a	

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							number of uses that may be acceptable which could be compatible with the college's uses and therefore, it would be beneficial if this could be acknowledged.	
Porters Avenue New Clinic	-1	RES566	Residential	Offices	Education Services	Visitor Housing		Noted
Residential Care Home, Corner of Harrow Road and Ripple Road	0	RES562					Former care in the community building (purpose built). This has now been empty for several years. It would make an ideal health centre.	Noted
Crown Garages,	-1	NMP1					We believe this site to have been sold.	Not aware of development

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							What are the development plans for the site?	plans for this site
							Please restrict flats from this site.	
							Might be suitable for houses or bungalows	
Withershaw Road Garages	0	NMP2					This could be included in the list of garage sites. They are in state of disrepair. One child split leg open on this site.	Noted
Old health clinic off Bastable Avenue	0	NMP3					Has this been included?	This will be addressed by Thames View Estate Masterplan
North side of Selina's	0	RES585	Offices	Light Industrial	General Industrial	Storage or Distribution	At the moment there is a	Noted

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
House, adjacent to Hoo Hing, Selinas House							significant amount of underutilised or derelict land around the Hoo Hing warehouse	
Morrisons Car Park	-1	RES585	Other Community Services	Leisure and Entertainment	Other		This area needs to be looked at as part of the proposed Becontree Health development. The east end of the Morrisons car park is never used, even on a busy Saturday.	This is now included within SSA SM10
							There is also a significant section of derelict land to the east of Morrisons itself. These areas could be replanned and	

Appendix 3 - Responses received on proposed sites

Suggested Site	Site known	Consultee ID from LDF	Acceptable Use 1	Acceptable Use 2	Acceptable Use 3	Acceptable Use 4	Detailed comments	Council Response
							used as car parking space for the new Becontree heath site, thus freeing up space for better use around the swimming pool area.	

Appendix 4 - Responses received on Retail Parades

Town Centre Comment	Town Centre ID	Consultee ID from LDF database	Review boundaries	Review boundaries1	Comment para 1	Comment para 2	Council response
1	Chadwell Heath	RES140	0		The Council charges too much on shops/business rates. This encourages large food outlet places who can afford it. We lose the independent shops, shoe makers, grocers, bakers, coffee shops.	More restrictions on A3 units and A5 units. No more hot food takeaways.	Local Development Framework places tighter controls on hot food takeaways
2	Dagenham Heathway	ANON1	-1	Review them	Population trends and 'white flight' because of vast influx of 'other faiths' often on English speakers - make this Borough a 'powder key ' of possible future racial tensions. Better supermarket and better shopping facilities needed.		Noted
3	Dagenham Heathway	ANON2	0				Noted
4	Dagenham East (South)	ANON2	-1	Review them			Noted
5	Dagenham East (North)	ANON2	-1	Review them			Noted
6	Faircross Parade	RES140	-1	Review them	Better selection of bakers/butchers/greengrocers/general		Noted

Appendix 4 - Responses received on Retail Parades

Town Centre Comment	Town Centre ID	Consultee ID from LDF database	Review boundaries	Review boundaries1	Comment para 1	Comment para 2	Council response
					stores. Keep post office. Include a car park rather than the parking system in place at the moment. Elderly/disabled need handy local xxxx of shopping/postal services		
7	Dagenham Heathway	ANON3	-1	Review them	Take away the 'speed bump and walkway parts' as these were not in the original plans. Emergency services + police have had to (on more than one occasion) try and turn around which is difficult with traffic chocablock	I suggest you decrease the the width of the pavements please	Noted
8	Faircross Parade	ANON5	-1	Review them	Faircross Parade is a thriving local centre. We even have a bank. However some businesses have closed because of the increased rents and instead we have a surfeit of 'general stores' whose wares spill over onto the pavement.	We need to encourage useful local businesses so that the parade continues to be viable and attractive local people.	Noted
9	Chadwell Heath	RES576	0		Need proper supermarket	Tescos too expensive for	Noted

