LDF

Local Development Framework

Hackney

LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT LOCAL PLAN

CONSULTATION REPORT

JULY 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	**Introduction**	3
2.	**Local Plan Preparation – Regulation 18 Consultation Process**	6
3.	**Summary of Consultation Responses and LBH Planning Responses**	9
	Appendix 1	52
	Appendix 2	53

1. Introduction

1.1 Hackney is replacing the 1995 Unitary Development Plan (UDP) with its Local Development Framework (LDF). The LDF itself comprises a suite of individual planning policy documents, known as Local Plans (LPs). The Council's Core Strategy, the over-arching, strategic, spatial planning document for the Borough, was adopted by the Council in November 2010, and sets the strategic context for the development of further LDF documents. Now that the Core Strategy has been adopted, the Council is taking forward a number of key planning policy documents to guide and manage development in the Borough.

1.2 Hackney Council prepared a draft Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) document for 'Public Participation' in June 2012. This set out detailed, generally criteria-based, proposed planning policies which the Council will be use to assess planning applications. Hackney Council also prepared a draft Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) for 'Public Participation' in June 2012 which identifies key strategic sites in the Borough and provides policies for those sites. The SALP provides certainty to developers and the public about the Council's position and requirements for individual sites. The document will assist the Council in future planning of the Borough. Early engagement with key stakeholders was undertaken in the form of meetings with Ward Members and a 'call for sites' from landowners/developers to establish views of key policy issues to be addressed in the DMLP and preferred development types on identified key sites for the SALP.

1.3 These documents were published for a 10-week joint consultation between 16th July and 25th September 2012. The consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, in line with Regulation 18 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 which came into effect on 6th April 2012, and in accordance with Council best practice. The consultation on these Local Plans was undertaken jointly as they have certain synergies as part to the production of the Council's LDF.

1.4 Under Regulations 18 and 22 (1) (c) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Council has produced this Consultation Report which sets out:

- Which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18;
- How those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18;
- A summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18; and
- How many representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account.

1.5 The major issues raised on the DMLP during the Regulation 18 Consultation process and the Council's responses to them are discussed in Section 3.

1.6 Regulations include the requirement to consult the public including 'specific and general consultation bodies', as well as consulting those residents and/or business the local authority considers appropriate. The 'specific consultation bodies' are listed in Regulation 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. These are a list of specific bodies that must be consulted by the local authority when preparing development plan documents in which they may have an interest. A list of the 'specific consultation bodies' applicable to Hackney is listed in Appendix 1.

1.7 The 'general consultation bodies' are also listed in Regulation 2 and include voluntary bodies in the local authority's area; bodies which represent different racial, ethnic or national groups in the local authority's area; bodies which represent different religious groups in the local authority's area; bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the local authority's area; and bodies which represent

the interests of people carrying on business in the local authority's area. The exact organisations that fall into this group vary locally. A list of the 'general consultation bodies' for Hackney is listed in Appendix 2.

1.8 There are also other consultation bodies which the Council have considered appropriate to consult, including hard-to-reach groups; those identified as likely to have an interest in planning policy development and those who have responded to previous policy consultation exercises, such as in relation to the Core Strategy and more recently the Area Action Plans.

1.9 The following section describes the consultation processes in detail and outlines what measures were taken to ensure as much participation from the public as possible.

2. Local Plan Preparation - Regulation 18 Consultation Process

2.1 The purpose of consulting residents, business, and other general and specific consultees, such as other public sector bodies, and landowners/developers in the Borough is to seek their views and involve them in shaping and informing the preparation of the draft local plans. As a result of consultation feedback, amendments have been made to the plans (see Section 3, summary of representations and changes/responses) – a detailed Consultation Spreadsheet has been produced containing all responses made and Council response, and also a Duty to Co-operate Report – available at http://www.hackney.gov.uk/Development-Management-DPD.htm.).

2.2 The Local Plans have been drafted taking into account comments received during the informal consultation period and the baseline study and analysis stage in the process of local plan preparation. This stage of consultation has provided the opportunity for the Borough's community and other stakeholders to further shape the development of the Development Management Local Plan.

When

2.3 The Regulation 18 consultation on both the DMLP and SALP ran for 10 weeks between July 16th and September 25th 2012, running beyond the statutory 6 week requirement (the consultation programme extended into October to allow for late submissions).

Who

2.4 The following groups of people were consulted:

- Residents, businesses organisations, and other organisations (e.g. schools) Borough-wide.
- Resident/community/amenity/business groups Borough-wide contained on the LDF Consultation Database, including older people, youth, faith, community and vulnerable groups. This list includes typically hard-to-reach groups, such as particular ethnic minority groups.

- Key strategic partners, such as the Greater London Authority (GLA), neighbouring local authorities such as the London Borough of Islington, service providers such as health and education authorities, infrastructure providers such as Thames Water, environmental bodies such as the Environment Agency.
- Members of the Council and other internal departments.
- General and Statutory consultees as set out in the Regulations.

How

2.5 The consultation period commenced with an advert in Hackney Today, which is distributed to every residential address in the Borough. Specific, general and other consultation bodies were contacted directly by post or by email on the day the 10 week consultation period began. Approximately 1,700 letters and 1,500 emails were sent out inviting consultees to comment and share their views on the two LDF documents in writing, or by email to the dedicated LDF mailbox or by comments via an online questionnaire. Documents were made available by providing links on the letters and emails to the online versions of the documents, as well as instructions on how to view a hard-copy of the two documents.. Copies of the documents were also distributed across Hackney's libraries and at Hackney's Service Centre (Hackney's main access point) to allow people without access to the internet to read the plans. Statutory Consultees were also each sent hard copies of the DMLP and SALP along with their associated supporting documents.

2.6 In addition, a number of other consultation methods were used, in accordance with the Council's SCI and LDF to help raise awareness of the two LDF documents and target all areas of Hackney's population. The following consultation methods were used:

- A statutory notice was placed in the Hackney Today paper on 16th July 2012, the start of the consultation period, which outlined what the Council was consulting on, how people could view the documents, how they could respond, where they could get further information and how long the consultation period would last.

- Two similar notices were placed in the Olay Gazette and Hamodia magazine on the 13th and 19th of July respectively to raise awareness in the Turkish and Orthodox Jewish communities, which form a significant part of Hackney's population.
- Online versions of the DMLP and SALP and their supporting documents were placed on Hackney's website, and a web-link to an online questionnaire was also placed on the Hackney website to allow people to send their comments on the documents directly to the Council.
- The documents were also distributed to eight public libraries across Hackney and were also placed in Hackney's Service Centre, a main point of contact to the Council for the public, to allow easy access to the documents for members of the public.
- Consultation leaflets and posters were placed in Borough libraries to provide further information on the consultation process.
- An email address dedicated to receiving comments from consultees as well as a 'LDF Hotline' was open throughout the consultation process, which allowed easy access to further information for the public.
- Stalls, which were run by Planning Policy Officers involved in the LDF process, were set up in Hoxton Square, Hackney Central Library, Stamford Hill and Ridley Market. Members of the public were free to ask the Planning Policy Officers questions about the two documents, and provide feedback. At these stalls consultation leaflets which contained further information about the consultation process were also handed out to members of the public.
- Meetings were held with several statutory consultees, developers and other local organisations and community groups during and after the formal consultation period to discuss the documents, and further discuss representations made and allow those who were not able to make representations during the formal consultation period to express their views on the documents.

3. Summary of Consultation Responses and LBH Planning Responses

3.1 This section summarises the consultation responses received during the Regulation 18 Consultation process. Hackney received many constructive comments which have helped shape and inform the next version (Publication Version) of the DMLP.

3.2 The Council received approximately 350 formal individual comments from approximately 70 respondees, including developers and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs), the Greater London Authority (GLA), Transport for London (TfL), other Boroughs, statutory and other key consultees e.g. English Heritage, Environment Agency, Theatres Trust, Natural England, and the Lee Valley Regional Park, amenity/community groups, and individuals. All comments were considered and a detailed summary of the key consultation comments and the London Borough of Hackney's responses to those specific comments is set out below, with key issues raised at the start of each chapter. A detailed spreadsheet of all comments received and the London Borough of Hackney's responses to those comments can be found online at http://www.hackney.gov.uk/Development-Management-DPD.htm. A Schedule of Changes is also available at this web address. This lists all the key changes made to the document after the Regulation 18 consultation process, including those changes that are not as a direct result of external consultation, but as a result of the Council's review of the document. This section summarises some of the key issues raised chapter-by-chapter and policy by policy (this is not an exhaustive list of all the issues raised, rather it is meant as a guide to capture many of the key issues, there may be an element of subjectivity in determining what is a main issue – detailed consultation responses and Council responses can be viewed in the documents referred to above).

