

**OLYMPIC  
DELIVERY  
AUTHORITY**

Planning Decisions Team

FREEPOST NAT 18925  
LDF Core Strategy  
Planning Policy Team  
London Borough of Hackney  
263 Mare Street  
London  
E8 3HT

6<sup>th</sup> August 2009

Case Officer	Alex Savine
Email	Alex.Savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk
Direct Line	020 8430 5454
Our Ref	DPS/09/002
Your Ref	

**Postal address**

Head of Development Control  
Olympic Delivery Authority  
Planning Decisions Team  
Mailpoint 32B  
23<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
1 Churchill Place  
London E14 5LN

t +44(0)20 8430 6020

f +44(0)20 8430 6021

[www.london2012.com/planning](http://www.london2012.com/planning)

Dear Sir,

**London Borough of Hackney Local Development Framework  
Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document Consultation**

Thank you for consulting the Olympic Delivery Authority on the submission version of the Hackney Core Strategy. The continued opportunity to input into the development of this key planning document is welcomed. It should be noted that in providing its response to the consultation the ODA is doing so in its role as Local Planning Authority for the area within and around the Olympic Park and the comments provided have been agreed by the ODA Planning Committee.

In commenting on the 'Preferred Options' consultation for the Hackney Core Strategy, the ODA had previously welcomed the positive approach taken towards the development of the Olympic Park and its long term legacy, but had objected to the extent of certain designations indicated on the Proposals Map. This essentially related to the extent of the Strategic Industrial Land (SiL) designation within the Hackney part of the Olympic Park, which at that point included an area that had been given planning permission for development as part of the Olympic Park Parklands, one of the key elements of the physical Olympic Legacy in this location. Comment was also made to the need to indicate flexibility for the range of uses that would be as acceptable in this employment use focused area.

The amendment of the SiL designation as shown on this 'submission' version of the Core Strategy and the designation of a 'Proposed Open Space' in the location of the Hackney element of the Olympic Park Parklands is welcomed and the above mentioned objection is withdrawn on this basis.

A detailed table of comments and a representation form for each is enclosed with this letter and forms the formal response to the consultation. These comments can be summarised as follows:

- A welcome of the overall strategic approach and recognition of Olympic and Paralympic Games and their Legacy as a key component in the Spatial Strategy.

- References to ODA as a partner for delivery of aspects of the Core Strategy are welcomed. Now that it is established, reference is sought to the Legacy Company as a key partner for delivery of Legacy development in the longer term.
- A welcome for the changes to employment land designation covering the Olympic Park part of the Hackney Wick area, which now shows an area of parkland and open space east of the Legacy Development Platform area (as identified in the 2007 Olympic Planning Permissions).
- Highlights that the Core Strategy text indicates an employment led mixed use future for the Strategic Employment Land around and including the area of the Games time International Broadcast Centre and Main Press Centre. A reinforcement of this being the strategic principle for development that will be sought in this location, within the text of the Core Strategy, given that the Proposals Map designation does not in itself imply this scenario.
- Consideration of a Metropolitan Open Land designation is sought of that public open space/parkland to the East of the IBC/MPC and associated Legacy development platforms, in order to secure its long-term function either in this or a future iteration of the Core Strategy.
- Identification of an 'Other Industrial Area' over and around the area of the Handball Arena/Multi-use Sports Venue (MUSV) and its surrounding Legacy Development Platforms is noted. Clarification is sought in respect of the range of uses that are seen as appropriate in this context and whether this takes account of the Legacy MUSV. It is acknowledged that general text in the Core Strategy appears to allow a range of uses as per the 2007 Olympic permissions and the emerging LDA Legacy Masterplan Framework proposals but considers that some clarification in the text would be helpful to reinforce this.
- Suggested inclusion of infrastructure planning and delivery supporting evidence within the Core Strategy.

The London Borough of Hackney Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document and officer review and comments were considered by the members of the ODA's Planning Committee at their meeting of the 28<sup>th</sup> July 2009. It was resolved that final written comments incorporate additional views that the Committee wished to make. The draft minutes of the 28<sup>th</sup> July 2009 ODA's Planning Committee are attached setting out detailed member comments under Item 5.

I trust that the above comments are helpful. Should you wish to further discuss the issues raised, please do not hesitate to contact the above named case officer.