Appendix 4 - Responses received on Retail Parades

Town Centre Comment	Town Centre ID	Consultee ID from LDF database	Review boundaries	Review boundaries1	Comment para 1	Comment para 2	Council response
						people on low income & disabled to access. Low cost food/supermarket (needed). Heathway needs to be more attractive. More types of shops and shop fronts. Market day would bring more people in.	
10	Dagenham Heathway	ANON14	-1	Review them	Heathway is the main shopping centre in Dagenham and should be treated as such, like it used to be. Banks, decent restaurants, decent public housing, decent shops not all pound shops, too many take aways, toilet facilities.	If you can provide these the local residents will come onboard.	Noted
11	Goresbrook	ANON14	-1	Review them	Think about Farstruter.		Noted

Appendix 4 - Responses received on Retail Parades

Town Centre Comment	Town Centre ID	Consultee ID from LDF database	Review boundaries	Review boundaries1	Comment para 1	Comment para 2	Council response
	Road/Chequers Parade						
12	Martin's Corner	RES569	-1	Review them	No more fast food shops	We need butchers, bakers and homeware stores	Local Development Framework places tighter controls on hot food takeaways
13	Gale Street, Becontree	RES566	0	Keep them as they are			Noted
14	Green Lane	RES560	0	Review them			Noted
15	Robin Hood	RES560	0	Review them			Noted
16	Martin's Corner	RES567	0	Review them	Retail shops. Fewer takeaways.	Possible site for a cinema?	Noted
17	Dagenham Heathway	RES567	0	Review them	Retail Shops		Noted
18	Dagenham Heathway	RES563	0	Review them	There should be a library and a health centre in the Heathway		New library currently being built. Health centre

Appendix 4 - Responses received on Retail Parades

Town Centre Comment	Town Centre ID	Consultee ID from LDF database	Review boundaries	Review boundaries1	Comment para 1	Comment para 2	Council response
							proposed on Woodward Road
19	Dagenham Heathway	RES570	0	Review them	The district centre has recently been developed. There is now few parking spaces which are not even enough.	They spend the money putting bricks on the road but they didn't provide free parkign areas/spaces. We need a big supermarket there as well.	Noted
20	Eastbury	RES562	0	Review them	2 - 12 Blake Avenue are not shops. They are flat conversions.		Noted
21	Faircross Parade	RES568	0		Restrict the fast food outlets & encourage green grocers, butchers and community shops.		Local Development Framework places tighter controls on hot food takeaways

Appendix 4 - Responses received on Retail Parades

Town Centre Comment	Town Centre ID	Consultee ID from LDF database	Review boundaries	Review boundaries1	Comment para 1	Comment para 2	Council response
22	Faircross Parade	RES564	0		Faircross is still a nice area to shop but it is getting worse.	Too many fast food shops and cheap hardware come general nika stores.	Local Development Framework places tighter controls on hot food takeaways
23	Gale Street, Becontree	RES580	0	Review them	Local shopping should be promoted. All shopping areas listed need immediate refurbishment/maintenance works to attract any national chain or new tenants.	Council grant/incentives to new tenants should be considered. Graffiti and anti social behaviour are also prevalent at these sites which also needs addressing.	Council is undertaking a programme of improvements to retail parades
24	Dagenham Heathway	RES581	0	Review them	The traffic has increased, there is a need for adequate parking as well as giving the area a better look and		Noted

Appendix 4 - Responses received on Retail Parades

Town Centre Comment	Town Centre ID	Consultee ID from LDF database	Review boundaries	Review boundaries1	Comment para 1	Comment para 2	Council response
					make it a more pleasant shopping experience.		
25	Gale Street, Becontree	RES581	0	Review them	This area needs a centre for young people		Noted
26	Dagenham East (North)	RES583	0	Keep them as they are			Noted
27	Eastbrook	RES583	0	Keep them as they are			Noted
28	Reede Road	RES583	0	Keep them as they are			Noted
30	Dagenham East (North)	RES584	0	Keep them as they are			Noted
31	Eastbrook	RES584	0	Keep them as they are			Noted
32	Reede Road	RES584	0	Keep them as they are			Noted