KEY ISSUES RAISED BY CONSULTEES

CHAPTER 3 DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE GROWTH

DM1 High Quality Design

General Comments	LBH Response
Plough Yard Developments Ltd and HDG Ltd responded proposing that there should be more flexibility in the policy to allow for the assessment and consideration of tall buildings.	*The policy does not seek to exclude tall buildings. It generally seeks to ensure that proposals fit with the scale, massing, rhythm of building(s) and the streetscene, with developments of a greater height and scale appropriate on sites with the ability to accommodate such developments. Core Strategy policy 24 directs taller buildings to the Council's Growth Areas, and the AAPs provide detailed policies for tall buildings in those areas.*
English Heritage responded stating that the policy should be strengthened to help manage taller buildings.	*The policy is considered to provide detailed guidance on the consideration of tall buildings (in conjunction with Core Strategy and AAP policies). An amendment has been made to tighten up the policy to ensure the preservation of heritage assets.*
Geffrye Museum responded stating that they supported the provision of the detailed criteria but requested that these criteria are applied flexibly on a	*It has been made clearer that each application will be assessed on its own merits, and as such the policy will be applied to individual circumstances of each development*

site by site basis.	*proposal.*

DM2 Development and Amenity

General Comments	LBH Response
Montagu Evans responded stating that the policy does not take account of the need to balance the amenity effects of a development with the planning advantages of the proposal.	*The point being made has been taken on board and an amendment to the policy has been made to emphasise that impacts on amenity will be considered together with the merits of a proposal.*
Sustainable Hackney responded stating that they believe that standards set in the London Housing Design Guide are the bare minimum for new homes to be sustainable. The development plan should oppose the development of 'pocket housing' built to 20% floorspace standards.	*Only in exceptional circumstances will units below 37sq.m be allowed, as set out in the London Housing Design Guide. This has been emphasised in the policy.*

DM3 Promoting Health and Well-Being

General Comments	LBH Response
Plough Yard Development Ltd and HDG Ltd responded stating that the policy must comply with CIL regulations 122 and 123. Reference should also be made to DM4 which must comply with these	*This point has been taken into account and references to the regulations have been made in the policy.*

regulations.	
Aspirations Ltd responded stating that the definition of a large qualifying scheme to provide a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) should be clarified.	*A threshold for the submission of a HIA has been included in the policy.*

DM4 CIL and Planning Contributions

General Comments	LBH Response
Rothas Limited responded stating that the policy needs to reflect the fact that, in some instances, financial viability prevents the delivery of planning contributions sought by the Council. This statement should be included within the policy.	*This point has been taken into account and reference to financial viability has been made in the supporting text and policy.*
Agudas Israel Housing Association responded requesting that special consideration be given to be exempt from CIL for the delivery of higher percentages of affordable housing.	*Affordable housing is already exempt from CIL, however this as well as other uses exempt from CIL will be listed in the supporting text to give clarity for developers.*

DM5 Protection and Delivery of Social and Community Facilities

General Comments	LBH Response
The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime commented stating that this policy will restrict the	*The supporting text and policy regarding exceptions to the net loss of community floorspace has been amended to*

replacement/renewal of policing facilities by making it difficult for the MOPAC to dispose of older properties classed as 'community facilities'.	*say that net loss can be considered where the proposals are part of the rationalisation of the estate of key public services, such as the emergency services, the City and Hackney PCT and the Learning Trust.*
The Office of the Archdeacon of Hackney was concerned with the loss of the specific faith provision policy in the Unitary Development Plan with a more general DM5 policy.	*The policy and supporting text has been amended to emphasise the importance of places of religious worship.*

DM6 Arts, Culture, and Entertainment Facilities

General Comments	LBH Response
Plough Yard Developments Ltd commented on the need to include a reference to policy DM4 in relation to S106 and the financial viability of schemes.	*The point has been taken into account and a reference to DM4 has been inserted in supporting text.*

CHAPTER 4 DYNAMIC AND CREATIVE ECONOMY

DM7 New Retail Development in Town Centres

Comment	LBH Response
Montagu Evans made representations stating that retail uses should not be restricted in the CAZ.	*Retail use is allowed in the CAZ, although policy DM7 and the supporting text has been amended to insert the correct references to the NPPF, which states that retail impact assessments are required for proposals of over 200 square metres to demonstrate that there will not be an adverse impact on the retail offer in the Borough's town centres. The CAZ area in Shoreditch is also not identified as a town centre in the Core Strategy and this has been reiterated in the policy and supporting text. .*
The London Borough of Islington responded stating that the impact on the retail offers in neighbouring boroughs needs to be taken into consideration.	*This has been referenced in the supporting text.*
iCity responded stating that if proposals comply with Local Plans then a sequential test should not be required.	*(Response is in relation to Hackney Wick). A sequential test is required in the Wick as it is not an identified shopping centre. The Creative Media City is not really meant for retail other than for supporting uses to B1 uses, so retail development above 200sq.m would need a retail impact assessment. The*

	London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) may develop a different policy in its emerging Local Plan.

DM8 Small and Independent Shops

No significant comments were made.	*No significant changes made.*

DM9 Changing the Use of Shops

General Comments	LBH Response
MOPAC responded stating that police front counters are appropriate town centre uses and should be encouraged in town centres.	*The focus of town centres is retail use, however the policy allows other uses in shopping frontages as long as a minimum threshold of units remain in A1 use. This is considered to enable sufficient scope for non retail uses such as police facilities to establish in town centres without impacting on their retail vitality and viability. The supporting text has been amended to state that other uses such as Police Shops are appropriate in town centres and they would be given favourable consideration, providing an appropriate shopfront design is proposed and there is no loss of substantial retail frontage.*

DM10 Change of use of shops outside shopping centres

General Comments	LBH Response
Sustainable Hackney responded stating that non-viable shops should be put to alternative uses, but often conversions of shops to residential in particular detract from the local environment.	*The policy facilitates alternative use if shops are non-viable, with other commercial uses prioritised, and shopfronts are required to be retained. No significant changes were considered necessary.*

DM11 Evening and Night-Time Economy

General Comments	LBH Response
Shoreditch and the CAZ area are a suitable location for evening and night-time economy uses and should not be limited.	*Although Shoreditch is considered a suitable location for evening and night-time economy uses, it is also an area identified as having a saturation of night time uses. A large part of it is covered by a Special Policy Area (SPA) designation which carries a presumption against permitting any new night-time economy uses or the intensification of existing uses either by increase to the capacity of a premises or the hours of operation, unless the applicant can demonstrate that this will not add to the cumulative impact already being felt in the area. Therefore, only a small part of Shoreditch is available and suitable for the location of night-time uses, hence why the reference is*

	included. The supporting text has been amended to reference the SPA and indicate that the boundary of the area will be shown on the Policies Map.

DM12 Hot Food takeaways and schools

No comments	*No significant changes are made.*

DM13 Street markets

No comments	*No significant changes are made.*

DM14 Retention of Employment Land and Floorspace

General Comments	LBH Response
MOPAC responded to this policy stating that surplus industrial sites should be allowed to change to other employment uses, including community uses and policing facilities.	*There is no need to repeat London Plan policy given the London Plan is part of Hackney's development plan. Also the policies deal with use classes, not specific types of use. Therefore, it is inappropriate to single out one type of alternative employment generating use such as police facilities. Policies DM14 and DM17 both allow alternative employment generating uses, be they Sui Generis or otherwise, on employment land subject to certain requirements. Clarification around what is meant by*

	'alternative employment generating use' has been added to supporting text, which includes Police Facilities.
HG Capital Investments Ltd responded stating that providing less than the `maximum amount' of employment space should be permitted where redevelopment will offer wider local economic benefits.	*Whilst it is acknowledged that it may "often not be economically feasible to provide the maximum amount of employment floorspace in a redevelopment scheme", it is always the case that the maximum economically feasible amount of employment floorspace possible can be provided and incorporated in any redevelopment scheme. In light of this the second paragraph of Policy DM14 has been amended to clarify this position.*
HG Capital Investments Ltd responded stating that the policy is insufficiently flexible and acts as an impediment to sustainable growth contrary to the NPPF. Marketing evidence should only be required where there is total loss of employment floorspace.	*The policy is not contrary to the NPPF, however it is reactive to 'market signals in accordance with the NPPF'. Viability will be a part of the assessment of development proposals. In many cases proposals for redevelopment of employment land and floorspace include token employment floorspace without the economic potential of the site being fully considered, the retention of the existing occupiers, and new occupiers being identified. No significant changes are considered necessary.*

DM15 New Business Floorspace

General Comments	LBH Response
Plough Yard Developments Ltd commented on the policy stating that It is not appropriate to restrict the application of this policy to circumstances where an end user has not been identified. There is no planning risk associated with the creation of buildings which once constructed are un-let and inflexible in terms of letting.	*While it is agreed particularly for larger schemes that development is unlikely to be implemented until an end user has been identified this is not always the case for smaller mixed use schemes. In some instances tokenistic employment floorspace has been provided which is either poorly designed and/or poorly marketed and subsequently remains vacant. This space is then generally the subject of a change of use application to residential at a later date. Also in many instances planning approvals are sold on and not implemented by the original applicant. No significant changes are considered necessary.*

DM16 Affordable Workspace

General Comments	LBH Response
The Notting Hill Housing Trust made representations on this policy stating that the requirement to provide 10% affordable workspace as part of any new commercial development should be decided on a case by case basis.	*The wording of Policy DM16 has been amended to reflect that affordable workspace "will be addressed on a site specific, case-by-case basis"*
CMA Planning commented on this policy the 10%	*The policy has a caveat for the consideration of impact on*

requirement and / or off site requirement was stated as being onerous, and likely to affect viability, and mothball sites.	*viability.*
The City of London responded stating that the Employment Growth Study on which the policy is based is out of date.	*The Atkins Study was updated in 2010, post recession, and so it is relatively up to date.*
iCity responded stating that Policy DM18 should be amended to place a cap of 1000sqm on the provision of affordable workspace as part of any single development. The suggested amendment would also help to deliver a greater variety and choice of affordable workspace across the Borough, would avoid circumstances where a very onerous policy requirement could lead to important developments not taking place.	*A cap is not considered appropriate as it would limit the flexibility of the policy. Applicants might also be minded to reduce the amount of employment floorspace they provide to under this threshold so as not to have to provide affordable workspace.*

DM17 Development Proposals in Priority Employment Areas (PEAs)