Yours faithfully,



**Vivienne Ramsey**

**Head of Development Control**

Olympic Delivery Authority Planning Decisions Team

London Borough of Hackney Core Strategy : Pre-submission Consultation - Proposed Detailed Comments

Para.	Policy	Proposals Map	Is CS Legally compliant/sound?	Comment	Changes sought
3.17	Strategic Objectives		Yes	Strategic Objectives (Para.3.17) – These are welcomed and supported, in particular the final objective which relates to harnessing the benefits of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.	None
5.13	Focusing Social Investment		Yes	Para 5.13 - Infrastructure Delivery – it is noted that the main elements of an infrastructure delivery plan have been set out throughout the Core Strategy document. The indications provided of what is required for delivery and when is welcomed.	None
4.42	Hackney Wick New Community		Yes – but requires addition as suggested.	Paragraph 4.42 – Hackney Wick (implementation and Monitoring)  Where the ODA is mentioned as a partner for delivering aspects of development and Olympic Legacy and associated benefits to the communities of Hackney, this is welcomed. However, there should also be recognition of the role of the newly established Olympic Legacy Company in delivering the long term legacy within and around the Olympic Park. This is irrespective of any specific proposals that may come out of the LDA/Legacy Company LMF work. (See also comments on 136a and 137 of the Proposals Map later in this table).	Add reference to the Olympic Legacy Company as a key partner for delivering infrastructure and development, in addition to the ODA and LDA.
4.56 – 4.61	Infrastructure		Suggest additions.	Para 4.56 – 4.61 - Infrastructure Planning and Delivery – it is noted that the main elements of an infrastructure delivery plan have been set out throughout the Core Strategy document and that the borough is currently commissioning an infrastructure study. The 'indicators to monitor delivery of Core Strategy Policy 7' (Working with Infrastructure	The inclusion of further infrastructure planning and delivery supporting evidence within the Core Strategy, including evidence of joined-up planning, delivery and funding, is suggested within the final Core Strategy.

Para.	Policy	Proposals Map	Is CS Legally compliant/sound?	Comment	Changes sought
				<p>Partners) indicates that a schedule of programmed infrastructure capital programmes will be maintained, updated and presented as a supporting Appendix to the LDF to demonstrate that the Core Strategy is realistic and capable of responding to changing circumstances. The inclusion of a schedule of programmed infrastructure capital programmes as a monitor of the delivery of Policy 7 is welcomed.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is unclear in setting out a delivery strategy for achieving identified strategic objectives, as per the guidance set out at Section 4 of PPS 12. The Core Strategy document does not provide comfort of the mechanisms and means of delivery. Reassurance are sought as to the arrangements through which infrastructure will be delivered.</p>	<p>Suggested inclusion of a schedule to identify infrastructure projects, including classification of which infrastructure had secured and unsecured funding to support the final Core Strategy.</p>
7.10	Housing Growth Areas		Yes	<p>Housing Growth Areas – para 7.10 – welcome the reference to Hackney Wick as an employment led mixed use growth area including residential growth that maximises Olympic Opportunities. This is in line with current Legacy development thinking, including the broad principles (rather than specific scenarios, within the LDA/Legacy Company LMF work. This should not however, be seen as a development scenario that compromises the delivery of public open space as required by the 2007 Olympic Planning Permissions.</p> <p>Proposals Map SIL 136a – The change to the boundary drawing SIL away from the Olympic Park Parklands is welcomed and the previous objection</p>	None
		136a SIL Designation	Potentially – but requires clarification/add		The Hackney Wick section of the Core Strategy text should clearly express the principle of acceptability

Para.	Policy	Proposals Map	Is CS Legally compliant/sound?	Comment	Changes sought
			Additional text	made at Preferred Options stage is therefore withdrawn. Text within the Core Strategy, at various points, implies that this SiL designation will be flexible enough to allow the promotion of employment led mixed use development. This is welcomed. However, it is considered that the Hackney Wick section of the Core Strategy should be more explicit about this approach. This should particularly be applied to the Legacy Development Platform that will be left between the International Broadcast Centre (IBC)/the reinstated Waterden Road and the Legacy Parklands. This would also reflect the general principles emerging from the LDA's Legacy Masterplan Framework development.	for an employment led mix of uses to be delivered in this SiL and for those uses to relate to and respect the edges of the Olympic Park Parklands.
		137 – Other Industrial Area	Potentially – but requires clarification/additional text	Proposals Map 137 – Other Industrial Area : This is the area in which the Olympic Legacy Multi-use Sports Venue is located (Handball Arena during the 2012 Games). It should also be noted that the LDA Legacy Master Plan Framework in its current draft indicates an intention for mixed use with a leisure focus in this area. It is important to be clear about the range of acceptable land uses for the location and in particular the need to ensure that development here takes account of the high quality design of the Handball Arena/MUSV. References in the Core Strategy imply a flexible approach to land-uses with an emphasis on employment use, although there is no recognition of the key Handball Arena/MUSV building that is currently being delivered here.	The Hackney Wick section of the Core Strategy text should recognise this as the location of the permitted Handball Arena/Legacy Multi-use Sports Venue, as a key anchor to development of this location in the Olympic Legacy period. The text should clarify the potential for a range of uses to be planned for in other LDF documents such as the Hackney Wick AAP.  Consideration of a spatial narrative providing clarity of the range of acceptable land uses at this location to encompass sport and leisure.
		196 Hackney Marsh East	Yes	Proposals Map 196 – Hackney Marsh East – support for proposed designation given the existing	None