Appendix 5 - Responses received on Open Spaces

Open Space	Consultee Code	Response	Council response
Barking Abbey Ruins & St Margaret's Churchyard	RES147	Part of the open space adjacent to St Margaret's school should be enclosed to create a playing field for the school. Current provision for play areas is woefully inadequate.	Protected as open space
Barking Park and Loxford Water	ANON5	We should protect the allotment site here. The site is thriving, well maintained and governed.	
		There is a general trend of increased interest in allotments and it should be encouraged. I believe the nearest allotments are quite a distance and I know that some allotments on Thames View were taken over and never replaced.	Protected as allotment
Gale Street Organics	RES155	Gale Street allotments could need to be managed in a more efficient and constructive manner, or alternatively, incorporated into the main Gale Street allotment site under East Barking Society.	Protected as an allotment
		Many more small areas could be developed into allotment areas using raised beds. This could be done in contaminated soil areas. Thames View has no allotment sites at present. Nor has the Hart Lane Estate or Marks Gate area.	
		Small nature reserve areas could be put under jurisdiction of local community groups.	
Mark's Gate	RES140	This site is in a poor state. Becontree Horticultural	Allocation ensures there are no net loss

		Allotment Society have been approached to see if they would take it on. But they cannot on the state that it is in.	of allotments
Furze House Farm	RES140	This site could benefit from a lake.	Noted
Field Gardens	RES140	Field Gardens allotment site should be protected.	Is protected as an allotment
The Chase Nature Reserve & Eastbrookend Country Park	ANON2		Noted
Barking Park and Loxford Water	RES147	The allotment, the only site in Barking should be protected. This can best be done by declaring them statutory allotments to replace the statutory allotments taken at River road for development without consent from the Secretary of State.	Is protected as an allotment
Goresbrook Park	ANON14	I back up on to the park and I can see and hear woodpeckers, sparrow hawks, crows, starlings, finches, sparrows, toads, robins, wrens, tits, magpies, pied wagtails, jays, blackbirds, frogs, thrushes, butterflies, dragonflies, bats, foyes, Sea birds, bees....moths and many more.	Noted
Castle Green Park	DEV154	Castle Green Park bounds and overlaps the proposed A13/Renwick Road Improvements Scheme (sites 98 & 99). Castle Green is listed as site which should be afforded protection from development.	Noted
		As part of the proposed A13 RR improvement, the bus-only link would require the development of a narrow earth embankment on a small strip of land which is currently located within Castle Green.	
		The land concerned runs from north to south currently	

		located within Castle Green's western boundary and incorporates a public footpath	
		It is separated from the playing fields that occupy the maj. Of the open space by a small line of semi-mature trees and a minor belt of vegetation.	
		The proposal would repalce the the footpath and existing vegetation with a landscaped embankment and a new 5m footway/cycleway alongside RR and Goresbrook Road.	
		The landscaping of the embankment would not result in a significant net reduction of green space and could be designed as such to soften the visual impact of the elevated section of the proposed highway north of the flyover.	
Wellgate Community Farm	DEV163	We propose that the land is allocated for a sustainable mixed use development comprising residential development in a well landscaped setting, an improved community farm, re-provision of a sports pitch and a new area of woodland	This allocation has not been included as it is not possible to allocate sites in the Green Belt in the SSA document
		Grover Consortium Ltd wish to propose that the existing community farm together with surrounding landholdings are allocated for further redevelopment that will deliver benefits to the openness of the Green Belt.	
		The site currently contains light industrial; residential; garden centre; community farm; cattery/kennels; area of fly tipping on former football pitch	
		The only uses compatible with green belt are the community farm and the former football pitch.	
		We object to the proposed open space allocation 23.	

		The site allocations DPD identifies this site by virtue of its current nature conservation interest. This is a new allocated from those currently found in the adopted UDP. We feel this is misguided.	
		On the basis of its limited nature conservation value is only due to its local community use, relocating the community farm to a more favourable location (from a nature conservation perspective) to the southeast corner of the site	
		Here, there is more opportunity to enhance the habitat for wildlife	
		This site falls within the Green Belt. However we consider that cumulatively this area has the characteristics of a major developed site in the green belt, as defined by Annex C of PPG2.	
Parsloes Park including the Squatts	RES569		Is protected as open space
Bushway	RES569		Is protected as allotment
Valence Park and House	RES569		Noted
Longbridge Road	RES559	Only half the space in the allotment site is used. The rest is not used at all.	Noted
Parsloes Park including the Squatts	RES566		Is protected as open space
Wood Lane	RES566		Noted
Longbridge Road	RES560		Noted