General Comments	LBH Response
Plough Yard Development Ltd commented on this	*Both London Plan policies make clear that proposals for*

policy stating that Policy 4.3 and Policy 2.11 of the London Plan specifically require the inclusion of residential floorspace within the CAZ.	*an increase in office floorspace should provide for a mix of uses including residential. It does not state that proposals in CAZ should optimise residential use to the detriment of the provision of office floorspace which enhances and promotes the unique international, national and London-wide roles of the CAZ. The Council is therefore correct in seeking an increase in office floorspace to ensure sustenance of these roles. Further, the policy is not excluding other uses, but rather it requires employment-led development.*
HG Capital Investment Ltd commented on this policy stating that it provides flexibility in allowing the amount of C1 and C3 floorspace to exceed the amount of commercial floorspace is supported. However, they also stated that the requirement for commercial / employment led schemes would prevent many proposals from coming forward.	*A benchmark or threshold as a starting point for the provision of employment floorspace in PEAs is needed. At present, without detailed clarification of policy in PEAs, sites are being marketed on a non-policy compliant mix with a focus on residential use, which is increasing the value of land, compromising commercial use. The policy has flexibility to allow for site and case circumstances. No significant changes are considered necessary.*
Plough Yard Developments Ltd commented stating that while they support the general direction of the policy, the supporting text 4.10.9 is contrary to the	*The Council does not consider that a conflict exists between London Plan Policy 2.11 (a) and second sentence in paragraph 4.10. 9 of the DMLP. The starting*

London Plan policy 2.11. The primary purpose of developments in the PEA is to achieve an increase in employment floorspace and respect London Plan objectives of mix of uses.	*point for PEAs, which represent only 6% of the Borough's total area, is for mixed use development to be employment led. Policy DM17 enables mixed use development consisting of one or a combination of uses along with B1 such as C1, C3, A1, D1 and some instances where these other PEA uses are not appropriate D2 and sui generis. This is considered to offer a balanced and flexible approach. Policy DM17 should also be read in conjunction with Policy DM14 which clearly outlines the limited number of instances where a loss of employment land will be deemed acceptable in policy terms.*
A comment was received from MOPAC stating that the allowance of C1, C3 and A1 uses was supported. However, the range of other use to be included should be widened to include A2-A4. The recognition that other uses besides `B' can contribute to the employment profile is also welcomed.	*Class A uses are supported in Core Strategy policy 17. This has been reflected in the supporting text/policy (not just limit to A1). Class A uses are subject to the tests in the policy.*
A comment was received from HG Capital Investments Ltd stating that student housing should be included as one of the uses appropriate within a	*The inclusion of student housing is not supported in PEAs as a supporting use in PEAs similar to A-class, C1, C3 and D1. These uses, unlike Student Housing, either provide*

PEA.	*much needed housing delivery or are employment generating and therefore are considered suitable subject to appropriate quantums within PEAs. This is not to say Student Housing can not be considered appropriate in certain instances as provided for under DM17(iii) and in accordance with DM24.*
Prairie Limited and Mount Anvil made representations on the proposed employment policies stating that the focus of policies DM14 and DM17 should be on jobs, quality of space, viability, deliverability and site characteristics rather than on the quantum of employment floorspace, and that the employment-led requirement will hinder the development of sites both within and outside the Borough's Priority Employment Areas (PEAs).	*It should be noted that the point being made was taken into account when the evidence base study which underpinned the designation of employment areas and the formulation of Core Strategy Policies 17 and 18 and DMLP policies DM14 and DM17 was carried out. Policy DM17, in particular, enables mixed use development in PEAs provided a site's employment function is protected. Specifically retail, hotel and leisure uses are permitted along side employment floorspace. The flexibility in the policy is introduced through the need for marketing evidence and a marketing strategy to ensure schemes are responding to market signals and the requirements of future occupiers. In Shoreditch in particular many sites come forward at a much greater density to existing development which generally enables employment land to*

	be reprovided along with other uses such as residential.

DM18 Railway Arches

No significant comments were made.	*No significant changes made.*

CHAPTER 5 PROVIDING BETTER HOMES

DM19 General Approach to New Housing Development

Comment	LBH response
Agudas Israel Housing Association responded stating that the policy should be expanded to include other areas of growth not identified in the AAPs.	*It is not clear what areas are being referred to and what other areas in the Borough have growth potential, and that public transport accessibility is strong enough to support such growth. This is a strategic issue in the first instance, to be picked up in the Core Strategy if the Council supports this approach, and also any future area-based plans. No significant changes made.*
Sustainable Hackney commented stating the New Homes Bonus funding should be ring fenced and used to identify empty and underutilised properties and generate plans to ensure they are properly used.	*The points made are noted, however, these are not appropriate to be picked up in this Plan. The Council is at present seeking to make the best use of all existing properties.*

DM20 Loss of Housing

No significant comments were made.	*No significant made..*

DM21 Affordable Housing Delivery

General Comments	LBH Response
Middlewater Trading and Investment Ltd responded stating that the policy should highlight where affordable housing policy requirement cannot be achieved the applicant must demonstrate through an 'open book' appraisal why on-site provision cannot be delivered.	*The supporting text will be amended to refer to the wording of Core Strategy policy 20, which sets out that the GLA's Affordable Housing Toolkit Assessment or similar appraisal model should be used in presenting the viability of a scheme. This policy is referenced in DM21, and so there is no need to make this change to the actual policy.*
CMA Planning responded stating that the policy needs more clarity. It should separate out someone adding extra units a month after the building has been completed compared to someone doing the same 10 years after completion. The policy should have a time reference.	*Given recent Government changes effectively adding a year to the life of a planning permission, it would make sense to clarify in the policy that this should apply for a four year period to match this. The last paragraph of Policy DM21 has been amended to clarify that additional units created on a scheme previously below the affordable housing threshold will be required to make provision for affordable housing if within four years of the planning permission for that site.*
Aspirations Ltd responded stating that the policy should refer to other site specific circumstances as exceptional circumstances where off-site affordable housing may be acceptable to the Local planning Authority.	*The policy reflects the London Plan (July 2011) and the GLA Housing SPG exceptional circumstances, however, the last sentence of paragraph 5.3.5 has been amended to refer to the GLA's Housing SPG's 'exceptional circumstances' and a new paragraph has been added to clarify that off-site provision should be on alternative sites 'within the vicinity of the site'*

Aspirations Ltd commented on DM21 which does not address a scenario where a development is not able to provide affordable housing on site or make a payment in lieu.	*The supporting text has been amended to refer to the wording of Core Strategy policy 20, which sets out that the GLA's Affordable Housing Toolkit Assessment or similar appraisal model should be used in presenting the viability of a scheme. The exceptional circumstances for when affordable housing can not be provided on site are referred to in the London Plan and the Housing SPG. Paragraphs 5.3.5 and 5.3.6 state that off-site provision within the vicinity of the site (*as a guide, vicinity could be considered as within a 10 minute walking distance or 800 metres from the main application site*) or cash in-lieu contributions may be acceptable in these circumstances, however this is determined on a case by case basis.*
Agudas Israel Housing Association commented on this policy stating that to ensure continued supply of affordable housing it should be clearly defined that any reduction below 50% or offsite provision should be an exception.	*The supporting text has been amended to refer to the GLA's Housing SPG's 'exceptional circumstances' and clarification that off-site provision should be on alternative sites 'within the vicinity of the site'.*
Agudas Israel Housing Association commented stating that the provision of 25% social rented housing is not	*The Council's evidence base demonstrates that 25% social rented provision is viable. These proportions are guidelines for*

viable within the current Affordable Homes Programme funding regime.	*negotiation with developers and RSLs.*
The GLA commented on the supporting text of this policy, stating that Para 5.3.14 does not make clear what the document is suggesting that decision makers would do if a development came forward which did not take account of the affordability guidelines, and as such it is unacceptable in terms of NPPF paragraph 154.	*The Interim Affordable Housing Needs statement (AHN) is a housing needs document, and has been referenced in the supporting text as such. Affordable rent levels are not contained within the policy itself, they are referenced in the supporting text as guidelines which form the basis for information for developers and RSLs and for negotiation between the Council and such parties. Some amendments to supporting text have been made for clarity.*
The Greater London Authority (GLA) commented on the Borough's overall approach regarding the setting of rent level caps and rigid percentages of the two products intended to meet the housing need hitherto addressed by social rent alone, could well leave the authority in some difficulty should priorities change in future investment rounds. They stated that a more flexible approach would not only help with the policy issues highlighted above, but avoid the necessity to go through formal alteration processes in the event of changing	*The Interim Affordable Housing Needs statement (AHN) is a housing needs document, and has been referenced in the supporting text as such. These are guidelines that are part of the housing strategy which can be updated relatively quickly, and as such the DMLP won't need to be updated. Affordable rent levels are not contained within the policy itself, they are referenced in the supporting text as guidelines which form the basis for information for developers and RSLs and for negotiation between the Council and such parties. Some amendments to the supporting text have been made for*

policy or investment priorities.	*clarity.*
The GLA also felt that the wording "Hackney currently seeks a breakdown of 25% Social rent and 75% Affordable Rent in the Borough's affordable rented programme" will constrain delivery.	*The Council's evidence base is that 25% social rent is viable, but this is negotiable with the Council in consideration of viability. No significant changes are considered necessary.*
Sustainable Hackney have requested that the Local Plan state that the targets of 50% affordable and intermediate housing set by policy 20 in the core document remain in place even if "affordable rent" housing now has to be treated as a substitute for intermediate housing. They also think that if more homes are built in Hackney than set out in the London Plan then the proportion that is affordable should remain the same.	*The supporting text references the Council's Position Statement on the Affordable Homes Programme, which sets out the rents that the Council considers are affordable in the Borough, and the guideline to developers that the Council would like provision of a proportion of social rented properties, as the basis for negotiation with applicants. The Council needs to reference the affordable rent product as set out in the NPPF, however, this is not an intermediate product. The target of 50% will remain the same, factoring in affordable rent.*
Sustainable Hackney commented on this policy stating that the Council should review public holdings of land in the Borough with a view to ensuring they are used to produce genuinely affordable homes.	*The Council is currently looking at its estate and housing strategy to consider how the stock of social rented properties can be increased.*