Para.	Policy	Proposals Map	Is CS Legally compliant/sound?	Comment	Changes sought
				MOL designation and the obligation in the 2007 Olympic Planning Permissions to ensure the return to open space and football pitches within the planning permissions/S106.	
		199 White Hart Field	Yes	Proposals Map 199 – White Hart Field – as with Hackney Marsh East, falls within the ODA administrative area. The continued identification of this area as open space and Metropolitan Open Land as indicated on the Proposals Map, is supported.	None
		262 Proposed Open Space	Potentially – but requires clarification/additional text	Proposals Map 262 – potential new open space (New Linear Park).  This area forms part of the permitted Olympic Park Parklands that would result from the post 2012 Games transformation/removal of temporary venues and other structures. The designation is supported. However, consideration should also be given to the designation of this area as Metropolitan Open Land. The requirement in the 2007 Olympic Planning Permissions is for the provision of public open space in Legacy that would meet the requirements of Metropolitan Open Land Designation. If it is not considered appropriate to provide this level of designation/protection at this point in time, the need to pursue designation in further iterations of the Core Strategy and Proposals Map should be considered.	Include a designation of Metropolitan Open Land (MoL) for this open space on the Proposals Map. Alternatively, indicate within the text of the Core Strategy that a potential MoL designation for this open space will be taken forward in the future.
11		263 Proposed Open Space	Yes	Proposals Map 263 – potential new open space (Proposed Open Space):  The principle of provision of a new open space in	Within the text of the Core Strategy, define the quantum required for a new open space in this general location, outline that this will be explored in

Para.	Policy	Proposals Map	Is CS Legally compliant/sound?	Comment	Changes sought
				<p>this general location is welcomed and seen as consistent with the requirement in the 2007 Olympic Planning Permissions to provide a minimum of 102 ha of public open space within the Legacy Olympic Park as a whole that is capable of being designated as Metropolitan Open Land. As shown, however, there appears to be some potential for over lap with the permitted (and under construction) International Broadcast Centre (IBC) and Main Press Centre (MPC) buildings. It would help to indicate within the text of the Core Strategy that this proposal indicates a general location that requires further definition through development of the Hackney Wick Masterplan and in terms of future planning permission(s) for any long term Legacy development in this location. An identification of the size of open space sought would help in securing an appropriate quantum when seeking delivery of this. It is considered that this would be appropriate to the level of detail of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>further detail in the Hackney Wick AAP and through consideration of specific Olympic Legacy planning proposals.</p>

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY**

**ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

11 August 2009

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 49th COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Held on 28 July 2009 at 18.00

Old Town Hall, Stratford, 29 Broadway, London E15 4BQ

---

**Present:**

Lorraine Baldry	Chairman
David Taylor	Deputy Chairman

**Local Authority Members:**

Cllr Rofique Ahmed	LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Geoffrey Taylor	LB Hackney
Cllr Terry Wheeler	LB Waltham Forest
Cllr Conor McAuley	LB Newham

**Independent Members:**

William Hodgson  
Janice Morphet

**Officers in attendance:**

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Head of Development Control
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
David Horkan	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Liz Fisher	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Catherine Sherwin	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Allison De Marco	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Allan Ledden	ODA Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Kate Dance	ODA Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)

**1. APOLOGIES  
(AGENDA ITEM 1)**

1.1. Apologies were received from Celia Carrington, Dru Vesty and Mike Appleton who were not able to attend the meeting.

**2. UPDATES, ORDER OF BUSINESS, AND REQUESTS TO SPEAK**

---

## **(AGENDA ITEM 2)**

2.1. There were Updates for:

Item 6 – Plot N26

- Correction to paragraph 8.3; and
- Consultation response.

Item 8 – Old Ford Pumping Station

- Additional noise condition from Tower Hamlets Environmental Health Officer; and
- Amendment to condition 10.

Item 9 – Outer Perimeter Security Fence

- Reason for original incorrect alignment; and
- Changes/additions to the remediation conditions.

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

3.1. The Secretary read the following statement:

‘Members of this Planning Committee need to declare personal interests relevant to the agenda at the beginning of each meeting of the Planning Committee.

‘Members will see that the paper for Item 3 which has been circulated lists interests which they have declared which appear to be personal interests relating to Items 5, 6, 8 and 9.

‘Would Members please confirm that the declarations of personal interests listed in the paper for Item 3 are correct; and state if there are any other interests you wish to declare?’

‘Personal interests are prejudicial if a reasonable member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would conclude that the nature of your personal interest is such that your judgement of the public interest is likely to be affected. If, by virtue of your personal interest you have been involved in decisions about these proposals, you may have a prejudicial interest. In that circumstance you would need to leave the meeting during the consideration of that item. In light of the agenda before you this evening, please state whether or not any of the interests declared are prejudicial interests?’