Barking Park and Loxford Water	People always want allotment land as it cuts down on the cost of food.		Noted
Parsloes Park including the Squatts	RES567		Noted
Bushway	RES567	Housing - market.	Noted
Parsloes Park including the Squatts	RES563		Noted
Mayesbrook and associated water courses	RES563	This is a park and should be kept. Over the years, I have seen lots of children fishing there and it should be preserved as long as possible.	Is protected as open space
Castle Green Park	RES570	Castle green park should be protected because it is near Jo Richardson school and school children can use it for their sports.	Is protected as open space
Mayesbrook and associated water courses	RES563	Mayesbrook Park - more swings please for kids as they queue for one swing there.	Noted
Mayesbrook and associated water courses	RES562		Noted
Barking Park	RES568		Noted

and Loxford Water			
Mayesbrook and associated water courses	RES568		Noted
Barking Park and Loxford Water	RES564		Noted
Mayesbrook and associated water courses	RES564		Noted
Mayesbrook and associated water courses	RES561	We should protect the open space because of children's future facilities, health, social care and leisure.	Is protected as open space
Castle Green Park	RES580	New school and facilities are a welcome addition.	Is protected as open space. Allocation enables Barking Rugby Club to expand
		It would appear however this has been at the cost of several rugby pitches used by the nearby club.	Noted
		Thought should be given to allocating more of the sport centre site to the club.	Noted
Manning Road	RES580		Noted
Hedgemans Road	RES580	Given the remainder of the land along Hedgemans Road has been developed it could be argued that this would be ideal for residential development.	Is protected as allotment
		That said, the popularity of the site would dictate that an alternative is sought, and should be sought.	Noted
Gale Street	RES580		Noted
Goresbrook and	RES580	Create an additional allotment site around the area of	Noted

the Ship and Shovel		Rowdowns Road. Park coverage is generous given the remainder of this park. Castle Green and Parsloes Park are all in close proximity.	
Gale Street	RES581	Allotment sites are a great way to involve people in physical activity. At the same time, it may offer a great sense of achievement to people growing their own vegetables.	Is protected as allotment
Hedgemans Road	RES581	It provides people with an opportunity to get some exercise and perhaps talk to other people, so it is not only good for the elderly but also for younger people.	Is protected as allotment
Goresbrook and the Ship and Shovel	RES581	I agree that it should be protected as open space. However, sometimes I don't feel safe to use such open space because of sometimes you get youths causing trouble.	Noted
The Chase Nature Reserve & Eastbrookend Country Park	COMG2	Better care can be taken of this site.	Noted
King George's Fields	RES582		Noted
Valence Park and House	RES191		Noted
Chitty's Lane	RES191		Noted
The Chase Nature Reserve & Eastbrookend Country Park	RES583		Noted

The Chase Nature Reserve & Eastbrookend Country Park	RES584		Noted
Temple Avenue	RES585		Noted
Romford Line railsides	RES585		Noted

Appendix 6 - Responses received on additional open spaces

ID	Additional Open Space Address	Consultee	Location of open space	Reasons for protecting open space1	Reasons for protecting open space2	Reasons for protecting open space 3	Council response
1	Parsloes Park	ANON1		Protect Parsloes Park and reject for new dressing rooms, cricket pitches and tennis courts (e.g. with a view to training for 2012 olympics?)			Protected
2	Riverbank adjoining flats and houses	ANON7	Gurney Close	This strip of land has a lot of native trees and plants and provides a home to many small animals, birds and insects. The treest must add quality to the air beside such a busy motorway. Residents like to have a natural green strip by their flats.	If area was opened up, the natural habitat for birds and small animals would be destroyed. It would become a dumping ground for litter and would lead to crime and criminal damage to property. Bank could become destabilised and possibly lead to flooding.		This is protected as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation
3	All open spaces	COM040	All	Any public space needs to be protected from car parking. Public spaces are needed, are vital for friendship, networking, exchange of ideas rather			All public parks have been protected