DM22 Homes of Different Sizes

General Comments	LBH Response
Middlewater Trading and Investment Ltf objected to part 3 of draft policy which requires a developer to provide off-site solutions for family accommodation where it is not possible to provide it on site, or an in-lieu financial payment.	*This part of the policy has been removed.*
Agudas Israel Housing Association commented on the need for support for Hackney's aim to provide higher percentages of family housing. To encourage the delivery of higher proportions of family housing which is less financially viable for developers/Registered Providers, some reduced levy should be considered.	*This is an interesting idea, but family housing also puts much strain on infrastructure, particularly education, and so the full CIL charge will be needed.*
A comment was received from Hanover Housing stating that the policy fails to recognise the flexibility that is required for over 55s housing. The proposed policy neglects to recognise the value that housing for older people provides in terms of releasing family size units back into the system.	*This comment seems reasonable and the policy has been made more flexible to address such development proposals.*

DM23 Residential Conversions

General Comments	LBH Response
Agudas Israel Housing Association responded stating that the policy should include the conversion of smaller family homes into larger homes via loft conversions and rear extensions in addition to conversion of larger houses into flats.	*This is a design related policy, and relates to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD. No change to the policy is required which focuses on conversions from houses to flat.*

DM24 Student Housing

General Comments	LBH Response
The GLA commented on this policy stating that it raises tensions with 4.4 of the London Plan, which requires Boroughs to take account of the potential for surplus employment land to help meet strategic and local requirements for other uses.	*The Borough does not have surplus employment land and has limited employment designations. It has been clarified in the policy that student housing will be resisted in particular in employment designations rather than across the whole Borough.*
Barton Willmore also responded stating that reference should be made to policies DM14-17 (employment policies) in the student housing policy as if compliance with these policies has been demonstrated then student accommodation on employment land should be	*The change is not supported as student housing is not directly supported in employment designations.*

considered.	
A comment was received from a Barton Willmore with regards to affordable tenancies, stating that there is no basis in national and local policy to require student accommodation to be the subject of affordable tenancies.	*In order to assess if tenancies are affordable the Council needs to know how much the rental levels would be. Such information will be treated confidentially. The Council wants to ensure that student housing is affordable to UK students in particular, and it is considered appropriate to request this information, in the same way that other financial information is requested for other uses, eg affordable housing. In any event, the policy does not insist on affordable tenancies, rather is seeking such in negotiation with developers.*
Barton Willmore also commented on the Management and Contractual Arrangements section of the policy. They stated that the requirement to demonstrate management and contractual arrangements with specified Institutions as part of a planning application is an unreasonable and excessive requirement when an appropriately worded obligation can be formulated and entered into to ensure appropriate controls on occupation and links with Institutions.	*Details of the education institution to which the student housing will serve should be submitted with an application, and to ensure that institution will be served a S106 agreement can be used as set out in the existing policy, thus removing the need for contractual arrangements. The requirement for a management plan in relation to the impact of the use on local amenity has been incorporated elsewhere in the policy.*
Middlewater Trading and Investment Ltd commented on	*In order to assess if tenancies are affordable the Council*

this policy stating that the rental levels which a development can charge are determined by the student accommodation market, and are not something which should form part of policy. In addition, this information is commercially sensitive and cannot be issued within the public domain at the planning application stage. Reference to providing student accommodation rental levels within a planning application should be removed.	*needs to know how much the rental levels would be, the same principle for determining affordable housing provision. Such info can be treated confidentially.*
There was also concern over the number of student accommodation proposals in Shoreditch – general Member response.	*The policy has been reviewed to strengthen it in order to assess the over-concentration/saturation of student accommodation proposals.*

DM25 House of Multiple Occupation

No significant comments were made.	*No significant changes made.*

DM26 Shared and Supported Housing

General Comments	LBH Response
A comment was received from Hanover Housing stating that in light of the positive contribution that housing	*If a proposal is for a specific group such as this then this response makes sense. This has been added to policy DM22*

development for the over 55s makes in terms of returning family units to the housing stock, developments for the over 55s should be exempt from having to provide family sized accommodation and from having to pay a financial contribution in lieu of that provision.	*as a caveat.*

DM27 Hotels

General Comments	LBH Response
A comment was received from Aspirations Ltd stating that planning policy should not place an onerous burden on the operation of ancillary hotel functions. More often than not these functions are publicly available. In certain circumstances there may be valid and appropriate reasons why such functions are only accessible to hotel residents and this should be noted in the draft policy.	*Criteria to consider exceptions have been inserted into the policy. Hotels can assist in providing local facilities, such as leisure facilities where there may be a shortage, for Borough residents and workers, and as such the proposed policy is seeking to require ancillary facilities (e.g. conference rooms, restaurants or gymnasiums) to be available for public use, unless there are valid and appropriate reasons that such facilities should not be accessible to the public.*

CHAPTER 6 CLEANER, SAFER AND GREENER

DM28 Managing Heritage Assets

General Comments	LBH Response
English Heritage commented on the policy stating that the terms used in the policy should be consistent with the NPPF i.e. Heritage Asset and Historic Significance. Reference should also be made to the setting of listed buildings and specifically guidance from English Heritage. Greater emphasis should also be placed on buildings of townscape merits and locally listed buildings.	*A new paragraph has been inserted into the supporting text making reference to the setting of Heritage Assets and reference to guidance from English Heritage. The supporting text has also been amended throughout the chapter to make terms used consistent with the NPPF (i.e. Historic Environment, Heritage Assets and Historic Significance).*
Sustainable Hackney commented on the policy stating that there should be greater control in conservation areas specifically on roof extensions.	*Comment noted. Policy DM28 has been amended to deal with roof extensions in conservation areas.*
English Heritage and Montagu Evans stated that DM28 should reference paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 regarding harm to or loss of a Heritage Asset.	*This comment has been noted. The supporting text has been amended to make reference to these paragraphs and a new section has been added to the policy making reference to the harm and loss of Heritage Asset. Reference to this has also been made in Appendix 4 'Marketing Evidence and Marketing Strategies' of the*

	DMLP.

DM29 Advertisements

General Comments	LBH Response
The British Sign and Graphics Associations and the Outdoor Media Centre commented on this policy stating that it is contrary to law and unsound. They also stated that it does not conform with Circular 03/2007, the NPPF and Regulations.	*It is not considered that the policy is contrary to law. Policy DM29 will be slightly amended however to comply with the relevant Circular, the NPPF, and the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations.*
The British Sign and Graphics Associations and the Outdoor Media Centre commented stating that the policy is overly restrictive in relation to conservation areas and large advertisement boards.	*Reference solely to large advertising hoardings has been removed. The existing criteria in the policy will be sufficient for determining applications for large hoardings.*

DM30 Telecommunications

General Comments	LBH Response
Mobile Operators Association commented stating that the policy was overly restrictive with regards to Listed buildings and Conservation Areas.	*The supporting text/policy has been revised to emphasise that there is potential for telecoms equipment in CAs and on/around listed buildings but that there will be more stringent requirements regarding design and siting.*

DM31 Open Space and Living Roofs

General Comments	LBH Response
The Notting Hill Housing Trust commented on this policy objecting to the quantum for communal open space required, which they feel is unrealistic.	*The supporting text makes it clear that communal space is required in addition to private space. It should also be noted that financial viability has always been a factor in accessing planning applications. As the population increases so will the pressure on `soft' infrastructure. Open spaces can contribute to physical and mental health, general wellbeing, climate change and biodiversity. Therefore on site contribution will be preferably, although financial contribution to the improvement and accessibility of existing open spaces may be acceptable. Flexibility has been allowed through consideration of private open space, non accessible living roofs to off-set the quantitative requirement. No significant changes made as a result of this comment.*
HG Capital Investments responded to this policy stating that student development should not be required to provide a specific quantum of communal open space.	*The main purpose of Policy DM31 is to ensure that as population increases, and working opportunity intensifies the provision of open space as a relaxation, leisure and communal area for residents and workers are integral to any scheme. However, LBH agree that student and other*

	types of supporting housing may not be expected to provide the same level of open space as a housing scheme within the Use Class Order C3. Furthermore, it has been made clear that social and community facilities will also not be expected to provide the stated quantum of communal open space. Therefore flexibility regarding the quantum of communal open space required from student accommodation and other types of supported housing and community facilities has been incorporated into the policy.
The Notting Hill Housing Trust considered that the policy should acknowledge that financial contributions will need to be considered as part of the overall scheme viability.	*Financial viability is implicit to all schemes including any financial contribution. However, the primary purpose of the policy is to seek on-site provision in the first instance.*
Sustainable Hackney made representations stating that they encourage research to identify those areas which are deficient in open space.	*The Council's evidence base does identify areas of deficiency at present and we have tried to identify sites for new open space. The Council does consider pooling of open space contributions already. No significant changes made.*

DM32 Protection and Enhancement of Existing Open Space

General Comments	LBH Response

Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) commented on this policy stating that the policy should contain greater recognition and reference to the LVRPA and their Area Proposals.	*Explicit reference to the Lee Valley Park Authority's Park Plan and Park Development Framework and Area Proposals schedule for the area of the Park within Hackney has been added to the policy. In addition, new supporting text explicitly references the LVRPA.*

DM33 Allotments and Food Growing

No significant comments were made.	*No significant changes made.*

DM34 Sites of Nature Conservation Value

General Comments	LBH Response
Sustainable Hackney commented stating that the policy needs to be stronger on protection of SINCs and that enhancements should also be required on development with a certain radius of a SINC.	*This comment has been noted. However, it should also be noted that Core Strategy Policy 26 'Open Space Network' states there should no loss of certain designated open space (including the identified SINCS), and only under certain conditions can other open spaces which may not be identified be developed upon which includes replacement /or enhancement of open space of better or equivalent quality. Furthermore, within the supporting text it is stated that any development proposals in or adjacent*

	to the SINCs do not have a detrimental impact on their nature conservation and biodiversity value.

