

London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
Draft Employment Areas Local Development Order
Summary of Comments and Responses
June 2014

Response No.	Respondent Name	Summary of Comments	Council Response	Local Development Order Amendments
1	Geoff Lentin, Local Dialogue	Expressed an interest in the potential for development in Barking and Dagenham.	Noted.	None
2	David Hussey, Highways Agency	No comments at this time. Will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network.	Noted.	None
3	Lucy Owen, Port of London Authority	The PLA objects to the LDO if it could result in changes being made to the use of a safeguarded wharf and such changes would for example, result in the loss of existing waterborne cargo handling uses or restrict the potential for non operational wharves to be reactivated for waterborne cargo handling uses in line with policy 7.26.	The Council agrees that the safeguarded wharves should be protected in line with London Plan policy 7.26 and LBBB Core Strategy Policy CE4.	An informative has been added to ensure that any changes which result in the loss of existing waterborne cargo uses, or restrict the potential for non-operational wharves to be reactivated for waterborne cargo handling uses, will not be allowed.
4	Julie Patenaude, English Heritage	No Comment on LDO. English Heritage would strongly advise that the local authority's conservation staff are involved throughout the preparation and implementation of the Local Development Order, as they are often best placed to advise on: local historic environment issues and priorities, sources of data; and consideration of options relating to the historic environment.	Noted.	None

Response No.	Respondent Name	Summary of Comments	Council Response	Local Development Order Amendments
5	Sean Peacock, Transport for London	<p>TfL have no objection to the adoption of this LDO.</p> <p>The proposed condition of this order to require applicants to submit a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment, where development is above a threshold of 2499sqm and 3999 sqm respectively, is welcomed. The borough are encouraged to continue notifying and consulting TfL in the usual way if any proposal is considered to have an impact on the Transport for London Road Network, Strategic Road Network or public transport safety and operations.</p>	Noted.	None
6	Andy Goymer, Environment Agency	<p>No objections to the proposals but recommend a change of wording to one of the informatives in section 7 on page 10.</p> <p>Informative <i>IN5</i> advises applicants to gain 'Land Drainage Consent' from the Environment Agency for sites within flood zone 3. This is not entirely correct as Flood zone 3 is not the trigger point for issuing consent. Applicants should instead consult us on works that are in close proximity to a watercourse and/or its defences. This '<i>Flood Defence Consent</i>' is a requirement of the Water</p>	The Council agrees with the recommended change of wording.	<p>Informative IN5 to be replaced with the following:</p> <p><i>Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency may be required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of a watercourse (16m for the</i></p>

Response No.	Respondent Name	Summary of Comments	Council Response	Local Development Order Amendments
		<p>Resources Act 1991 and the Thames Land Drainage Byelaws 1981.</p> <p>Suggested wording: <i>Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency may be required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of a watercourse (16m for the tidal sections of the river Thames) and flood defence structures.</i></p>		<p><i>tidal sections of the river Thames) and flood defence structures.</i></p>
7	Michael Cullen, Ramblers Association	<p>No objections to the LDO but wishes to express that the need, importance and value of green spaces is recognised.</p>	Noted.	None
8	Piotr Behnke, Natural England	<p>Natural England has no issue with the content.</p> <p>It would be good to see more use of Green infrastructure within the area. Given the locations of a number of the areas covered by this development order are in fact near to the Thames it would make sense to ensure that as much as possible is done to ensure that any changes of use include some kind of biodiversity benefits in their plans, whether this be through the use of green</p>	Noted.	None

Response No.	Respondent Name	Summary of Comments	Council Response	Local Development Order Amendments
		<p>roofs or rainwater harvesting for use within the buildings themselves for instance.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the LDO would need to ensure that any works carried out are in conformity with the Barking Riverside Masterplan so as to be complementary to it and not competing with the objectives set out in the plan.</p>		