Appendix 6 - Responses received on additional open spaces

ID	Additional Open Space Address	Consultee	Location of open space	Reasons for protecting open space1	Reasons for protecting open space2	Reasons for protecting open space 3	Council response
				than dependence on mass media advertising			
4	All parks	ANON14	All	Open space	Site of importance for nature conservation	Allotment land	Noted

Appendix 7 - Generic comments made on the SSA

Consultee ID from LDF	Additional site number	Suggested Site	Detailed comments	Detailed comment para2	Council's response
BUS004	32	Employment Uses	We support the recognition within section 6.3 of the SSA Issues and Options draft that there are employment uses outside the B classes that are suitable for employment land.	These representations request that uses outside the B use classes are continued to be recognised in future stages of the developmetn of the SSA.	Noted
COMG1	34	Allotment sites	There is a shortage of allotments in the south of the borough since the loss of an allotment site as part of the Barking Riverside development.	Originally we were told that a a site would be found to replace it but this has not happened due to land contamination issues.	New allotments are proposed as part of the Barking Riverside proposal
			One member stated that through providing sites with raised beds contaimitation need not be a barrier.		
COMG2	35	Youth facilities	More sports facilities and youth faciliites needed in the borough.		Noted
COMG2	36	Youth facilities	Outdoor sports facilities, swimming pool and basketball courts needed		Noted

COMG2	37	Youth facilities	Bettter parks and facilities needed.		Noted
COMG2	38	Youth facilities	Entertainment facilities for teens needed in the borough.	Music studios Dance facilities Health facilities	Noted
COMG2	39	Youth facilities	Improvements to Dagenahm Swimming Pool needed.		Becontree Leisure centre proposed to replace this
COMG3	40	Religious meeting places	There is a need for more religious meeting places in the borough. For every 1000 homes in the borough, a new faith building is required.	Buildings need to be adaptable so they can be used for faith groups, play groups etc	Whalebone Lane retail park designated for local community uses
				There should not be restrictions limiting their use.	
COMG3	41	Religious meeting places	Hindus need more sites in the borough.		Noted
DEV143	15		Sanofi Aventis proposes that the actual quantum of development should not be prescribed in the allocation, but rather that the Council adopts a flexible approach to land use.	This could then be progressed through the planning process depending on suitable uses at the time which the land comes forward.	Noted
DEV158	16	Fire Stations	Future growth within the borough will create additional risks from fire and other emergencis across the	The SSA should specifically mention the links between future development proposals	Noted

			Borough.	and maintaining community safety.	
				The SSA should address the need to grasp opportunities offered by new developments in the borough to design out risks from fire, particularly in residential accommodation	
				LFB supports the document in so far as it seeks for new development to be designed in a way to improve access for emergency services (page 14.).	
DEV161	23	Main Text, Section 6.4, Social Infrastructure	The MPA support the need for social infrastructure in the borough and support the reference to policing.	However, it is recommended that the second paragraph is reworded to accurately reflect the wider aspect of the MPA's estate.	No specific sites were put forward by the MPA for inclusion in the document
				E.g "the SSA DPD will explore options for increasing the presence	

				of emergency services, for example, through the location of police shops in town centres and policing facilities in employment areas.	
DEV161	24	Main Text, Section 8, Retail Frontages	A key part of the MPA's estate review is to introduce policy 'shops' into locations with good accessibility. The purpose of police 'shops' is to provide direct public interface facilities with the police. Town centres are ideally locations for these.		No specific sites where put forward by the MPA for inclusion in the document
MEM2	44	Local community facilities.	The area surrounding Brocklebank lodge is in need of a club for local residents.		Noted
NMP3	42	Access to secondary schools	There is an issue of access for Thames View pupils to secondary school at Castle Green.		Secondary school will be provided as part of Barking Riverside development
NMP3	43	Access to primary schools	Great Fleete residents expressed a need for primary school in the area.		New primary schools will be provided as part of Barking Riverside development
OTH170	1	Borough	A borough wide evaluation of transport impacts of the local network and SRN is	Given the large amount of housing to be delivered and the	The Core Strategy requires transport assessments for the major sites. Separate work is

			necessary to demonstrate that all major proposed SSA and BTCAP developments are deliverable in transport terms.	relatively low PTAL levels at a few major development sites, it is possible that a large number of car trips would be generated, which may adversely impact the SRN.	being conducted for the Barking Town Centre Area Action Plan
				The HA advise that a borough wide evaluation is carried out to quantify the potential cumulative transport impact on the local network and SRN.	
				In order to help identify the most sustainable development scenario, options should be developed and tested as part of the evaluation (ideally prior to the preferred options stage). For example, the ELT bus proposal.	
				E.g the ELT routes, frequencies and details must be taken into account as part of the assessment	