DM35 Landscaping and Tree Management

General Comments	LBH Response
Sustainable Hackney commented on this policy stating that additional text is recommended providing more protection for trees and work on them.	*Changes have been made to the supporting text to clarify that the trees will protected. Mention has been made explicitly to the British Standard 5837:2012 on the design and protection of trees and reference has also been made to Root Protection Areas.*

DM36 Residential Moorings

General Comments	LBH Response
The LVRPA commented on this policy stating that residential mooring should be off line from main navigation routes, to be consistent with the London Plan and should not be supported in the LVRP.	*This comment has been noted. An amended has been added requiring residential moorings to comply with the Park Plan of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. This will ensure that the LVRP Plan and Areas Proposals are taken into consideration.*

CHAPTER 7 CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

A significant proportion of the comments made on Chapter 7 relate to a misconception that the Council had introduced a 'wood first' policy that would see a presumption in favour of using sustainable timber in all new development. To clarify, the DMLP does not contain a policy favouring any one type of construction material. Policies DM37, 38 and 39 allow applicants to demonstrate how they meet the required standards, which can be through the use of one or a number of materials. In general, the Council is undertaking research on the appropriate use of sustainable construction materials in the Borough which includes sustainably-sourced timber and other materials such as concrete and steel to reduce carbon emissions in the building's full life cycle. Further information on Hackney's approach to sustainable materials will be included within the Appendix of the emerging Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Guidance. Consultation with industry and construction bodies will be undertaken as part of the development of this guidance.

DM37 performance targets for major residential development

General Comments	LBH Response
CMA Planning queried why town centres have higher thresholds for Code for Sustainable Homes and proposed a single code requirement for all schemes across the Borough.	*Both the Hackney Central and Dalston town centres are identified as growth areas in Hackney's Core Strategy and Dalston is identified as an area of intensification in the London Plan. As such the Council considers that development in these areas should make the greatest contribution to reducing C02. Additional supporting text has been inserted to explain why there are differing standards for different parts of the Borough.*

DM38 Sustainable standards for minor residential development

The DMLP (policies 37 and 38) and Core Strategy (Policy 29) require BREEAM and Ecohomes / CfsH standards. Discussed at great length at the meeting between BCSA and LBH the potential imbalances that may arise from the introduction of a preference for any one material or the addition of further weightings that do not take into account the broader sustainability criteria already addressed in these standards.	*The DMLP does not contain a policy favouring any one type of construction material. Policies DM37, 38 and 39 allow applicants to demonstrate how they meet the required standards, which can be through the use of one or a number of materials. In general, the Council is undertaking research on the appropriate use of sustainable construction materials in the Borough which includes sustainably-sourced timber and other materials such as concrete and steel to reduce carbon emissions in the building's full life cycle. Part of the supporting text has been amended to remove the reference to sustainably sourced timber as well as concrete, steel and hybrid materials and now makes the general reference to sustainable construction materials.*

DM 39 Sustainable standards for other development

General Comments	LBH Response
Middlewater Trading and Investments Ltd requested that the requirement to achieve BREEAM rating should be subject to feasibility and applied on flexible case–by-case basis.	*Noted. Additional wording has been included in line with the London Plan in the supporting text of policies DM37 and DM38 and DM39 to highlight that measures to achieve these targets should take into consideration such*

	factors as ease of practicality of connection to existing networks, context, size, nature, location, accessibility and expected operation. Furthermore, the targets are associated with all aspects of building design which is subject to technical and financial feasibility and every major development proposal should be accompanied by an energy assessment demonstrating how the targets have been met. In those cases where targets shall be unmet, justification should be provided and the Council will consider this as part of the application process.

DM 40 Offsetting

The Geffrye Museum noted policy DM40 whereby if the Council accepts that it is not possible to reduce C02 emissions on-site by the specified levels, carbon emission off-setting payments will be required. These will be secured via legal agreement. The Museum supports the aspirations of this policy but requests further detail on how off-setting payments will be calculated. The Museum requests that these payments are negotiated on a site by site	*The supporting text has been revised to state that further details on carbon emission off-setting calculations and its payment will be provided in the upcoming revised Planning Contributions SPD.*

basis considering project viability and the need to balance the benefits associated with protecting and enhancing heritage assets.	

DM 41 Heating and Cooling

The Greater London Authority requested that a bespoke Decentralized Energy policy which stipulates the requirement to connect to existing or proposed district heat networks and where none exist to commit to future proofing should also be included along with the requirement to commit to onsite heat networks where direct connection to District heating is not viable.	*DM41 has been amended to require development to be designed to connect to decentralised heat and energy networks where they are planned or existing and connection is technically feasible. Also supporting text has been included requiring development proposals in areas identified in Hackney's heat mapping report of 2010 to be designed to connect to existing or planned decentralised energy networks or be committed to future proofing.*

DM 42 Contaminated Land

General Comments	LBH Response
The Environment Agency commented on this policy proposing that in order to protect groundwater quality and public water supply, we need to look to restrict certain contamination	*This comment has been noted. Additional text has been inserted into the supporting text and in policy DM42 setting out the minimum information that would be required by an applicant for sites potentially affected by contamination.*

activities within SPZ1 – the inner source protection zone of the public water supply abstractions.	*DM42 will also be amended to include reference to the requirement to provide desk study information and what this encompasses.*

DM 43 Pollution and Water and Air Quality

The Environment Agency comment on this policy proposing that development proposals should include measures to reduce the risk to the water environment and aim to protect and improve the water quality of surface water and groundwater.	*This comment has been noted. An additional section of policy under DM43 along with additional supporting text will be included under DM43 requiring development proposals to consider risks arising from development on water quality and where appropriate, to reduce the risk to the water environment and aim to protect and improve the water quality of surface water and ground water.*

DM 44 Flooding and Flood Risk

General Comments	LBH Response
Thames Water commented on this policy seeking revision of the policy and supporting text to address issue of sewer flooding, and the need for applicants to meet infrastructure costs in certain circumstances.	*An additional policy section specifically addressing sewer and water and wastewater infrastructure has been included in DM44 along with supporting text to require developers to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply, surface water, foul drainage and sewerage treatment capacity both on*

	and off site to serve the development. Policy provisions have also been included to enable the Council to seek improvements to this water and/or sewer infrastructure where necessary to ensure that the works are completed prior to occupation of the development.

CHAPTER 8 TRANSPORT

DM45 Movement Hierarchy

No significant comments were made.	*No significant changes made.*

DM46 Development and Transport

General Comments	LBH Response
CgMs on behalf of Tesco commented on this policy stating that it is not in accordance with the NPPF. The NPPF states that 'development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe'. The need for the inclusion of such wording in the draft Plan given the overarching principles of the planning policy and the determination of planning applications is to consider any application on its individual merits, including impact on highway safety and free flow of traffic. The draft policy wording does not provide for individual consideration of development in accordance with the NPPF.	*Objection noted. Policy DM46 will be amended to include in a new paragraph at the end of the policy, the statement in the NPPF that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.*
TfL requested that reference should be made to the	*Comment noted. A new paragraph has been inserted in the*

Crossrail and CIL required from developers in line with the Mayors SPD.	*supporting text making reference to this requirement.*

DM47 Walking and Cycling

General Comments	LBH Response
An individual commented on this policy stating that it is becoming too dangerous to ride a bike. The individual explained that there needs to be separate cycle lines everywhere.	*Comment noted. The Council seeks to encourage provision of more safe and secure cycle lines as much as is possible as do TfL. Hackney seeks to achieve this through Policy DM45 (Movement Hierarchy), which states that all development proposals should prioritise pedestrians, those with mobility difficulties and cyclists; Policy DM46 (Development and Transport), also requires that all development proposals should maximise safe, convenient and inclusive movement and accessibility to, from and within the site for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users; and Policy DM47 (Walking and Cycling), also promotes walking and cycling in the Borough through various means. No significant changes are made.*
Sustainable Hackney welcomed the commitment to increased permeability where ramped routes encourage more direct access across Hackney. They stated that	*Support welcomed.*

this is not just good for cyclists, but good for pedestrians too; particularly for those who are elderly and have mobility problems.	

DM48 Car Free and Car Capped Development

Sustainable Hackney commented on this policy stating that they do not understand why any off street parking should be allowed unless new developments first make provision for car club parking.	*This may be unreasonable and too significant a change. The policy has been reassessed but will remain as proposed. Although all new developments are required to provide a variety of parking types which includes off-street parking, parking for disabled people and car club parking; the Council prioritises spaces for car clubs, pool cars and disabled people car parks over any off-street car parking as set out in the supporting text. DM47 and DM48 essentially heavily support more sustainable forms of transport, and also AAP and Core Strategy policies. The Council will be considering more stringent car parking standards to come forward in place of London Plan standards.*
TfL commented on this policy stating that they support the proposed policy on car-free and low car parking developments and welcome Hackney's provision for electric vehicle charging points as part of any proposed	*Support welcomed.*

car parking. Secure, integrated and accessible cycle parking facilities should be provided in line with the standards set out for each class use. TfL welcome the proposed low car parking provision under the London Plan standards.	

POST FORMAL CONSULTATION PERIOD MEETINGS

In addition to comments received during the consultation period, once the formal consultation period had ended, meeting requests were sent to all specific consultees and prescribed bodies, as well as organisations that had sent in representations to discuss these further. The intention was to discuss representations made by these bodies further and resolve any issues/objections that were raised.