Members confirmed that the personal interests recorded were correct. None of the personal interests were considered prejudicial.

## **4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

AGREED the Minutes of the 48th Planning Committee Meeting

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS

### 5. London Borough of Hackney Core Strategy Pre-Submission Consultation (AGENDA ITEM 5)

- 5.1. The Head of Development Control gave a presentation to the Committee seeking their comments on the London Borough of Hackney Core Strategy and Proposals Map, pre-submission consultation. Planning Committee considered a report of comments for the Preferred Options consultation in May 2008, this resulted in an objection by the ODA in its role as local planning authority to the extent of the Strategic Industrial Land designation proposed at Hackney Wick, within the Olympic Park, seeking a realignment of this and a suitable designation of the Olympic Park Parklands that are being delivered in this location.
- 5.2. The Head of Development Control reported that the Strategic Industrial Land area had been modified to exclude the park and that potential park areas were now included. Officers now considered that the previous objection could be withdrawn but that the report outlined some area of detailed comment which should be forwarded to London Borough of Hackney.
- 5.3. Members welcomed the report, however Janice Morphet stated that although she was generally supportive she wished to make several comments for inclusion in the final written comments to be submitted to the London Borough of Hackney.
- 5.4. Janice expressed concerns that the Core Strategy did not provide comfort of the actual mechanisms and arrangements for delivery. Janice noted that independent examination would consider the Core Strategy in terms of legal compliance and soundness and commented that the "Test of Soundness" and the notion of deliverability, as a sub-test, needed to be clarified and that evidence be provided to illustrate such arrangements have been set up or in the process of being set up.
- 5.5. In addition she noted the test of consistency and coherency with neighbouring authorities did not seem to be met and that there was a need to safeguard current arrangements and provide more evidence of a commitment to continue relationships in future.
- 5.6. Janice noted that the primary issue was that the Core Strategy was unclear in setting out a delivery strategy for achieving identified strategic objectives, as per the guidance set out at Section 4 of PPS 12. She stated that the document did not provide comfort of the mechanisms and means of delivery and sought reassurance as to the arrangements through which infrastructure would be delivered. Janice requested that a list be produced to identify each project, including classification of which infrastructure had secured and unsecured funding. She stated that the inclusion of infrastructure planning supporting evidence within the Core Strategy would assist in safeguarding the legacy of the Olympic Park.
- 5.7. Janice further noted that there was a need to show the joined-up way in which infrastructure is being planned, delivered and funded and that this would also be tested through separate audit, which was distinct and separate from the Development Plan Document examination process. She noted that if a

scheme was not included within the delivery schedule then it would not be eligible to go forward, the onus was on proving that infrastructure elements are delivered within a sound system.

- 5.8. The Head of Development Control read from an email from London Borough of Hackney which set out that the London Borough of Hackney planning policy team are currently surveying infrastructure suppliers to compile evidence in support of the Core Strategy comprising:

- ”
1. a schedule of all the known infrastructure plans set out according to PAS recommendations. This will provide for each PAS defined category (e.g. green, social, public realm, energy utilities etc) the PAS recommended information items: type, what, where when, why, lead delivery, cost, sources of funding and any dependencies. The aim is to produce a factual schedule about infrastructure proposals, it is not intended to enumerate known infrastructure.
  2. With the schedule there will be a supporting narrative regarding the alignment on infrastructure delivery plans with the Core Strategy proposals.

Following submission and Examination In Public it is proposed to undertake further in depth work regarding current infrastructure capacities and proposals, but this work cannot be completed in full for the Examination In Public, and it is felt that the approach in 1. & 2. will provide adequate evidence to demonstrate alignment of the core Strategy and infrastructure plans.”

- 5.9. Janice stated that there should still be a possibility to include an element of the delivery plan within the Core Strategy before examination.
- 5.10. Members sought clarification on the meaning of "infrastructure". Janice explained that "infrastructure" means a capital facility, usually a building or piece of land and noted that the "infrastructure" includes physical, green, social and community infrastructure categories.
- 5.11. Members queried the compatibility of the industrial category with the handball and public realm elements contained within the industrial area identified on the Proposal Map, there was concern that the industrial category was too broad. Janice noted that it was possible to include a spatial narrative with the land use category and that this could encompass sport and leisure.
- 5.12. The Head of Development Control noted that the report included comments requesting elaboration of uses which could fall within the proposed Industrial Land area.
- 5.13. Members sought confirmation that the categories within the Core Strategies would not be too vague and to reinforce to the authority that the area should have a sports-related designation. Members also agreed that the matters raised by Janice should be included in the written response to London Borough of Hackney.
- 5.14. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED by a majority that

the Committee

- a) Agreed with the comments set out in the pre-submission consultation Core Strategy report; and
- b) **AUTHORISED** the Head of Development Control to provide final written comments to the London Borough of Hackney as set out in this report and incorporating the additional views that the Committee wished to make as discussed at the committee.