OTH170	2	Borough	The HA is supportive of mixed use development, ideally occurring in existing town centres where public transport accessibility is good.	Development sites located far from existing town centres or public transport provision should be avoided wherever possible.	Noted
				In addition, the Council should work from the principle of reduce, manage and invest so that the provision	
				The HA agreed with the statement: "a development site which has poor access to public transport should not be a focus for large scale housing development unless significant improvements are provided.."	
OTH170	3	Retail and Town Centres	The HA would seek assurance that the 'lack of cycle parking facilities' identified at several of the Borough's retail centres, as mentioned in section 6.5 of the SSA will be addressed in order to provide visitors and		This is being addressed through the LIP funding process

			employees with more alternative modes.		
OTH170	4	Transport Infrastructure	The HA would be supportive of those transport infrastructure initiatives outlined in paragraph 6.6. of the SSA to improve public transport and encourage sustainable transport.	In addition to identifying any land requirement for the proposals, the SSA should detail the cost required, funding sources, phasing and delivery responsibility for the associated transport infrastructure as part of a robust evidence base.	Given the current uncertainty surrounding a number of significant proposals the SSA does what it can to provide the necessary detail
				The HA would emphasize that it is important for the Council to consider the mechanisms for delivering and funding the proposed transport infrastructure	
OTH171	8	Smaller housing sites	We hope the Council considers identifying other, possibly smaller sites, within established, well connected and popular residential locations, already supported by adequate infrastructure (e.g Goodmayes).	This may be necessary to ensure that housing supply can be maintained in the current downturn.	Noted

				The Council may wish to discuss the market potential of such developments with house builders operating in the borough.	
OTH171	9	Public Transport and Affordable Housing	We note that large development sites with poor public transport accessibility will not be prioritised unless s106 obligations are sufficient to support connection-up to existing networks.	We would support this, but point out that London Plan policy 6A.4 does allow planning obligations to be prioritised for transport and affordable housing.	Noted
				Prioritisation could ensure that the necessary revenue for transport connections is raised, but probably only if other obligations are scaled back.	
				The Council may wish to consider the availability of other public investment for transport, such as the Government's CIL fund.	
OTH171	10	Constraints	In addition to its SA, the	The forthcoming LDA	Noted

		on Development Sites	council may also wish to assess potential constraints on residential development sites via its SHLAA.	brownfield sites review will also consider constraints on potential brownfield developments sites for all use types.	
OTH171	11	Social Infrastructure Needs	We note the scale of the social infrastructure need, and while we would not dispute this, we would caution against the feasibility of all the expressed need being met by solely developers through the levying of section 106 obligations.	We must draw attention of paragraph B10 of Circular 5/2005.	Noted
				London Plan paragraph 3.52 also requires LPAs to consider development viability by accounting for "individual circumstance of the site.....".	
				Furthermore, "the Mayor wishes to encourage, not restrain residential development and boroughs should take a reasonable and flexible	

				approach on a site by site basis".	
RES091	12	Public Rights of Way	Although some of the site plans indicate Public Rights of Way (PROW) not all do and the future needs and aspirations must be taken into account.	The Government Maritime Bill deals with access to the coast line but I understand now, only into rivers as far as the first pedestrian crossing.	Noted
				In the River Thames this is now likely to be Tilbury, not the Woolwich foot tunnel.	
RES091	13	Thames Path	A major project is to continue the Thames Path, currently designated and supported from source down to the Barrier, taken up by the Thames Estuary Partnership and set out in the brochure "City to Sea".	I hope that you will include reference to this and other riverside paths (Beam and Roding) in the LDF.	Noted
RES091	14	Open Spaces - Appendix 3	Public Rights of Way and other permissive paths need to be shown on a map.		This is covered in the Council's Draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan
RES561	33	Open Spaces	We need to protect all our open spaces for the future we are planning.		Noted
RES582	45	General River	Medical facilities are needed		Health centres have been