It was possible to arrange meetings with the following bodies to discuss their representations:

Organisation	Location	Date
Greater London Authority	City Hall	05/10/2012
Thames Water	Hackney Offices	13/12/2012
City of London	City of London Offices	05/12/2012
London Borough of Islington	London Borough of Islington Offices	19/12/2012
Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Hackney Offices	03/12/2012
English Heritage	Hackney Offices	19/12/2012
Environment Agency	Hackney Offices	05/12/2012

Canal and River Trust	Canal and River Trust Offices	15/11/2012
London Legacy Development Corporation	Hackney Offices	04/03/2013
CgMs on behalf of Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime	CgMs Offices	27/12/2012
Agudas Israel Housing Association	Hackney Offices	28/02/2013
Montagu Evans on behalf of HDG Ltd	Hackney Offices	30/01/2013
ICENI Projects on behalf of Regal Homes	Hackney Offices	20/02/2013
Barton Willmore on behalf of HG Capital Investments	Hackney Offices	15/03/2013
Network Rail	Hackney Offices	08/03/2013
London Gypsies and Travellers Unit	Hackney Offices	13/02/2013
Office of Archdeacon of Hackney	Telephone Meeting	17/05/2013
Campaign for Real Ale	Hackney Offices	25/04/2013
Sustainable Hackney	Hackney Offices	14/08/2012
Hackney Homes Disability Forum	Hackney Homes Offices	12/09/2012

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF SPECIFIC CONSULTATION BODIES

Canal and River Trust
Central Networks
City of London
Civil Aviation Authority
Coal Authority
Communities and Local Government (CLG)
Community Services, London Borough of Hackney
Countryside Agency
Crown Estate Commissioners
Department for Culture, Media and Sport
Department for Energy and Climate Change
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Department for Transport
English Heritage
English Nature
Entec UK
Environment Agency
Forestry Commission
Garden History Society
Greater London Authority – Mayor of London
Health and Safety Executive
Highways Agency
Homes and Communities Agency
Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
London Legacy Development Corporation
London Borough of Haringey
London Borough of Islington
London Borough of Newham
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Borough of Waltham Forest
Marine Management Organisation
Metropolitan Police Authority
Ministry of Defence
Mobile Operators Association
National Grid House
Natural England
Network Rail
NHS City and Hackney PCT
Office of Rail Regulation
Planning Inspectorate
Sport England
Team Hackney
Thames Water Utilities
Theatres Trust
Transport for London (TfL)

APPENDIX 2

LIST OF GENERAL CONSULTATION BODIES

360 Networks and ConJoint Works Ltd
A Space
Ability Centre Hoxton
Abney Park Cemetery Trust
Access Homes Newlon Housing Trust
Access to Employment and Training
Accounts Department - Europeak Group of Companies
Ackee Housing Project
Acting Up
AddAction Hackney Community Drug Services
Addendum Ltd
Adelaide Court Sheltered Accommodation
Adrian Salt And Pang Limited
Adrian Salt and Pang Limited (EDF Energy)
Aecom
Affordable Housing Group
African Community Development and Welfare Organisation
African Community School
African Francophone Refugee Association UK
African Support and Project Centre
Age Concern
Age Concern Hackney - Coldline
Age Concern Hackney - Information Service
Agudas Israel Housing Association
Agudas Israel Housing Association Ltd
Ajex Housing Association Ltd
Al Falah Muslim Boys School
Albion Kids Show
Alevi Cultural Centre
Alglo Cameroonian Society
Alliance Planning
ALMO Board
Amhurst Park Action Group
An Viet Foundation
Anchor Staying Put
Angela Flowers Gallery/ Flowers East
AOP Gallery
Appleton Court Sheltered Accommodation
Arcola Theatre
Armadillo restaurant
Arriva
ARTSA (Anatolin Restaurants Takewarys & Supermarkets Association)
Ascent 21
Ashley Court Sheltered Accommodation
Aspland & Marcon Estates Tenants & Residents Association
Association of British Insurers
Association of Jewish Ex-Servicemen and Women - Stamford Hill
Atelier-UWA Architects
AtisReal

Augustines Court Sheltered Accommodation
Aveley Court Sheltered Accommodation
Balik Arts
Banbury TRA
Barratt
Barrowgate Properties LTD
Barton Willmore Planning Partnership
Bath House Children's Community Centre
Battle McCarthy
Bayton Court Sheltered Accommodation
Beaumont Lodge Sheltered Accommodation
Beeraahaar Sweet Combination
Beis Chana Jewish Womens Centre
Bells Project
Bellway
Benabo Court Sheltered Accommodation
Berkeley Homes
Berkeley Homes (South East London) Ltd
Bethnal Green and Victoria Park HA Ltd
Bikur Cholim DSatmar Trust
Black and Ethnic Minority Arts network (BEMA)
Black and Ethnic Minority Working Group
Black Women in the Arts
Blyth Design
BMTRA
Bootstrap Company
Bootstrap Enterprises
Bootstrap Enterprises London Credit Union Development Agency (BELCUDA)
Boredon Board
Borough Tenant Convention
Bostall Estates Ltd
Brady Mallalieu Architects
BREAM
Brenner Community Centre
British Gas plc
British Telecome PLC
British Waterways
British Waterways -London
British Wind Energy Association
Britist Plastics Federation
Broadway Malyan
Broughton Court Sheltered Accommodation
BT Plc
Buckley Gray Yeoman
Building Exploratory
Building London Project
Burberry Limited
Business in The Community
Business into Growth
CABE
Cable & Wireless (London)
Canalside Housing Partnership
Capita Percy Thomas
Capital Transport Campaign

Cara Irish Housing Association
Carol Straker Dance Foundation
Cassiopeia Consultancy
Catch
Catholic Association for Racial Justice
Cazenove Architects
Cazenove Area Action Group
Cedar Practice
Centerprise Literature Development Project
Centerprise Trust Ltd
Centerprise Youth Project
Central Africa's Rights and AIDS Society
Central and South Hackney Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Centre For Young Musicians (CYMH)
Cester Street Sheltered Accommodation
Cghp Architects Limited
CgMs Consulting
CgMs Consulting Limited
CgMs Consulting Planning, Archaeology &Historic Buildings Consultants
CgMs ConsultingPlanning,Archaeology & Historic Buildings Consultants
Chats Palace Arts centre
Chats Palace Arts Centre and Venue
Child & Adolescent Mental Health Service
Children First - Child Contact Centre
Childrens Scrap Project
Chinese Mental Health Association
Chizuk
Choice in Hackney
Choices N4, John Scott H/C
Chora architecture and urbanism
Chris Thomas Ltd
Church Of God World Fellowship
Circus Space
Citigen (London) Ltd
Citizens Advice Bureau - Dalston CAB
City and Hackney Carers Centre
City and Hackney MIND
City and Hackney MIND - Advocacy and Advice Service
City and Hackney MIND - Legal Advice Surgery
City and Hackney MIND - Prescribed Drugs Project
City and Hackney MIND Employment Project
City and Hackney Primary Care Trust
City and Hackney Teaching PCT
City Fringe Partnership
City of London
City of London Telecommunications
Cityzen
Clapton Christian centre
Clapton Community Housing Trust Playscheme
Clapton Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Clapton Orient Women's Football Team
Clapton Park Community Project

Clapton Park Tenant Management Organisation Ltd
Clapton Park United Reform Church
Claudia Jones Organisation
Clissold Park Junior Tennis Club
Clissold Swimming Club
Clowns Gallery Museum and Archive
Cluttons
Cluttons LLP
CMA Planning
Coal Authority
Cohen Lodge Sheltered Accommodation
Collier CRE
Colliers CRE
Colliers CRE on behalf of SPACE
COLT Telecommunications
Comaps Music
Comedy CafÃ© (East) Ltd
Communities and Local Government
Community Centre For Skills Development and People In Need
Community Groups
Community Link Up
Community of The Word of God
Community Services, LB Hackney
Comsol Communication Solutions Ltd
Congolese Refugee Womens Association
Congolese Youth Association
Connexions Careers Centre
Conservation Area Pavillion Committee
Conservative Councillors, LBH
Consortium of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Voluntary and Community Organisations
Contact a Family
Coombe Property Consultants
Core Arts
Corporation of London
Countryside Properties
Cozmo Clinic
Creative Arts Hackney
CrossRail line 2
Crossrail London Rail Links Ltd
Crown and Manor Club (for Boys and Young Men)
Crusoe House School
Cullinan and Buck Architects LTD
Cynosure Systems
Dalston Baptist Community Church
Dalston Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Dalston Methodist Church
Dalston Ward Labour Party
Dalston Youth Project
Dalton Warner Davis
Dalton Warner Davis LLP
DaWAY TO FITNESS
Day-Mer Turkish and Kurdish Community Centre
De Beauvoir Association
Dental Practice
Design Co-ordination Desk
Detectaplant
Detention Advice Service

Devplan UK
Dial-a-Ride and Taxicard Users
Diaspora - Sudanese Community Group
D-IDEAS
Diocese of London
Disability Back Up
Disability Hackney
Doctors Practice
Dominic Berning Gallery
Dominion Limited
Downs Baptist Church
DP9
DP9 Planning Consultants
DPDS Consulting
Drivers Jonas LLP
DTZ Pieda Consulting
Dunloe Centre - St Saviour's Priory
East & Wesr Bank Nature Reserve
East and West Reservoir Community Garden
East London Advanced Technology Training
East Reservoir Residents Assoc
Easynet
eco-ACTIVE Environmental Education Centre
Education Services - Hackney
Education Action Zone
Eigemet Limited
Ellingfort Creative Partnership
Energis Communication Ltd
English Heritage
ENO Baylis
Entec UK Ltd
Environment Agency
Erect Architecture
Estate Committees
Ethnic Right to Advice
Ezer Leyoldos
Ezer Leyoldos For Children and Families
Faith in the Future Ltd
Families Need Fathers
Family Action
Family Mosiac
Family Rights Group
Family Tree Christian Community
Family Welfare Association
FATAL
Fields estates TRA
Findon Urban Lofts DP9
Finesse Security LTD
Finsburry Club Happy over 60's club
Finsbury Park Homeless Families Project
Firstmark Ltd
FirstPlus Planning
Flat5
Fontier Communications
Forster Inc.
Fountayne Road Sheltered Accommodation
FRA
Frampton Park Baptist Church
Free Form Arts Trust
Freeform Arts Trust