**6. APPLICATION NO: 09/90065/REMODA – Stratford City Plot N26 (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

**Application for the approval of reserved matters for 242 residential units and 454sqm of complementary retail floorspace (A1-A5) with associated car parking and on plot landscaping pursuant to conditions B1 and B8 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA being details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping together with: i) Approval in writing pursuant to condition O9 to erect residential dwelling that will experience levels of ground borne noise from railway tracks in excess of the maximum level cited in condition O8 of the outline planning permission. ii) Approval in writing pursuant to condition O6 to erect residential dwellings that will experience noise levels exceeding Noise Exposure Category B as cited in condition O5 of the outline planning permission.**

***Plot N26, Zone 4, Stratford City Development, Stratford, London***

- 6.1. The Architects gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant illustrating the approach and principles of design and the proposal drawings and details.
- 6.2. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report. The proposals were for the approval of reserved matters for 242 residential units and 454sqm of complementary retail floorspace (A1-A5) with associated car parking and on plot landscaping pursuant to conditions B1 and B8 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA being details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping together with: i) Approval in writing pursuant to condition O9 to erect residential dwelling that will experience levels of ground borne noise from railway tracks in excess of the maximum level cited in condition O8 of the outline planning permission. ii) Approval in writing pursuant to condition O6 to erect residential dwellings that will experience noise levels exceeding Noise Exposure Category B as cited in condition O5 of the outline planning permission.
- 6.3. The Planning Officer noted that prior to making a decision on the reserved matters submission, members were asked to consider requests for changes to the distribution of floorspace permitted by Condition D2 of the outline planning permission and minor adjustments to the Site Wide Housing Strategy (SWHS) as set out at sections 7, 8 and 9 of the report. The Planning Officer indicated that Plot N06 would require future consideration by either a free-standing 'slot-in' application or further adjustments to the distribution of floorspace. It was noted that the minor adjustments and changes to the distribution of floorspace do not propose to increase the number of dwellings permitted by the SWHS nor change the densities permitted by Condition U1.
- 6.4. Members welcomed the report but expressed concern about the likely ventilation and cooling required by the units and the power demands and

Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

Part A : Your Personal Details	Agent's Details (if applicable)
First Name <b>Alex</b>	First Name _____
Surname <b>Savine</b>	Surname _____
Address <b>Mail-Point 32B Level 23, 1 Churchill Place Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN</b>	Address _____
Phone number <b>020 8430 5454</b>	Phone number _____
Email <b>alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk</b>	Email _____
Job title <b>Chief Planner (Policy &amp; Relationships)</b>	Job title _____
Organisation <b>Olympic Delivery Authority Planning Decisions Team</b>	Organisation _____

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph 3.17 Policy Strategic Objectives Proposals Map \_\_\_\_\_

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes  No  Please go to Question 4

Sound? Yes  No  Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified  Effective  Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Strategic Objectives (Para.3.17) – These are welcomed and supported, in particular the final objective which relates to harnessing the benefits of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.**

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful can to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

None.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination

6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes

No

7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature

*Z Ransay*

Date

06/08/2009

Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

**Part A : Your Personal Details**

**Agent's Details (if applicable)**

First Name	<b>Alex</b>	First Name	
Surname	<b>Savine</b>	Surname	
Address	<b>Mail-Point 32B</b>	Address	
	<b>Level 23, 1 Churchill Place</b>		
	<b>Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN</b>		
Phone number	<b>020 8430 5454</b>	Phone number	
Email	<b>alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk</b>	Email	
Job title	<b>Chief Planner (Policy &amp; Relationships)</b>	Job title	
Organisation	<b>Olympic Delivery Authority</b>	Organisation	
	<b>Planning Decisions Team</b>		

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph 5.13 Policy Focusing Social Investment Proposals Map \_\_\_\_\_

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes   
Sound? Yes

No  Please go to Question 4  
No  Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified  Effective  Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Para 5.13 - Infrastructure Delivery – it is noted that the main elements of an infrastructure delivery plan have been set out throughout the Core Strategy document. The indications provided of what is required for delivery and when is welcomed.**

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful can to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

None.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination

6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?  
Yes  No

7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature Z. Ransey

Date 06/08/2009

Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

Part A : Your Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)	
First Name	<b>Alex</b>	First Name	
Surname	<b>Savine</b>	Surname	
Address	<b>Mail-Point 32B Level 23, 1 Churchill Place Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN</b>	Address	
Phone number	<b>020 8430 5454</b>	Phone number	
Email	<b>alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk</b>	Email	
Job title	<b>Chief Planner (Policy &amp; Relationships)</b>	Job title	
Organisation	<b>Olympic Delivery Authority Planning Decisions Team</b>	Organisation	