		Ward sites	for most sites as there are 2 large residential sites and an industrial site. Fire & police stations should be considered.		identified within the document to meet the needs of existing and forecast households
STA002	6	not applicable	From a strategic perspective, it is important to know how much industrial land is being transferred to other uses through the site allocations document.	This is to ensure that the general approach to industrial land release in Barking is broadly along the lines anticipated in the Industrial Capacity SPG published in March 2008.	The Joint Waste Plan demonstrates which sites the Council has allocated to meet future waste management needs
				It is also important to ensure that sufficient sites are being retained to ensure that the Council can meet its waste management obligations.	
STA002	7	waste management sites	The SSA will need to make clear that waste management sites will be dealt with in the Joint Waste Plan.		The Joint Waste Plan demonstrates which sites the Council has allocated to meet future waste management needs
STA011	17	Sequential Testing	It is important that flood risk is considered at the earliest	E.g. there may e opportunities to build in	All sites have been sequentially tested and all

			stage of formulating your site allocations document so as to create opportunities to reduce flood risk to the community and ensure sust.dev at a strategic level.	increased flood storage, sustainable drainage elements or locate higher vulnerability class uses to areas of the lowest flood risk.	allocations where appropriate address flood risk
				When allocating land for development you must demonstrate that flood risk, the information from the SFRA and the vulnerability of development have been considered in the site allocation process.	
				This is achieved by applying the sequential test and where necessary the exception test.	
STA011	18	Contaminated Sites	For brownfiel sites we recommend that there are requirements in place to ensure that site risk assessments are carried out and any contaminated land is remediated in line with PPS23 and the risk management framework	for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination.	All sites have been sequentially tested and all allocations where appropriate address flood risk

			provided in CLR11, Model for Procudures		
STA011	19	Main Text, Section 5, Page 7	We acknowledge the proposed increase in developments within the borough as set out in the London Plan, However another key challenge is the management of flood risk and ensuring all new developments are developed sustainably.		All sites have been sequentially tested and all allocations where appropriate address flood risk
STA011	20	Main Text, Section 6, Page 8	The Sequential test needs to be applied when allocating development with Flood Zone 2 an 3.		All sites have been sequentially tested and all allocations where appropriate address flood risk
STA011	21	Main Text, Section 7, Page 18	We strongly support this sectionand the aim to consider the various river courses within your borough for enhancement and restoration.	We are pleased to see the Council is looking at river enhancements in partnership with ourselves.	All sites have been sequentially tested and all allocations where appropriate address flood risk
STA011	22	Appendix 1, Schedule of Sites	All sites proposed which are located in Flood Zone 2 and 3 will require the application of the sequential test.		All sites have been sequentially tested and all allocations where appropriate address flood risk
STA013	25	Archaeology	All of the key regeneration sites and strategic industrial	some of the other sites also lie within APAs and	This has been addressed where relevant

			locations fall within or largely within archaeological priority areas which make them special interest.	of course archaeology may be found anywhere.	
				The potential effect of redevelopment on archaeology remains should therefore be considered.	
STA013	26	Public Buildings	Several sites include public buildings such as libraries and educational buildings.	Some of these are local landmarks and we would advise that the option of reuse is fully considered as the first option.	Noted
STA013	27	Locally Listed Buildings	There are a number of locally significant historic buildings that should be fully accessed and retained in new developments. E.g. Ethel cottages, the Cedars Club, Japan Road Centre and Westbury Arms.		The Council has recently updated its local list
STA013	28	Key Regeneration Sites	It is important that the built heritage of larger sites is assessed as part of the planning process through rapid area assessment.		Noted