Friends of Clapton Cinematograph Theatre
Friends of Hackney Archives
Friends of St John at Hackney Churchyard Gardens
Friends of the Earth
FUJITSU Telecommunications
FWA Hoxton NEWPIN
G L Hearn
Gardens, The Sheltered Accommodation
Gascoine 2 TRA
Geffrye Museum
Gemini Commercial Investments Ltd.
Gems Outreach
Generic Technology Centre
Genesis Housing Group
George Wimpey North Thames
GL Hearn
GOL - Planning and Housing Division
Government Groups
Government Office for London (GOL)
Grace Women's Organisation
Graham Road & Neighbourhood Association
Grainger Planning Associates Limited
Great Nile Trust
Greater London Authority
Green Lanes Sheltered Accommodation
Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL)
Gremline
Groundwalk east London
Groundwork East London
Groundwork East London Youth Programme
Groveworld
Growing Communities
Guiness Trust
GVA Grimley
GVA Grimley Ltd
gvagrimley
H.E.L.P
Hackney 180Â°
Hackney Allotment Society
Hackney and City of London Victim Support
Hackney and East London Crack Intervention Service
Hackney and Islington National Childbirth Trust
Hackney Bereavement Service
Hackney Chamber of Commerce
Hackney Chinese Community Services
Hackney Community and Police Consultative Group
Hackney Community Transport Ltd
Hackney Co-operative Development Agency
Hackney Cooperative Developments
Hackney Co-operative Developments
Hackney Co-operative Developments CIC Ltd.
Hackney Council for Voluntary Service
Hackney Council for Voluntary Services
Hackney Council Voluntary Services

Hackney Credit Union Steering Group
Hackney Cypriot Association
Hackney Downs Users Group
Hackney East African Community Association
Hackney Empire Bullion Theatre Room
Hackney Empire Ltd
Hackney Environment Forum
Hackney Environmental Forum
Hackney Family Back Up Ltd
Hackney Family Backup
Hackney Foster Carers Association
Hackney Green Party
Hackney Historic Buildings Trust
Hackney Homes
Hackney Homes Estate Based Youth Provision
Hackney Independent Living Team
Housing Association Ltd
Hackney Independent Parental Support Service
Hackney Information and Advice Consortium
Hackney LCC
Hackney Living Streets
Hackney Marsh Users Group
Hackney Marshes User Group
Hackney Music Development Trust (HMDT)
Hackney Muslim Womenâ€™s Council
Hackney Parks Forum
Hackney Play Association
Hackney Playbus
Hackney Players
Hackney Pyramid Scheme
Hackney Quest
Hackney Right to Buy Leaseholders/Freeholders Association
Hackney Rugby Club
Hackney Schools' Athletic Association
Hackney Singers
Hackney South Credit Union Ltd
Hackney Strategic Partnership, London Borough of Hackney
Hackney Tenants And Residents Convention
Hackney Training and Employment Network
Hackney Twinning and International Links Association
Hackney Voluntary Action
Hackney WellFamily Service
Hackney Wick Community Association
Hackney With Kingsland District Scout Council
Hackney Youth Orchestras' Trust
Hackney Youth Parliament (Homerton and North East)
Hackney Youth Parliament (Shoreditch and Stoke Newington)
Hackney Youth Service
Haggerston Sure Start
Halkevi - Turkish/Kurdish Community Centre

HAMHP (Hackney Action on Learning Difficulties)
Hanover in Hackney
Hanover in Hackney Housing Association
Hansen Partnership Pty Ltd - Town Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture consultancy
Haphzibah Christian Centre,
Haringey Council
HAWK Tenants and Residents Association
HBV enterprise
HCA
Healing & Empowering Lone Parents, Family Care Centre
Help Overcome Panic Effects
Help The Aged Hackney Handy Van Referral Scheme
Helping Hands Welfare and Development Association
Henley Halebrown Rorrison Architects
Herbal
Hidden Art Design and Manufacture Network
Highways Agency
Holborn Studios
Holborn Studios Ltd
Holy Trinity Church - Dalston
Home Builders Federation
Homerton Baptist Church
Homerton Neighbourhood Forum
Homerton Space Project
Homes and Communities Agency
Home-Start Hackney
Horden Cherry Lee Architects
Horton Road Residents
House Builders Federation
Housing Coop
Hoxton Bibliotech
Hoxton Hall Theatre and Arts Centre
Hoxton Health Group
Hoxton Trust Horticultural Training Project
Hoxton Trust Legal Advice Service
Huddleston Centre Hackney
HWO architects
I.D.S.
IAG to Police
Iceni Projects
Iceni Projects Limited
IDS
Immaculate Heart of Mary and St Dominic
Immediate Theatre
Independent Complaints Advocacy Service
Individual
Industrial Dwellings Society (1885) Ltd.
Interlink Foundation
International Somali Trust
Intrepid
Invest in Hackney
Investream Limited
Islington Council
Ivy Street Family Centre

J C DECAUX
J Hodgson Ltd
Jacobs Infrastructure
JALA
JC Decaux
JCMT architects
Jeffery Smith Associates
Jewish Care - Brenner Community Centre
Jewish Care - Wolfson House
Jobwise Community Venture
John Scott Health Centre
John Sharkey & Co
John Stebbing Architect
Jones Lang LaSalle
Jones Wood Architects
JUMP (Jewish Maternity Programme)
KC Law Chambers Solicitors
Kelly Communications
Kent Hall Hotel
Keswick Lodge Sheltered Accommodation
KeyRing Living Support Networks
King Bee Music Academy
King Sturge
Kings College London
Kingsland Community Regeneration Trust
Kingsland Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Kingsmead and Trowbridge Community Alarm Project
Kingsmead Homes Hackney
Kingsmead Kabin
Kingsway International Christian Centre
Kit Grover Limited
Knight Frank LLP
kpf
Kush HA
Laburnum Boat Club
Lambert Smith Hampton
Landscape Consulting
Lauriston Road Sheltered Accommodation
Lawns, The (Sheltered Accommodation)
Lawrence Court Sheltered Accommodation
LBH (Development Management)
LBH AD Culture
LBH Woodberry Down Regeneration
Lea View Community Nursery
Lea View House Sheltered Accommodation
Learning Trust
Leaside Trust
Lee Al Ltd.
Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
Legacy Company
Leonard Cheshire Services In Hackney - Alfred Heath Centre
Level (3) Three Communications
Levitt Bernstein
Levvel

LFB
Lidl UK
Lien Viet Housing Association
Limehouse Software
Living Space/Marsh Hill Project
Living Street Hackney
Livingstone Youth and Parent Support Centre
Local Dialogue
London 2012
London Aikido Club - Iwama Ryu
London Borough of Enfield
London Borough of Hackney
London Borough of Haringey
London Borough of Islington
London Borough of Newham
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Borough of Waltham Forest
London Cycling Campaign in Hackney
London Development Agency
London Fields Chess Club
London Fields Playgroup
London Fields Solutions Housing Association
London Fields Users Group
London Gypsy and Traveller Unit
London Irish Womens Centre
London School of Business & Finance
London Stock Exchange
London Sustainability Weeks 2004
London Sustainablity Exchange
London Thames Gateway Development Corporation
London Transport Bus Passenger
London Underground Ltd
London Voluntary Sector Training Consortium
London Waste Regulatory Authority
London Wildlife Trust
Lonfest Management Company
Longford Court Sheltered Accommodation
Longshots Bowls Club for Mature People
Lonodon Fields Solutions Housing Assocaition
Love 2 Work
Lovejoy London
Lower Ground Floor Office
LSM Partners
Lubavitch
Lubavitch Boys Primary School
Lubavitch Boys School - Juniors
Lubavitch Community Centre
Lubavitch Foundation and Synagogue
Lubavitch House
Lubavitch Orthodox Jewish Nursery
LUL
Luncheon Club
LV Services Northwestern
Macdonald Wright Architects
Mace Housing Co-operative
Madina Msque Trust
Malcolm Judd and Partners
Manor House Development Trust
Manor House House

Manor House Lodge
Marcon and Aspland Estates TRAs
Mare Street Sheltered Accommodation
Marie Murray (OPEN Dalston)
Markazul Uloom London
Matthew Lloyd Architects LLP
Mazorca Projects Ltd
MCI
McNicholas (Brown) PLC
McNicholas (Green)
Media
Mentoring Potential Ltd
Metro New Media
Metromedia Fiber Network UK Ltd
Metropolitan Housing Partnership
Metropolitan Housing Trust
MFS/Worldcom
MHT Development, London
Development Services
Mono Consultants Limited
Mono Consultatns
Montagu Evans
More Group
Morrel Court Sheltered Accommodation
Morricom Ltd
Mosaic Homes - Head Office
Motorcycle Action Group (MAG)
Muslim Careercare
Muslim Cultural Society of UK
N1 Wado-Kai
Naana's Kitchen
NACRO Housing Project
Napier Senior Citizens
Nathaniel Lichfield
National Association for People
Abused in Childhood
National Rivers Authority
Natural England
NCH Hackney Young Carers
NCH Independent Visitors Scheme
NCH Turnaround
Neale and Norden Arch
Network Rail
New Capital
New River SSLP
New Rivers Action Group
Newcastle (Wenlock Rd) Ltd
Newlon Housing Trust
Newman Association
Newnton Close Sheltered
Accommodation
NHS City and Hackney Primary Care
Commissioning
NHS London Healthy Urban
Development Unit
NHS Newham
Nia Project
Nicholas Taylor and Associates
Nile Centre - African-Caribbean Mental
Health Crisis Intervention Service
Nile Sweet Dental
NLMCC
NLSA
No Hackney High Rise
North and South Arden Tenants and
Residents Association