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph 4.42 Policy Hackney Wick Proposals Map \_\_\_\_\_  
New Community

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes  No  Please go to Question 4  
 Sound? Yes  Yes – but requires addition as suggested No  Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified  Effective  Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Paragraph 4.42 – Hackney Wick (implementation and Monitoring)**

Where the ODA is mentioned as a partner for delivering aspects of development and Olympic Legacy and associated benefits to the communities of Hackney, this is welcomed. However, there should also be recognition of the role of the newly established Olympic Legacy Company in delivering the long term legacy within and around the Olympic Park. This is irrespective of any specific proposals that may come out of the LDA/Legacy Company LMF work. (See also comments on 136a and 137 of the Proposals Map later in this table).

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful can to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

**Add reference to the Olympic Legacy Company as a key partner for delivering infrastructure and development, in addition to the ODA and LDA.**

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination

6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes

No

7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature

*Z. Lacey*

Date

06/08/2009

Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

Part A : Your Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)	
First Name	Alex	First Name	
Surname	Savine	Surname	
Address	Mail-Point 32B Level 23, 1 Churchill Place Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN	Address	
Phone number	020 8430 5454	Phone number	
Email	alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk	Email	
Job title	Chief Planner (Policy & Relationships)	Job title	
Organisation	Olympic Delivery Authority Planning Decisions Team	Organisation	

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph 4.56 - 4.61 Policy Infrastructure Proposals Map \_\_\_\_\_

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes  No  Please go to Question 4  
 Sound? Yes  Suggest additions No  Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified  Effective  Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Para 4.56 – 4.61 - Infrastructure Planning and Delivery – it is noted that the main elements of an infrastructure delivery plan have been set out throughout the Core Strategy document and that the borough is currently commissioning an infrastructure study. The ‘Indicators to monitor delivery of Core Strategy Policy 7’ (Working with Infrastructure Partners) indicates that a schedule of programmed infrastructure capital programmes will be maintained, updated and presented as a supporting Appendix to the LDF to demonstrate that the Core Strategy is realistic and capable of responding to changing circumstances. The inclusion of a schedule of programmed infrastructure capital programmes as a monitor of the delivery of Policy 7 is welcomed.**

**The Core Strategy is unclear in setting out a delivery strategy for achieving identified strategic objectives, as per the guidance set out at Section 4 of PPS 12. The Core Strategy document does not provide comfort of the mechanisms and means of delivery. Reassurance are sought as to the arrangements through which infrastructure will be delivered.**

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful can to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

**The inclusion of further infrastructure planning and delivery supporting evidence within the Core Strategy, including evidence of joined-up planning, delivery and funding, is suggested within the final Core Strategy.**

**Suggested inclusion of a schedule to identify infrastructure projects, including classification of which infrastructure had secured and unsecured funding to support the final Core Strategy.**

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination

6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes

No

7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature     *Z Ransley*    

Date     06/08/2009

Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

**Part A : Your Personal Details**

**Agent's Details (if applicable)**

First Name	<b>Alex</b>	First Name	
Surname	<b>Savine</b>	Surname	
Address	<b>Mail-Point 32B</b>	Address	
	<b>Level 23, 1 Churchill Place</b>		
	<b>Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN</b>		
Phone number	<b>020 8430 5454</b>	Phone number	
Email	<b>alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk</b>	Email	
Job title	<b>Chief Planner (Policy &amp; Relationships)</b>	Job title	
Organisation	<b>Olympic Delivery Authority</b>	Organisation	
	<b>Planning Decisions Team</b>		

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph 7.10 Policy Housing Proposals Map \_\_\_\_\_  
Growth Areas

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes

No

Please go to Question 4

Sound? Yes

No

Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified

Effective

Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound.

Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Housing Growth Areas – para 7.10 – welcome the reference to Hackney Wick as an employment led mixed use growth area including residential growth that maximises Olympic Opportunities. This is in line with current Legacy development thinking, including the broad principles (rather than specific scenarios, within the LDA/Legacy Company LMF work. This should not however, be seen as a development scenario that compromises the delivery of public open space as required by the 2007 Olympic Planning Permissions.**

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful can to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

None.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination

6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes

No

7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature Z Ransey

Date 06/08/2009

Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

**Part A : Your Personal Details**

**Agent's Details (if applicable)**

First Name <b>Alex</b>	First Name _____
Surname <b>Savine</b>	Surname _____
Address <b>Mail-Point 32B</b>	Address _____
<b>Level 23, 1 Churchill Place</b>	_____
<b>Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN</b>	_____
Phone number <b>020 8430 5454</b>	Phone number _____
Email <b>alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk</b>	Email _____
Job title <b>Chief Planner (Policy &amp; Relationships)</b>	Job title _____
Organisation <b>Olympic Delivery Authority</b>	Organisation _____
<b>Planning Decisions Team</b>	