STA013	29	Maps	A map illustrating sites of importance for heritage conservation would be useful.	This could include details on heritage assets both statutory designated and undesignated that need to be considered in new developments.	This will be done seperately to this document
STA027	30	Thames Water	We would support options that would concentrate development on a small number of large clearly defined development sites, rather than dispersal options that would see an extensive number of smaller less well defined sites being selected.		Noted
STA027	31	Foul and Surface Water Sewers	Separate foul and surface water sewers serve the remainder of the Borough that drains to Beckton STW and Riverside STW, and there are no significant sewer capacity problems at present.		Noted
STA030	5	not applicable	The schedule of sites is listed by ward and not numerically, this makes sites identification laborious and complicated. It is suggested the preferred options includes a numerical		Noted

		index.		
--	--	--------	--	--

Consultees

STAT

STA002

Mr Giles Dolphin
Planning Decisions Manager
Greater London Authority

STA007

Mr Peter Hall
Development Planning Team Leader
London Borough of Havering

STA011

Ms Liz Lightbourne
Planning Liaison Officer
The Environment Agency

STA013

Ms Adina Brown
Reginal Planning Adviser
English Heritage

STA027

Mr Mark Mathews
Planner
Thames Water Property Services Ltd

STA029

Mr Javiera Maturana
Planning Manager
London Development Agency

ANON14

ANON2

ANON3

ANON4

ANON5

ANON6

ANON7

ANON8

ANON9

RES025

Mr

Stanley

Bartels

RES091

Mr

Michael

Cullen

Ramblers Association

RES140

Mr

Vic

Ferridge

27 March 2009

RES147

Mr

B

Fletcher

RES155

Mr

C

Gallehawk

RES174

Mrs

June

Griffin

RES191

Mr

Hill

RES401

Mrs

Val

Shaw

RES559

Mr

Amin

Vikash

27 March 2009

RES560

Miss

Mary-Ellen

Gallacher

RES561

Mr

Usubidi

Batuba

RES562

Mr

Trevor

Fisher

RES563

Ms

Linda

Whittle

RES564

Mr

Chris

Burgess

RES566

Mrs

Fatima

Leigh

27 March 2009

RES567

Mrs

Stella

Sadza

RES568

Mr

Brian

Harris

RES569

Mrs

Kathleen

Judge

RES570

Miss

Rhoda

Lishandi

RES575

Ms

Stella

Lisboa

RES576

Mrs

Doreen

Barnes

27 March 2009

RES577

Mr

Jacques

Isles

RES578

Ms

Sandra

Hussey

RES579

Mr

A

Gardner

RES580

Mr

Paul

Wilson

RES581

Ms

Virginia

Toledo Romero

RES582

27 March 2009

RES583

RES584

OTH

OTH101

Mr Colin Newman
LBBD Representative / LCC Leader
CTC

OTH164

Rebecca Scott

Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust

OTH170

Mr Patrick Blake
Network Operations South East
The Highways Agency

OTH171

Mr James Stevens
Regional Planner for London and Surrey
Home Builders Federation

27 March 2009

OTH172

Sir/madam

Land & Development Stakeholder and Policy Manager

National Grid

OFF

OFF1

OFF2

MEM

MEM1

MEM2

MEM3

DEV

27 March 2009

DEV012

Ms

Carly

Vince

AXA Real Estate Investment Managers c/o RPS

DEV092

Ms

Lillian

Harrison

Development Plans Manager

Robert Brett & Sons Ltd

DEv143

Ms

Tessa

Morton

Senior Planning Consultant

Jones Lang LaSalle

DEV144

Daniel

Osborne

Senior Planner

Drivers Jonas

DEV144

Felicity

Wye

Planning Research Manager

Tribal MJP

DEV154

Mr

Ian

Johnson

Technical Director

Jacobs

27 March 2009

DEV155

Ms Jackie Kirby

Development Planning Partnership LLP

DEV157

Mr Patrick Grincell

Director

Savills

DEV158

Ms Claire Morrison

Drivers Jonas LLP

DEV159

Ms Julianne Chowings

Drivers Jonas LLP

DEV160

Mr Ed Kemsley

Peacock and Smith Limited

DEV161

Mr Alun Evans

Senior Associate Director

CgMs Consultants

27 March 2009

DEV162

Mr John Tootell
Planner
Tribal MJP

DEV163

Mr Will Edmonds
Partner
Grover Consortium Ltd

COM

COM040

Ms Barbara Stanley-Hunt

Bahai of Barking and Dagenham

COMG1

COMG2

COMG3

27 March 2009

NMP1

NMP2

NMP3

BUS

BUS004

Ms

Faye

Wilders

Planning Assistant

Costco Wholesale UK c/o RPS

27 March 2009