North London Action for the Homeless
North London Mosque
North London Muslim Community Centre
North London Muslim Housing Association Ltd
North London Muslim Youth Club - Boys and Young Men
Northwold Area Residentsâ€™ Group
NOVAS
NSPCC Child Protection Helpline
NSPCC London Schools Team
NTL
O" - Bay Community Trust for Nigerians
object architecture
Oblique
Ocean Music Trust
Off Centre - Hackney Young People's Counselling, Advice and Information Service
Older Peopleâ€™s Council
Olive Cox Lodge Sheltered Accommodation
Olympic Delivery Authority
Olympic Delivery Authority - Planning Decisions Team
Olympic Delivery Authority Planning Decisions Team
Onit Design Ltd
Open Dalston
Orange Personal Communications
Orient Music
Origin Community Association
Outreach Facilitation
Outward Housing
Oxfam
Pan African Ahmadiyah Muslim Association
Papa Architects Ltd
Parents Education Advice and Support Group
Park User Groups
Parton Lodge Sheltered Accommodation
Peabody
Peabody Trust
Pembury Estate Youth Club/Pembury Estate Community Hall
Pennie's Pet Store
Petadists Community Organisation
Peter Bedford Housing Association
Peter Smith Architects
Physical Disability Reference Group
PINS
Places for People
Planning Decisions Unit
Planning Potential
Plumpton Lodge Sheltered Accommodation
Port of London Authoirty
Premises Studios
Presentation _ SIA
Prideaux House

Prideaux House - Community of Reconciliation and Fellowship
Primary Care Dermatology Service
Prince's Trust City Road
Project Fresh Start - Hoxton
Project Mimique
Property 4 U
Property Department, London Stock Exchange plc
Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association
Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association (PRA) - Darnley Restaurant Club
Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association (PRA) - Darnley Road Day Centre
Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association (PRA) - Et Cetera Gallery
Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association (PRA) - Industrial Education Unit
PTEA
Pykewell Lodge Sheltered Accommodation
Queensbridge Trust
Quicksilver Theatre
Quit/Quitline
Race on the Agenda
Rail Safety and Regional Division, Department for Transport
Rapleys LLP
Ravenscourt Sheltered Accommodation
Rectory Road United Reformed Church
Refugee Womens Association
Refugee Workers Cultural Association
Regents Community Halls Management Committee
Regents Estate Tenants
Reggae Video Express
Release
Renaisi
Represented by Councilor Coggins
resident
Residents' Association of Benn Street, Bushberry Road and Wick Mews
Rhodes Estate Tenants & Residents Association (TRA)
Rhodes Estate TRA
Rio Cinema
Riverside Association
RMJM
Robert Owen Lodge Sheltered Accommodation
Robin Redmond Centre
Robin Redmond Resource Centre
Rolfe Judd Planning
Rooms & Studios London Ltd
Rosemary Works Residents Community Association Ltd.
Round Chapel Arts Centre
Royal Association for Deaf People
Royal Association for Disability and Rehabilitation (RADAR)
Royal Mail
RP3PLC
RPS
RPS Planning

RPS Southbank
Safer Space Free Form
Salvation Army - Hoxton Cornerstone Centre
Salvation Army Clapton Corps
Sanctuary Clinic
Save the Children UK
Savills
Savills (L&P) Ltd
Savills L&P Ltd
Scherazarde Ltd
Schonfeld Square Home for the Frail and Elderly
Scope Shop - Morning Lane
Scope Shop - Stamford Hill
Scott Brownrigg
Scott Wilson Ltd
Senegambia Youth Association
Senior Building Exploratory Explorers (BEEs)
Serco Technology
Shakespare Neighbourhoodd Resident's Association
Shaklewell Lane Mosque
Shellgrove TRA
Shian Housing Association
Shian Housing Association Ltd
Shiloh Pentecostal Church
Shoreditch Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Shoreditch Trust
Shoreditch Trust Neighbourhood Youth Forum 'Shore Thing'
Shrubland TRA
Sir Thomas Abney School
Skinners Academy
Smart Housing Group
SNCACC
Social and Environmental Analysis Ltd
Sol Cohen Youth Project
Somers Children and Family Centre
SongRise
Sound Life Trust
Sound Vision Trust/ Sound Radio
South Kingsland Youth Partnership
South Shoreditch Community Association
Southern Housing Group - Stamford Hill
Southern Housing Group Ltd
Sower, The
SPACE
Space Studios
Spacelab
SPIN
Spitalfields Crypt Trust
Sport England-London Region
Sports Forum
Springboard Hackney
Springfield Park User Group
Squadron Air Training Corps
SRBG BME
St Augustine's Tower
St Barnabas with St Pauls - Homerton
St Chad's Parish Church

St John Ambulance Brigade - Hackney Division
St John at Hackney and St Lukes at Hackney
St John at Hackney Congregation
St John the Baptist Church
St John the Baptist Roman Catholic Church
St John's Church Hall
St Johns Estate TRA
St Joseph's Hospice
St Joseph's Hospice Community Palliative Care Team
St Jude's Church
St Leonards Church
St Lukes Church
St Mark Stoke Newington
St Mark with St Bartholomew Church
St Mary of Eton Church
St Mary's Church of England
St Monica's Catholic Church
St Munroes
St Olaves Church
St Paul's Church - Stoke Newington
St Peter De Beauvoir Church
St Scholastica's Catholic Church
St Thomas Abney School
St Thomas Anglican Church
St Thomas More Church
St Thomas More Hall
St. Andrews Vicarage
STA Bikes
Stamford Hill Community Centre
Stamford Hill Estate Community Centre
Stamford Hill Group Practice
Stamford Hill Library
Standpoint Studios
Stephen Taylor Architects
Stepping Up
Stern Thom Fehler Architects
Stoke Newington Baptist Church
Stoke Newington Business Association
Stoke Newington Common Users Group
Stoke Newington Conservation Area Advisory Commission
Stoke Newington Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Stoke Newington First
Stoke Newington Leaseholders and Freeholders Association
Strategic Rail Authority
Strategic Urban Futures
Strettons Chartered Surveyors
Stroke Survivor's Project
Studio E Architects
Subterra and Urband
Sudan Culture and Sport Association
Suffolk Tenant Management Organisation
Sulemaniye Mosque
Supernova
Sustainable Development Group
Sutton House
T.Loughman & Co Ltd
Talking Matters (Association Ltd)

Tanet Ltd
Tangram Architects
Tawhid Educational Trust (Muslim Boys School)
Tayabah Muslim Girls School
Team Hackney (Partnerships)
Teger Trading
Telereal Services Ltd
Telewest Communications
Tendring District Council
Tetlow King Planning
TfL
Thames Water Property Services Limited
Thames Water Utilities Ltd
The Artist and Music Promotion Service
The Barley Mow
The Development Planning Partnership
The Finsbury Park Community Garden Project
The Guinness Trust
The Hackney Artists
The Hackney Society
The Halpern Partnership Limited
The Heron Practice
The Hype
The Landscape Partnership
The Light
The Littman Partnership
The London Planning Practice LLP
The London Planning Practice LPP
The Methodist Church
The National Trust
The Planning Inspctorate
The Planning Inspectorate
The Reservoirs Nature Society
The Sharp End
The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain
The Skinners Company School For Girls
The Surgery
The Theatres Trust
The White Horse
Thirlmere House Sheltered Accommodation
Thrive
TLC Care Services
Total Pipeline Solutions
TRaC Research Centre
Trading Places
Transco
Transport & Technology Service
Transport 2000
Transport for London - Land Use Planning
Transport Planning, Parsons Brinckerhoff Ltd
Trelawney Estate
Tropical Isles
Trowbridge Senior Citizens Club
Trueform Engineering
Turkish Cypriot Cultural Association
Turkish Islamic Association
Turley Associates
Turning Point

UBS LTD
Ujaama Arts Project Ltd
Ujama Arts Project
UK Turkish Islamic Cultural Centre Trust/Valide Sultan
Unite the UNION
United Group PLC
University College London
University of Westminster
Upfront Theatre
Upper Clapton United Reformed Church
Upper School
Urban Spectrum Property Management Ltd & Fieldingdale Holdings Ltd (66a-76)
UXL Training Centre
V.A.D.C.H TA
V22 Art Collective
Vanguard House Residents
Vanguard Project
Viacom (formally London Transport Advertising)
Vicharles Playcentre After School Club - Greenwood Road
Victoria Chambers Residents
Victoria Community Association
Victoria park Traders Association
Vietnamese Mental Health Drop-in
Vitesse Networks
Volunteer Reading Help - London East Branch
Wagmin Ltd
Walford Road Synagogue
Walk Hackney
Washinghton Young LLP
Wayside Christian Community Centre
WDCO
WDCO
Well Street Common User Group
Wenlock Barn Tenants and Residents Association
Wenlock Barn TRA
West Indies Associtaion UK
WGI
Whiston Practice
Whiston Road Hostel
Wilson Street Chapel
Wimpey Homes
Woodberry Bridge Club
Woodberry Down & Stamford Hill SRB6
Woodberry Down and Stamford Hill SRB
Woodberry Down Centre
Woodberry Down Community JMI School
Woodberry Down School
Woodland Trust
Woolf Bond Planning
Workforce
Workspace Group Plc
WORLDwrite
Worship Street Properties Ltd
Wrens Park House Sheltered Accommodation

WS Atkins

Wyke Estate Tenant Management

Organisation

Yad Voezer

Your Communications