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph \_\_\_\_\_ Policy \_\_\_\_\_ Proposals Map **136a**  
**SiL Designation**

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes  No  Please go to Question 4  
 Sound? Yes  Potentially – but requires clarification/additional text No  Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified  Effective  Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Proposals Map SiL 136a – The change to the boundary drawing SiL away from the Olympic Park Parklands is welcomed and the previous objection made at Preferred Options stage is therefore withdrawn. Text within the Core Strategy, at various points, implies that this SiL designation will be flexible enough to allow the promotion of employment led mixed use development. This is welcomed. However, it is considered that the Hackney Wick section of the Core Strategy should be more explicit about this approach. This should particularly be applied to the Legacy Development Platform that will be left between the International Broadcast Centre (IBC)/the reinstated Waterden Road and the Legacy Parklands. This would also reflect the general principles emerging from the LDA's Legacy Masterplan Framework development.**

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful can to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The Hackney Wick section of the Core Strategy text should clearly express the principle of acceptability for an employment led mix of uses to be delivered in this SiL and for those uses to relate to and respect the edges of the Olympic Park Parklands.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination

6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?  
Yes  No

7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature Z. Rawley Date 06/08/2009

Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

**Part A : Your Personal Details**

**Agent's Details (if applicable)**

First Name	<u>Alex</u>	First Name	_____
Surname	<u>Savine</u>	Surname	_____
Address	<u>Mail-Point 32B</u>	Address	_____
	<u>Level 23, 1 Churchill Place</u>		_____
	<u>Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN</u>		_____
Phone number	<u>020 8430 5454</u>	Phone number	_____
Email	<u>alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk</u>	Email	_____
Job title	<u>Chief Planner (Policy &amp; Relationships)</u>	Job title	_____
Organisation	<u>Olympic Delivery Authority</u>	Organisation	_____
	<u>Planning Decisions Team</u>		_____

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph \_\_\_\_\_ Policy \_\_\_\_\_ Proposals Map 137 -  
Other Industrial Area

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes  No  Please go to Question 4

Sound? Yes  Potentially – but requires clarification/additional text No  Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified  Effective  Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound.

Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Proposals Map 137 – Other Industrial Area :**

This is the area in which the Olympic Legacy Multi-use Sports Venue is located (Handball Arena during the 2012 Games). It should also be noted that the LDA Legacy Master Plan Framework in its current draft indicates an intention for mixed use with a leisure focus in this area. It is important to be clear about the range of acceptable land uses for the location and in particular the need to ensure that development here takes account of the high quality design of the Handball Arena/MUSV. References in the Core Strategy imply a flexible approach to land-uses with an emphasis on employment use, although there is no recognition of the key Handball Arena/MUSV building that is currently being delivered here.

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful can to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

**The Hackney Wick section of the Core Strategy text should recognise this as the location of the permitted Handball Arena/Legacy Multi-use Sports Venue, as a key anchor to development of this location in the Olympic Legacy period. The text should clarify the potential for a range of uses to be planned for in other LDF documents such as the Hackney Wick AAP.**

**Consideration of a spatial narrative providing clarity of the range of acceptable land uses at this location to encompass sport and leisure.**

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination

6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes

No

7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature *Z. Ramsey*

Date 06/08/2009

Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

**Part A : Your Personal Details**

**Agent's Details (if applicable)**

First Name <b>Alex</b>	First Name _____
Surname <b>Savine</b>	Surname _____
Address <b>Mail-Point 32B</b>	Address _____
<b>Level 23, 1 Churchill Place</b>	_____
<b>Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN</b>	_____
Phone number <b>020 8430 5454</b>	Phone number _____
Email <b>alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk</b>	Email _____
Job title <b>Chief Planner (Policy &amp; Relationships)</b>	Job title _____
Organisation <b>Olympic Delivery Authority</b>	Organisation _____
<b>Planning Decisions Team</b>	

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph \_\_\_\_\_ Policy \_\_\_\_\_ Proposals Map **196 - Hackney Marsh East**

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes

No

Please go to Question 4

Sound? Yes

No

Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified

Effective

Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound.

Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Proposals Map 196 – Hackney Marsh East – support for proposed designation given the existing MOL designation and the obligation in the 2007 Olympic Planning Permissions to ensure the return to open space and football pitches within the planning permissions/S106.**

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful can to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

None.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination

6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?  
Yes  No

7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature

*Z. Ransey*

Date

06/08/2009

Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

**Part A : Your Personal Details**

**Agent's Details (if applicable)**

First Name <b>Alex</b>	First Name _____
Surname <b>Savine</b>	Surname _____
Address <b>Mail-Point 32B</b>	Address _____
<b>Level 23, 1 Churchill Place</b>	_____
<b>Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN</b>	_____
Phone number <b>020 8430 5454</b>	Phone number _____
Email <b>alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk</b>	Email _____
Job title <b>Chief Planner (Policy &amp; Relationships)</b>	Job title _____
Organisation <b>Olympic Delivery Authority</b>	Organisation _____
<b>Planning Decisions Team</b>	

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph \_\_\_\_\_ Policy \_\_\_\_\_ Proposals Map **199 - White Hart Field**

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes   
Sound? Yes

No  Please go to Question 4  
No  Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified  Effective  Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound.

Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Proposals Map 199 – White Hart Field – as with Hackney Marsh East, falls within the ODA administrative area. The continued identification of this area as open space and Metropolitan Open Land as indicated on the Proposals Map, is supported.**



Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

**Part A : Your Personal Details**

**Agent's Details (if applicable)**

First Name	<b>Alex</b>	First Name	
Surname	<b>Savine</b>	Surname	
Address	<b>Mail-Point 32B</b>	Address	
	<b>Level 23, 1 Churchill Place</b>		
	<b>Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN</b>		
Phone number	<b>020 8430 5454</b>	Phone number	
Email	<b>alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk</b>	Email	
Job title	<b>Chief Planner (Policy &amp; Relationships)</b>	Job title	
Organisation	<b>Olympic Delivery Authority</b>	Organisation	
	<b>Planning Decisions Team</b>		

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph \_\_\_\_\_ Policy \_\_\_\_\_ Proposals Map **262 – Proposed Open Space**

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes  No  Please go to Question 4  
Sound? Yes  Potentially – but requires clarification/additional text No  Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified  Effective  Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Proposals Map 262 – potential new open space (New Linear Park).**

This area forms part of the permitted Olympic Park Parklands that would result from the post 2012 Games transformation/removal of temporary venues and other structures. The designation is supported. However, consideration should also be given to the designation of this area as Metropolitan Open Land. The requirement in the 2007 Olympic Planning Permissions is for the provision of public open space in Legacy that would meet the requirements of Metropolitan Open Land Designation. If it is not considered appropriate to provide this level of designation/protection at this point in time, the need to pursue designation in further iterations of the Core Strategy and Proposals Map should be considered.

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the core strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful can to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

**Include a designation of Metropolitan Open Land (MoL) for this open space on the Proposals Map. Alternatively, indicate within the text of the Core Strategy that a potential MoL designation for this open space will be taken forward in the future.**

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination

6. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes

No

7. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature

*Z. Ransley*

Date

06/08/2009

Please refer to the guidance notes before completing this form. An electronic copy of the guidance notes and representation form are available at [www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ldf)

**Part A : Your Personal Details**

**Agent's Details (if applicable)**

First Name	<b>Alex</b>	First Name	_____
Surname	<b>Savine</b>	Surname	_____
Address	<b>Mail-Point 32B Level 23, 1 Churchill Place Canary Wharf, London E14 5LN</b>	Address	_____
Phone number	<b>020 8430 5454</b>	Phone number	_____
Email	<b>alex.savine@pdt.oda.gov.uk</b>	Email	_____
Job title	<b>Chief Planner (Policy &amp; Relationships)</b>	Job title	_____
Organisation	<b>Olympic Delivery Authority Planning Decisions Team</b>	Organisation	_____

**Part B. Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

1. Which part of the Core Strategy are you commenting on?

Paragraph \_\_\_\_\_ Policy \_\_\_\_\_ Proposals Map **263 – Proposed Open Space**

2. Do you think the Core Strategy is:

Legally compliant? Yes   
Sound? Yes

No  Please go to Question 4  
No  Please go to Question 3

3. Do you consider the core strategy is unsound because it is not:

Justified  Effective  Consistent with national policy

4. Please give details of why you consider the core strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the core strategy, please also use this space to set out your comments.

**Proposals Map 263 – potential new open space (Proposed Open Space):**

The principle of provision of a new open space in this general location is welcomed and seen as consistent with the requirement in the 2007 Olympic Planning Permissions to provide a minimum of 102 ha of public open space within the Legacy Olympic Park as a whole that is capable of being designated as Metropolitan Open Land. As shown, however, there appears to be some potential for over lap with the permitted (and under construction) International Broadcast Centre (IBC) and Main Press Centre (MPC) buildings. It would help to indicate within the text of the Core Strategy that this proposal indicates a general location that requires further definition through development of the Hackney Wick Masterplan and in terms of future planning permission(s) for any long term Legacy development in this location. An identification of the size of open space sought would help in securing an appropriate quantum when seeking delivery of this. It is considered that this would be appropriate to the level of detail of the Core Strategy.

